SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY - VOLUME III

by Charles Hodge

Charles Hodge's systematic exploration of faith and its spiritual implications.

11 Chapters

Table of Contents

0. Systematic Theology - Volume III
1. CHAPTER XV: REGENERATION
2. CHAPTER XVI: FAITH
3. CHAPTER XVII: JUSTIFICATION
4. CHAPTER XVIII: SANCTIFICATION
5. CHAPTER XIX: THE LAW
6. CHAPTER XX: THE MEANS OF GRACE
7. CHAPTER I: STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.
8. CHAPTER II: THE RESURRECTION.
9. CHAPTER III: SECOND ADVENT.
10. CHAPTER IV: THE CONCOMITANTS OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

Chapter 0

Systematic Theology - Volume III

CHAPTER XV: REGENERATION

REGENERATION

---

§ 1. Usage of the Word.

The subjective change wrought in the soul by the grace of God, is variously designated in Scripture. It is called a new birth, a resurrection, a new life, a new creature, a renewing of the mind, a dying to sin and living to righteousness, a translation from darkness to light, etc. In theological language, it is called regeneration, renovation, conversion. These terms are often used interchangeably. They are also used sometimes for the whole process of spiritual renovation or restoration of the image of God, and sometimes for a particular stage of that process. Thus Calvin gives the term its widest scope: "Uno verbo poenitentiam interpretor regenerationem, cujus non alius est scopus nisi ut imago Dei, quæ per Adæ transgressionem foedata et tantum non obliterata fuerat, in nobis reformetur. . . . Atque hæc quidem instauratio non uno momento, vel die, vel anno impletur, sed per continuos, imo etiam lentos interdum profectus abolet Deus in electis suis carnis corruptelas." [1]

With the theologians of the seventeenth century conversion and regeneration were synonymous terms. In the acts of the Synod of Dort, we find such expressions as "Status conversionis aut regenerationis," and "effecta ad conversionem sive regenerationem prævia." John Owen, in his work on the Holy Spirit, follows the same usage. The fifth chapter of the third book of that work is entitled "The nature of regeneration," and one of the heads under this is, "Conversion not wrought by moral suasion only." "If the Holy Spirit," he says, "acts no

otherwise on men in regeneration or conversion," then so and so follows. Turrettin, as we have seen, distinguishes between what he calls "conversio habitualis" and "conversio actualis." "Conversio habitualia seu passiva, fit per habituum supernaturalium infusionem a Spiritu Sancto. Actualis vero seu activa per bonorum istorum exercitium. . . . Per illam homo renovatur et convertitur a Deo. Per istam homo a Deo renovatus et convertus convertit se ad Deum, et actus agit. Illa melius regeneratio dicitur, quia se habet ad modum novæ nativitatis, qua homo reformatur ad imaginem Creatoris sui. Ista vero conversio, quia includit hominis ipsius operationem." [2] This is clear and accurate. As these two things are distinct they should be designated by different terms. Great confusion arises from this ambiguity of terms. The questions whether man is active or passive in regeneration and whether regeneration is effected by the mediate or immediate influence of the Spirit must be answered in one way if regeneration includes conversion, and in another if it be taken in its restricted sense. In the Bible, the distinction is generally preserved; metanoia, repentance, change of mind, turning to God, i.e., conversion, is what man is called upon to do; anagennesis, regeneration, is the act of God. God regenerates; the soul is regenerated. In the Romish Church justification is making subjectively just, i.e., free from sin and inwardly holy. So is regeneration. So is sanctification. These terms, therefore, in the theology of that church are constantly interchanged. Even by the Lutherans, in the "Apology for the Augsburg Confession," regeneration is made to include justification. That is, it is made to include the whole process by which the sinner is transferred from a state of sin and condemnation into a state of salvation. In the "Form of Concord" it is said, "Vocabulum regenerationis interdum in eo sensu accipitur, ut simul et remissionem peccatorum (quæ duntaxat propter

Christam contingit) et subsequentem renovationem complectatur, quam Spiritus Sanctus in illis, qui per fidem justificati sunt, operatur, quandoque etiam solam remissionem peceatorum, et adoptionem in filios Dei significat. Et in hoc posteriore usu sæpe multumque id vocabulam in Apologia Confessionis ponitur. Verbi gratia, cum dicitur: Justificatio est regeneratio. . . . Quin etiam vivificationis vocabulum interdum ita accipitur, ut remissionem peccatorum notet. Cum enim homo per fidem (quam quidem solus Spiritus Sanctus operatur) justificatur, id ipsum revera est quædam regeneratio, quia ex filio iræ fit filius Dei, et hoc modo e morte in vitam transfertur. . . . Deinde etiam regeneratio sæpe pro sanctificatione et renovatione (quæ fidei justificationem sequitur) usurpatur. In qua significatione D. Lutherus hac voce, tum in libro de ecelesia et conciliis, tum alibi etiam, multum usus est." [3]

As this lax use of terms was unavoidably attended with great confusion, the "Form of Concord" itself, and the later Lutheran theologians were more precise. They made especially a sharp distinction between justification and anything signifying a subjective change in the sinner.

In the early Church regeneration often expressed, not any inward moral change, but an external change of state or relation. Among the Jews when a heathen became a proselyte to their religion, he was said to be born again. The change of his status from without to within the theocracy, was called regeneration. This usage in a measure passed over to the Christian Church. When a man became a member of the Church he was said to be born anew; and baptism, which was the rite of initiation, was called regeneration. This use of the word has not yet entirely passed away. A distinction is still sometimes made between regeneration and spiritual renovation. The one is external, the other internal. Some of the advocates of baptismal regeneration make this

distinction, and interpret the language of the formulas of the Church of England in accordance with it. The regeneration effected in baptism, in their view, is not any spiritual change in the state of the soul, but simply a birth into the visible Church.

---

[1] Institutio, lib. III. cap. iii. 9, edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. i. p. 389.

[2] Locus xv. quæs. iv. 13, edit. Edinburgh, 1847, vol. ii. p. 460.

[3] III. 19, 20, 21; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. p. 686.

---

§ 2. Nature of Regeneration.

By a consent almost universal the word regeneration is now used to designate, not the whole work of sanctification, nor the first stages of that work comprehended in conversion, much less justification or any mere external change of state, but the instantaneous change from spiritual death to spiritual life. Regeneration, therefore, is a spiritual resurrection; the beginning of a new life. Sometimes the word expresses the act of God. God regenerates. Sometimes it designates the subjective effect of his act. The sinner is regenerated. He becomes a new creature. He is born again. And this is his regeneration. These two applications of the word are so allied as not to produce confusion. The nature of regeneration is not explained in the Bible further than the account therein given of its author, God, in the exercise of the exceeding greatness of his power; its subject, the whole soul; and its effects, spiritual life, and all consequent holy acts and states. Its metaphysical nature is left a mystery. It is not the province of either philosophy or theology to solve that mystery. It is, however, the duty of the theologian to examine the various theories concerning the nature of this saving change, and to reject all such as are inconsistent with

the Word of God.

Not a change in the Substance of the Soul.

Regeneration does not consist in any change in the substance of the soul. The only advocate of the opposite doctrine among Protestant theologians was Flacius Illyricus, so called from the place of his birth. He was one of the most prominent Lutheran theologians in what is called the second Reformation in Germany. He did great service in the cause of truth in resisting the synergism of Melancthon, and the concessions which that eminent but yielding reformer was disposed to make to the papists. He contributed some of the most important works of the age in which he lived to the vindication of the Protestant faith. His "Catalogus Testiam Veritatis," designed to prove that the doctrine of the Reformation had had their witnesses in all ages; his "Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ;" and especially the great historical work, "The Magdeburg Centuries" (in thirteen volumes, folio), of which he was the originator and principal author, attest his learning, talents, and untiring industry. His fervent and uncompromising spirit involved him in many difficulties and sorrows. He died worn out by suffering and labour, says his biographer; one of those men of faith of whom the world was not worthy. Always extreme in his opinions, he held that original sin was a corruption of the substance of the soul, and regeneration such a change of that substance as to restore its normal purity. All his friends who had sided with him in his controversy with the Synergists and the supporters of the Leipzig Interim, forsook him now, and he stood alone. In the "Form of Concord," adopted to settle all the controversies of the period, these peculiar views of Flacius were condemned as a virtual revival of the Manichæan heresy. It was urged that if the substance of the soul be sinful, God, by whom each individual soul is created, must be the author of sin; and that Christ

who, in assuming our nature, became consubstantial with us, must be a partaker of sin. No Christian Church has assumed the responsibility of the doctrine of Flacius, or held that regeneration involves a change of the essence of the soul.

Regeneration does not consist in an Act of the Soul.

Regeneration does not consist in any act or acts of the soul. The word here, of course, is to be understood not as including conversion, much less the whole work of sanctification, but in its restricted sense for the commencement of spiritual life. The opposite view, which makes regeneration, even in its narrowest sense, an act of the soul, has been held by very different classes of theologians. It is, of course, involved in the Pelagian doctrine which denies moral character to everything except acts of the will. If "all sin is sinning," and "all love loving," then every moral change in man must be a change from one form of voluntary activity to another. As the later Remonstrants held the principle in question they made regeneration to consist in the sinner's own act in turning unto God. The influence exerted on him was one which he could yield to or resist. If he yielded, it was a voluntary decision, and in that decision his regeneration, or the beginning of his religious life, consisted.

Dr. Emmons's View.

Dr. Emmons, holding that all sin and holiness consist in acts, which acts, whether sinful or holy, are immediately created by God, makes regeneration to consist in God's giving rise to the commencement of a series of holy acts. In his discourse on Regeneration, the first proposition which he undertakes to establish is, "that the Spirit of God, in regeneration, produces nothing but love." This is maintained in opposition to those who say that the Spirit produces a new nature, principle, disposition, or taste. "Those in the state of nature," he

says, "stand in no need of having any new power, or faculty, or principle of action produced in them, in order to their becoming holy. They are just as capable of loving as of hating God. . . . This is true of all sinners, who are as much moral agents, and the proper subjects of moral government, before as after regeneration. Whenever, therefore, the divine Spirit renews, regenerates, or sanctifies them, He has no occasion of producing anything in their minds besides love." [4] "The love which the Spirit of God produces in regeneration is the love of benevolence, and not the love of complacence." [5] "Though there is no natural or necessary connection between the first exercise of love and all future exercises of grace yet there is a constituted connection, which renders future exercises of grace as certain, as if they flowed from a new nature, or holy principle, as many suppose." [6] His first inference from the doctrine of his sermon is, "If the Spirit of God produces nothing but love in regeneration, then there is no ground for the distinction which is often made between regeneration, conversion, and sanctification. They are, in nature and kind, precisely the same frdits of the Spirit. In regeneration, He produces holy exercises; in conversion, He produces holy exercises; and in sanctification, He produces holy exercises." [7] Secondly, "If the Spirit of God in regeneration produces nothing but love, then men are no more passive in regeneration than in conversion or sanctification. Those who hold that the divine Spirit in regeneration produces something prior to love as the foundation of it, that is, a new nature, or new principle of holiness, maintain that men are passive in regeneration, but active in conversion and sanctification. . . . But if what has been said in this discourse be true, there is no new nature, or principle of action, produced in regeneration, but only love, which is activity itself." [8]

Professor Finney's Doctrine.

Professor Finney, in his "Lectures on Systematic Theology, teaches: (1.) That satisfaction, happiness, blessedness, is the only absolute good; that virtue is only relatively good, i.e., good as tending to produce happiness. (2.) That all virtue lies in the intention to promote the happiness of being, that is, of universal being. There is no virtue in emotion, feeling, or any state of the sensibility, for these are involuntary. Love to God even is not complacency in his excellence, but "willing him good." (3.) All sin is selfishness, or the choice of our own happiness in preference to the good of universal being. (4.) Every moral agent is always "as sinful or holy as with their knowledge they can be." (5.) "As the moral law is the law of nature, it is absurd to suppose that entire obedience to it should not be the unalterable condition of salvation." [9] (6.) Regeneration is an "instantaneous" change "from entire sinfulness to entire holiness." [10] It is a simple change of purpose.

The system of Professor Finney is a remarkable product of relentless logic. It is valuable as a warning. It shows to what extremes the human mind may be carried when abandoned to its own guidance. He begins with certain axioms, or, as he calls them, truths of the reason, and from these he draws conclusions which are indeed logical deductions, but which shock the moral sense, and prove nothing but that his premises are false. His fundamental principle is that ability limits obligation. Free will is defined to be "the power of choosing, or refusing to choose, in compliance with moral obligation in every instance." [11] "Consciousness of the affirmation of ability to comply with any requisition, is a necessary condition of the affirmation of obligation to comply with that requisition." [12] "To talk of inability to obey moral law, is to talk sheer nonsense." [13]

But it is acknowledged that man's ability is confined to acts of the

will, therefore moral character can be predicated only of such acts. The acts of the will are either choices or volitions. "By choice is intended the selection or choice of an end. By volition is intended the executive efforts of the will to secure the end intended." [14] We are responsible, therefore, only for our choices in the selection of an ultimate end. "It is generally agreed that moral obligation respects strictly only the ultimate intention or choice of an end for its own sake." [15] "I have said that moral obligation respects the ultimate intention only. I am now prepared to say, still further, that this is a first truth of reason." [16] "Right can be predicated only of good-will, and wrong only of selfishness. . . . It is right for him [for a man] to intend the highest good of being as an end. If he honestly does this, he cannot, doing this, mistake his duty, for in doing this he really performs the whole of duty." [17] "Moral character belongs solely to the ultimate intention of the mind, or to choice, as distinguished from volition." [18]

The end to be chosen is "the highest good of being." "Good may be natural or moral. Natural good is synonymous with valuable. Moral good is synonymous with virtue." [19] Moral good is only a relative good. It does meet a demand of our being, and therefore produces satisfaction. This satisfaction is the ultimate good of being." [20] "I come now to state the point upon which issue is taken, to wit: That enjoyment, blessedness, or mental satisfaction, is the only ultimate good." [21] "Of what value is the true, the right, the just, etc., aside from the pleasure as mental satisfaction resulting from them to sentient existences." [22]

It follows from these principles that men perform their whole duty, and are perfect, if they intend the happiness of being in general. There is no morality in emotions, sentiments, or feelings. These are involuntary

states of the sensibility, and are in themselves neither good nor bad. "If any outward action or state of the feeling exists, in opposition to the intention or choice of the mind, it cannot by any possibility have moral character. Whatever is beyond the control of a moral agent, he cannot be responsible for." [23] "Love may, and often does exist, as every one knows, in the form of a mere feeling or emotion. . . . This emotion or feeling, as we are all aware, is purely an involuntary state of mind. Because it is a phenomenon of the sensibility, and of course a passive state of mind, it has in itself no moral character." [24] Gratitude, "as a mere feeling or phenomenon of the sensibility, . . . has no moral character." [25] The same is said of benevolence, compassion, mercy, conscientiousness, etc. The doctrine is, "No state of the sensibility, . . . has any moral character in itself." [26] The love which has moral excellence, and which is the fulfilling of the law, is not a feeling of complacency, but "good-will," willing the good or happiness of its object. Should a man, therefore, under the impulse of a benevolent feeling, or a sense of duty, perform a right act, he would sin as really as if, under the impulse of malice or cupidity, he should perform a bad act. The illustration is, that to pay a debt from a sense of justice, is as wicked as to steal a horse from acquisitiveness. A man "may be prevented [from committing commercial injustice] by a constitutional or phrenological conscientiousness or sense of justice. But this is only a feeling of the sensibility, and if restrained only by this, he is just as absolutely selfish as if he had stolen a horse in obedience to acquisitiveness." [27] "If the selfish man were to preach the gospel, it would be only because upon the whole it was most pleasing or gratifying to himself, and not at all for the sake of the good of being as an end. If he should become a pirate, it would be exactly for the same reason. . . . Whichever course he takes,

he takes it for precisely the same reason; and with the same degree of light it must involve the same degree of guilt." [28] To feed the poor from a feeling of benevolence, and to murder a parent from a feeling of malice, involve the same degree of guilt! Such a sacrifice to logic was never made by any man before. But still more wonderful, if possible, is the declaration that a man may "feel deeply malicious and revengeful feelings toward God. But sin does not consist in these feelings, nor necessarily imply them." [29]

Moral excellence is not an object of love. To say that we are bound to love God because He is good, is said to be "most nonsensical. What is it to love God? Why, as is agreed, it is not to exercise a mere emotion of complacency in Him. It is to will something to Him." [30] "Should it be said that God's holiness is the foundation of our obligation to love Him, I ask in what sense it can be so? What is the nature or form of that love, which his virtue lays us under an obligation to exercise? It cannot be a mere emotion of complacency, for emotions being involuntary states of mind and mere phenomena of the sensibility, are without the pale of legislation and morality." [31] "We are under infinite obligation to love God, and to will his good with all our power, because of the intrinsic value of his well-being, whether He is holy or sinful. Upon condition that He is holy, we are under obligation to will his actual blessedness, but certainly we are under obligation to will it with no more than all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength. But this we are required to do because of the intrinsic value of his blessedness, whatever his character might be." [32] Surely such a system is a hupodeigma tes apeitheias.

Dr. Taylor's View.

The system of Dr. Taylor of New Haven agrees with that of Professor Finney in making free agency include plenary power; in limiting

responsibility and moral character to voluntary acts, in regarding happiness as the chief good; and in making regeneration to consist in a change of purpose. The two systems differ, however, essentially as to the ground of moral obligation or nature of virtue; and as to the nature of that change of purpose in which regeneration consists.

Professor Finney adopts the common eudæmonistic theory which makes the happiness of being, i.e. of the universe, the chief good; and therefore makes virtue consist in the governing purpose to promote that happiness, and all sin in the purpose to seek our own happiness, instead of the happiness of being; consequently, regeneration is a change of that purpose; that is, it is a change from selfishness to benevolence.

Dr. Taylor, on the other hand, recognized the fact that as the desire of happiness is a constituent element of our nature, or law of our being, it must be innocent, and therefore is not to be confounded with selfishness. He hence inferred that this desire of happiness is rightfully the controlling principle of action in all sentient and rational creatures. Sin consists in seeking happiness in the creature; holiness in seeking happiness in God; regeneration is the purpose or decision of a sinner to seek his happiness in God and not in the world. This change of purpose, he sometimes calls a "change of heart," sometimes "giving the heart to God," sometimes "loving God." As regeneration is the choice of God as our chief good, it is an intelligent, voluntary act of the soul, and therefore must take place according to the established laws of mental action. It supposes the preliminary acts of consideration, appreciation, and comparison. The sinner contemplates God as a source of happiness, estimates his suitableness to the necessities of his nature, compares Him with other objects of choice, and decides to choose God as his portion. Sometimes

the word regeneration is used in a comprehensive sense, including the whole process of consideration and decision; sometimes in a restricted sense, for the decision itself.

Such being the nature of regeneration, it is of course brought about through the influence of the truth. The Bible reveals the nature of God, and his capacity and willingness to make his creatures happy; it exhibits all the motives which should determine the soul to take God for its portion. As regeneration is a rational and voluntary act, it is inconceivable that it should take place except in view of rational considerations. The Spirit's influence in this process is not denied. The fact is admitted that all the considerations which ought to determine the sinner to make choice of God, will remain without saving effect, unless the Spirit renders them effectual.

These views are presented at length in the "Christian Spectator" (a quarterly review) for 1829. On the nature of the change in question, Dr. Taylor says: "Regeneration, considered as a moral change of which man is the subject -- giving God the heart -- making a new heart -- loving God supremely, etc., are terms and phrases which, in popular use, denote a complex act. . . . These words, in all ordinary speech and writing, are used to denote one act, and yet this one act includes a process of mental acts, consisting of the perception and comparison of motives, the estimate of their relative worth, and the choice or willing of the external action." "When we speak of the means of regeneralion, we shall use the word regeneration in a more limited import than its ordinary popular import; and shall confine it, chiefly for the sake of convenient phraseology, to the act of the will or heart, in distinction from other mental acts connected with it; or to that act of the will or heart which consists in a preference of God to every other object; or to that disposition of the heart, or governing

affection or purpose of the man, which consecrates him to the service and glory of God." [33]

"Self-love or desire of happiness, is the primary cause or reason of all acts of preference or choice which fix supremely on any object. In every moral being who forms a moral character, there must be a first moral act of preference or choice. This must respect some one object, God or mammon, as the chief good, or as an object of supreme affection. Now whence comes such a choice or preference? Not from a previous choice or preference of the same object, for we speak of the first choice of the object. The answer which human consciousness gives, is, that the being constituted with a capacity for happiness desires to be happy; and knowing that he is capable of deriving happiness from different objects, considers from which the greatest happiness may be derived, and as in this respect he judges or estimates their relative value, so he chooses or prefers the one or the other as his chief good. While this must be the process by which a moral being forms his first moral preference, substantially the same process is indispensable to a change of this preference. The change involves the preference of a new object as the chief good; a preference which the former preference has no tendency to produce, but a direct tendency to prevent; a preference, therefore, not resulting from, or in any way occasioned by a previous preference of any given object, but resulting from those acts of considering and comparing the sources of happiness, which are dictated by the desire of happiness or self-love." [34]

Regeneration being a change of purpose, the mode in which it is produced is thus explained. "If man without divine grace is a moral agent, then he is qualified so to consider, compare, and estimate the objects of choice as means of happiness, and capable also of such constitutional excitement in view of the good and evil set before him,

as might result in his giving his heart to God, without grace. . . .
The act of giving God the heart must take place in perfect accordance with the laws of moral agency and of voluntary action. If the interposing grace violate these laws, the effect cannot be moral action; and it must violate these laws, if it dispense with the class of mental acts now under consideration. Whatever, therefore, be the influence which secures a change of heart in the sinner, the change itself is a moral change, and implies the exercise of all the powers and capacities of the moral agent, which in the nature of things are essential to a moral act." [35] On a previous page it had been said, "The Scriptures authorize us to assert, generally, that the mode of divine influence is consistent with the moral nature of this change as a voluntary act of man; and, also, that it is through the truth, and implies attention to truth on the part of man." [36] "Cannot," Dr. Taylor asks, "He who formed the mind of man, reach it with an influence of his Spirit, which shall accord with all the laws of voluntary and moral action? Because motives, without a divine interposition, will not secure this moral change in sinful man, and because they have no positive efficiency in its production, must God in producing it dispense with motives altogether? Must the appropriate connections between motives and acts of will, or between the exercise of affections and the perception of their objects, be dissolved, and have no place? Must God, if by his grace He brings sinners to give Him their heart in holy love, accomplish the change in such a manner that they shall have no prior perception or view of the object of their love; and know not what or whom they love, or wherefore they love Him, rather than their former idols? Does a consistent theology thus limit the Holy One, and oblige Him to accomplish the veriest impossibilities, in transforming the moral character of sinful man?" [37] This may be a correct account

of the process of conversion, with which this system confounds regeneration. Conversion is indeed a voluntary turning of the soul from sin to God. From the nature of the case it is produced proximately by appropriate motives, or it would be neither rational nor holy. But this proves nothing as to the nature of regeneration. The most accurate analysis of the laws of vision can throw no light on the way in which Christ opened the eyes of the blind.

Remarks.

It is plain that these views of regeneration are mere philosophical theories. Dr. Emmons assumes that such is the dependence of a creature upon the creator, that it cannot act. No creature can be a cause. There is no efficiency in second causes. Then, of course the first cause must produce all effects. God creates everything, even volitions. In the soul there are only acts or exercises. Regeneration, therefore, is an act or volition created by God; or, it is the name given to the commencement of a new series of exercises which are holy instead of sinful.

Professor Finney assumes that plenary ability is essential to moral agency; that a man, so far as his internal life is concerned, has power only over his choices and volitions; all, therefore, for which he is responsible, all that constitutes moral character, must fall under the category of choice, the selection of an ultimate end. Assuming, moreover, that happiness is the only absolute good, all sin consists in the undue pursuit of our own happiness, and all virtue in benevolence or the purpose to seek the happiness of being. Regeneration, therefore, consists in the change of the purpose to seek our own happiness, for the purpose to seek as our ultimate end the happiness of the universe.

Dr. Taylor, agreeing with Professor Finney on the nature of free agency, and in the doctrine that happiness is the chief good, holds

with him that all sin and holiness consist in voluntary action. But assuming that self-love, as distinguished from selfishness, is the motive in all rational moral action, he makes regeneration to consist in the choice of God as the source of our own happiness.

All these speculations are outside of the Bible. They have no authority or value which they do not derive from their inherent truth, and any man is at liberty to dispute them, if they do not commend themselves to his own reason and conscience. But besides thc purely philosophical character of these views, it would be easy to show, not only that they have no valid ground on which to rest, but also that they are inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture and with genuine Christian experience. This will be attempted when the Scriptural account of regeneration comes to be considered.

Regeneration not a change in any one Faculty of the Soul.

Regeneration does not consist in a change in any one of the faculties of the soul, whether the sensibility, or the will, or the intellect. According to some theologians, the feelings, or heart, in the restricted sense of that word, is the exclusive seat of original sin. Hereditary corruption, in other words, is made to consist in the aversion of the heart from divine things, and a preference for the things of the world. The end to be accomplished in regeneration, therefore, is simply to correct this aversion. The understanding, it is urged, so far as moral and religious truth is concerned, apprehends aright and appreciates what is loved; and in like manner, in the same sphere, we believe what we apprehend as right and good. If, therefore, the feelings are made what they ought to be, all the other operations of the mind, or inner man, will be right. This theory is founded in part upon a mistaken view of the meaning of the word "heart" as used in the Scriptures. In a multitude of cases, and in all cases where

regeneration is spoken of, it means the whole soul; that is, it includes the intellect, will, and the conscience as well as the affections. Hence the Bible speaks of the eyes, of the thoughts, of the purposes, of the devices, as well as of the feelings or affections of the heart. In Scriptural language, therefore, a "new heart" does not mean simply a new state of feeling, but a radical change in the state of the whole soul or interior man. Besides, this theory overlooks what the Bible constantly assumes: the unity of our inward life. The Scriptures do not contemplate the intellect, the will, and the affections, as independent, separable elements of a composite whole. These faculties are only different forms of activity in one and the same subsistence. No exercise of the affections can occur without an exercise of the intellect, and, if the object be moral or religious, without including a correspondent exercise of our moral nature.

Regeneration not merely Illumination.

Another and antagonistic theory equally one-sided, is that the intellect only is in fault, and that regeneration resolves itself into illumination. This view is far more plausible than the preceding. The Bible makes eternal life to consist in knowledge; sinfulness is blindness, or darkness; the transition from a state of sin to a state of holiness is a translation from darkness into light; men are said to be renewed unto knowledge. i.e., knowledge is the effect of regeneration, conversion is said to be effected by the revelation of Christ; the rejection of Him as the Son of God and Saviour of men is referred to the fact that the eyes of those who believe not are blinded by the god of this world. These Scriptural representations prove much. They prove that knowledge is essential to all holy exercises; that truth as the object of knowledge, is of vital importance, and that error is always evil and often fatal; and that the effect of

regeneration, so far as they reveal themselves in our consciousness, consist largely in the spiritual apprehension or discernment of divine things. These representations also prove that in the order of nature, knowledge, or spiritual discernment, is antecedent and causative relatively to all holy exercises of the feelings or affections. It is the spiritual apprehension of the truth that awakens love, faith, and delight; and not love that produces spiritual discernment. It was the vision Paul had of the divine glory of Christ that made him instantly and forever his worshipper and servant. The Scriptures, however, do not teach that regeneration consists exclusively in illumination, or that the cognitive faculties are exclusively the subject of the renewing power of the Spirit. It is the soul as such that is spiritually dead; and it is to the soul that a new principle of life controlling all its exercises, whether of the intellect, the sensibility, the conscience, or the will is imparted.

Not a Change of the Higher, as distinguished from the Lower Powers of the Soul.

There is another view of the subject, which falls under this head of what may be called partial regeneration. it is founded on trichotomy, or the assumption of three elements in the constitution of man, namely, the body, the soul, and the spirit (the soma, psuche, and pneuma); the first material, the second animal, the third spiritual. To the second, i.e., to the soul or psuche, are referred what man has in common with the lower animals; life, sensibility, will, and understanding; to the spirit what is peculiar to us as rational, moral, and religious beings, namely, conscience and reason. This third element, the pneuma, or reason, is often called divine; sometimes in a literal, and sometimes in a figurative sense. In either case, according to the theory under consideration, it is not the seat of sin, and is uncorrupted by the

fall. It remains, although clouded and perverted by the disorder in the lower departments of our nature, the point of contact and connection between man and God. This at least is one view of the matter. According to another view, neither the body nor the soul (neither soma nor psuche), has any moral character. The seat of the moral and divine life is exclusively the pneuma or spirit. This is said to be paralyzed by the fall. It is figuratively dead insusceptible of impression from divine things. There are as many theories of the nature of regeneration among the advocates of this threefold division in the constitution of man, as there are systems of anthropology. The idea common to all, or to a majority of them, is that regeneration consists in restoring the pneuma or spirit to its normal controlling influence over the whole man. According to some, this is a natural process in which an animal man, i.e., a man governed by the psuche, comes to be reasonable, or pneumatic, i.e., governed by the pneuma or higher powers of his nature. According to others, it is a supernatural effect due to the action of the divine (Pneuma) Spirit upon the human pneuma or spirit. In either case, however, the pneumatikos, or Spiritual man, is not one in whom the Holy Spirit dwells as a principle of a new, spiritual life; but one who is governed by his own pneuma or spirit. According to others again, the pneuma or reason in man is God, the God-consciousness, the Logos, and regeneration is the gradually acquired ascendency of this divine element of our nature.

In reference to these views of regeneration it is sufficient to remark, (1.) That the threefold division of our nature on which they are founded is antiscriptural, as we have already attempted to prove. (2.) Admitting that there is a foundation for such a distinction, it is not of the kind assumed in these theories. The soul and spirit are not distinct substances or essences, one of which may be holy and the other

unholy, or negative. This is inconsistent with the unity of our interior life which the Scriptures constantly assume. (3.) It subverts the Scriptural dostrine of regeneration and sanctification to make the governing principle in the renewed to be their own pneuma or spirit, and not the Holy Spirit.

Modern Speculative Views on this Subject.

The modern speculative philosophy has introduced such a radical change in the views entertained of the nature of God, of his relation to the world, of the nature of man and of his relation to God, of the person and work of Christ, and of the application of his redemption to the salvation of men, that all the old, and, it may be safely said, Scriptural forms of these doctrines have been superseded, and others introduced which are unintelligible except in the light of that philosophy, and which to a great extent reduce the truths of the Bible to the form of philosophical dogmas. We cease to hear of the Holy Ghost as the third person of the Trinity, applying to men the redemption purchased by Christ; of regeneration by his almighty power, or of his dwelling in the hearts of believers. The forms of this new theology are very diversified. They are all perhaps comprehended under three classes: first, those which are avowedly pantheistic, although claiming to be Christian; secondly, those which are Theistic but do not admit the doctrine of the Trinity; and thirdly, those which endeavour to bring theology as a philosophy into the forms of Christian doctrine. In all, however, the anthropology, christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology advocated, are so changed as to render it impossible to retain in their exhibition the terms and formulas with which the Church from the beginning has been familiar. Regeneration, justification, and sanctification are almost antiquated terms; and what remains of the truths those terms were used to express, is merged into the one idea of

the development of a new divine life in the soul. As to anthropology, these modern speculative, or as they often call themselves, and are called by others, mystic, theologians teach, (1.) That there is no dualism in man between soul and body. There is but one life. The body is the soul projecting itself externally. Without a body there is no soul. (2.) That there is no real dualism between God and man. The identity between God and man is the last result of modern speculation; and it is the fundamental idea of Christianity.

Soul and Body one.

As to the former of these points, Schleiermacher [38] says, "There are not a spiritual and a corporeal world, a corporeal and spiritual existence of man. Such representations lead to nothing but the dead mechanism of a preëstablished harmony. Body and spirit are actual only in and with each other, so that corporeal and spiritual action can only be relatively distinguished." The Late President Rauch [39] says, "A dualism which admits of two principles for one being, offers many difficulties, and the greatest is, that it cannot tell how the principles can be united in a third. A river may originate in two fountains, but a science cannot, and much less individual life." "It would be wrong to say that man consists of two essentially different substances, of earth and the soul; but he is soul only, and cannot be anything else. This soul, however, unfolds itself externally in the life of the body, and internally in the life of the mind." So Olshausen [40] teaches that the soul has no subsistence but in the body. Dr. J. W. Nevin [41] says, "We have no right to think of the body in any way as a form of existence of and by itself, into which the soul as another form of such existence is thrust in a mechanical way. Both form one life. The soul to be complete, to develop itself at all as a soul, must externalize itself, throw itself out in space; and this externalization

is the body."

God and Man one.

As to the second point, or the oneness of God and man, as the soul externalizes itself in the body, "dividing itself only that its unity may become thus the more free and intensely complete," [42] so God externalizes Himself in the world. Schleiermacher says, it is in vain to attempt to conceive of God as existing either before or out of the world. They may be distinguished in thought, but are only "zwei Werthe fur dieselbe Forderung, two values of the same postulate." According to this philosophy, it is just as true, "No world, no God," as "No body, no soul." "The world, [43] in its lower view, is not simply the outward theatre or stage on which man is to act his part as a candidate for heaven. In the midst of all its different forms of existence, it is pervaded throughout with the power of a single life, which comes ultimately to its full sense and force only in the human person." The world, therefore, is pervaded by "the power of a single life;" the highest form of that life (on earth) is man. What is that life? What is that pervading principle which reveals itself in such manifold forms of existence, and culminates in man? It is, of course, God. Man, therefore, as Schleiermacher says, is "the existence-form" of God on earth. [44] Ullmann [45] says that the German mystics in the Middle Ages taught "the oneness of Deity and humanity." The results reached by the mystics under the guidance of feeling, he says, modern philosophy has reached by speculation. This doctrine of the essential oneness of God and man, the speculative theologians adopt as the fundamental idea of Christianity. To work out that idea in a manner compatible with Theism and the Gospel, is the problem which those theologians have attempted to solve. These attempts have resulted, in some cases, in avowed Christian Pantheism, as it is called; in others, in forms of

doctrine so nearly pantheistic as to be hardly distinguished from Pantheism itself; and in all, in a radical modification, not only of the theology of the Church as expressed in her received standards, but also of the Scriptural form of Christian doctrines, if not of their essence. This is seen to be true in the anthropology of this system, which destroys the essential difference between the creator and his creatures, between God and man.

The christology of this modern theology has already been presented in its essential features. There is no dualism in Christ as between soul and body. The two are one life. Neither is there any dualism between divinity and humanity in Him. The divine and human in his person are one life. In being the ideal or perfect man, He is the true God. The deification which humanity reached in Christ, is not a supernatural act on the part of God; it is reached by a process of natural development in his people, i.e., the Church.

Soteriology of these Philosophers.

The soteriology of this system is simple. The soul projects itself in the body. They are one life, but the body may be too much for the soul. The development of this one life in its twofold form, inward and outward, may not be symmetrical. So humanity as a generic life, a form of the life of God, as projected externally in the world from Adam onward, has not developed itself aright. If left unaided it would not reach the goal, or unfold itself as divine. A new start, therefore, must be given to it, a new commencement made. This is done by a supernatural intervention resulting in the production of the person of Christ. In Him divinity assumes the fashion of a man, -- the existence-form of man, -- God becomes man, and man is God. This renewed entrance, so to speak, of God into the world, this special form of divine-human life, is Christianity, which is constantly declared to be

"a life," "the life of Christ," "a new theanthropic life." Men become Christians by being partakers of this life. They become partakers of this life by union with the Church and reception of the sacraments. The incarnation of God is continued in the Church; and this new principle of "divine-human life" descends from Christ to the members of his Church, as naturally and as much by a process of organic development, as humanity, derived from Adam, unfolded itself in his descendants. Christ, therefore, saves us, not so much by what He did, as by what He is. He made no satisfaction to the divine justice; no expiation for sin; no fulfilling of the law. There is, therefore, really no justification, no real pardon even, in the ordinary sense of the word. There is a healing of the soul, and with that healing the removal of the evils incident to disease. Those who become partakers of this new principle of life, which is truly human and truly divine, become one with Christ. All the merit, righteousness, excellence, and power, inherent in this "divine-human life" of course belong to those who partake of that life. This righteousness, excellence, etc., are our own. They are subjective in us, and form our character, just as the nature derived from Adam was ours, with all its corruptions and infirmities.

If asked what is regeneration according to this system, the proper answer would probably be, that it is an obsolete term. There is no room for the thing usually signified by the word, and no reason for retaining the word itself. Regeneration is a work of the Holy Spirit. But this system in its integrity does not acknowledge the Holy Spirit as a distinct person or agent. And those who are constrained to make the acknowledgment of his personality, are evidently embarrassed by the admission. What the Scriptures and the Church attribute to the Spirit working with the freedom of a personal agent, when and where he sees

fit, this system attributes to the "theanthropic-life" of Christ, working as a new force, according to the natural laws of development.

[46]

The impression made upon the readers of the modern theologians of this school, is that made by any other form of philosophical disquisition. It has not, and from its nature it cannot have anything more than human authority. This system may be adopted as a matter of opinion, but it cannot be an object of faith. And therefore it cannot support the hopes of a soul conscious of guilt. In turning from such writings to the Word of God, the transition these theologians would have us believe, is from gnw/sij to pi,stij; but to the consciousness of the Christian, it is like the transition from the confusion of tongues at Babel, where no man understood his fellow, to the symphonious utterance of those "who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Doctrine of Ebrard.

Of the writers who belong to the general class of "speculative" theologians, some adhere much more nearly to the Scriptures than others. Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, of Erlangen, has already been repeatedly referred to as addicted to the Reformed faith; and where he consciously departs from it, he considers himself as only carrying out its legitimate principles. His "Dogmatik" has, in fact, a far more Scriptural character than most of the modern German systems. In Ebrard, as in others, we find a compromise attempted between the Church doctrine of regeneration, and the modern theory of the incarnation of God in the race of man. Not only is a distinction made between repentance, conversion, and regeneration; but also true repentance and genuine conversion are made to precede regeneration. The two former take place in the sphere of the consciousness. In all the states and exercises connected with repentance and conversion, the soul is active

and coöperative; and the only influence exercised by God or his Spirit, is mediate and moral. It is not until the sinner has obeyed the command to repent, to believe in Christ, and to return unto God, that God gives the soul that divine something which makes it a new creature, and effects its living organic union with Christ. In this latter process the soul is simply passive. God is the only agent. What is said to be communicated to the soul is Christ; the person of Christ; the life of Christ; his substance, or a new substance. A distinction, however, is made between essence and substance. Ebrard insists [47] that the most hidden, substantial germ of our being is born again in regeneration -- not merely changed, but new-born. Nevertheless, he says that the "essentia animæ humanæ" is not changed, and assents to the statement by Bucan, "Renovatio fit non quoad essentiam ut deliravit Illyricus, sed quoad qualitates inhærentes." What he asserts, [48] frequently elsewhere, is, "That Christ, real and substantial, is born in us. But he adds that the words "real and substantial" are used to guard against the assumption that regeneration consists simply in some inward exercise, or transient state of the consciousness. It is, as he truly teaches, much more; something lower than the consciousness; a change in the state of the soul, which determines the acts and exercises which reveal themselves in the consciousness, and manifest themselves in the life. He finds his doctrine of regeneration, not in what Calvin and some few of the Reformed theologians taught under that head, but in what they teach of the Lord's Supper, and of the mystical union. Calvin [49] says, "Sunt qui manducare Christi carnem, et sanguinem ejus bibere, uno verbo definiunt, nihil esse aliud, quam in Christum ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus . . . . nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari. . . .Quemadmodum enim non aspectus sed esus panis corpori alimentum

sufficit, ita vere ac penitus participem Christi animam fieri convenit, ut ipsius virtute in vitam spiritualem vegetetur." "We have here certainly," says Ebrard, [50] "the doctrine of a secret, mystical communication of Christ's substance to the substantial centre in man (the anima'), which develops itself on the one hand in the physical, and on the other, in the noetic life." These writers are correct in denying that regeneration is a mere change in the purposes, or feelings, or conscious states of any kind in man; and also in affirming that it involves the communication of a new and abiding principle of life to the soul. But they depart from Scripture and from the faith of the Church universal in substituting "the theanthropic nature of Christ," "his divine-human life," "generic humanity healed and exalted to the power of a divine life" (i.e., deified), for the Holy Ghost. This substitution is made avowedly in obedience to modern science, to the new philosophy which has discovered a true anthropology and revealed "the real oneness of God and man." As already remarked, it is assumed that this communication of the "theanthropic nature of Christ" carried with it his merits as well as his blessedness and power. All we have of Christ, we have within us. And if we can discover little of God, and little God-like in our souls, so much the worse. It is all we have to expect, until our inner life is further developed. The Christ within (as some of the Friends also teach), is, according to this system, all the Christ we have. Ebrard, therefore, in one view identifies regeneration and justification. "Regeneration," he says, [51] "as the act of Christ, is the cause (causa efficiens') of justification; He communicates his life to us, and awakens a new life in us. This is justification, an inward subjective change, which involves merit as well as holiness. This confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, with the judicial, objective act of

justification, belongs to the system. At least it is only on the ground of this infused life that we are pronounced righteous in the sight of God. What we receive is "the real divine-human life of Christ," and "whatever there may be of merit, virtue, efficacy or moral value it any way, in the mediatorial work of Christ, it is all lodged in the life, by the power of which alone this work has been accomplished, and in the presence of which only it can have either reality or stability. The imagination that the merits of Christ's life may be sundered from his life itself, and conveyed over to his people under this abstract form, on the ground of a merely outward legal constitution, is unscriptural and contrary to all reason at the same time." [52] Regeneration consisting in the communicating the life of Christ, his substance, to the soul, and this divine-human life comprehending all the merit, virtue, or efficacy belonging to Christ and his work, -- regeneration involves justification, of which it is the ground and the cause.

Doctrine of Delitzsch.

Delitzsch devotes one division of his "Biblical Psychology" to the subject of regeneration. He begins the discussion with a discourse on Christ's person. "When we wish to consider the new spiritual life of the redeemed man, we proceed from the divine human archetype, the person of the Redeemer." [53] Man was, as to his spirit and soul, originally constituted in the image of God; the spirit was the image "of His triune nature and the latter [the soul] of His sevenfold doxa.'" Man was free to conform his life to the spirit, or divine principle within him, or to allow the control of his life to be assumed by the soul. Utter ruin was the consequence of the fall. This could be corrected and man redeemed only by "a new beginning of similar creative intensity." [54] This new beginning was effected in the incarnation. The Son of God became man, not by assuming our nature, in the ordinary

sense of those words, but by ceasing to be almighty, omniscient, and omnipresent, and contracting Himself to the limits of humanity. It was a human life into which He thus entered; a life including a spirit, soul, and body. There is no dualism in Christ's person, as between the corporeal and spiritual, or between the human and divine. It is the divine nature in the form of humanity, or this divine-human nature, which is purely and simply, though perfectly, human, which is communicated to the people of God in their regeneration. To this fellowship in the life of Christ, faith is indispensable, and therefore Ebrard says, infants cannot be the subjects of regeneration, while Delitzsch, a Lutheran, maintains that infants are capable of exercising faith, and therefore are capable of being regenerated. What is received from Christ, or that of which his people are made partakers, is "the Spirit, the soul, the body of Christ." [55] The new man, or second Adam, was made a "life-giving spirit," and gradually subdues the old man, or our Adamic nature, and brings the whole man (pneuma, psuche, and soma), spirit, soul, and body, up to the standard of the life of Christ, in whom the divine and human are merged into one, or rather appear in their original oneness.

The communication of the theanthropic life to the soul is an act of the divine Spirit in which we have neither agency nor consciousness. Delitzsch infers from what our Lord said to Nicodemus, John iii. that "The operation of the Spirit of regeneration is, therefore, (1.) A free one, withdrawn from the power of human volition, of human special agency. (2.) A mysterious one, lying beyond human consciousness, and only to be recognized by its effects." [56] "It is peculiar to all God's creative agencies, that the creature which is thereby brought into existence, or in which this or that is brought into existence, has no consciousness of what is occurring." [57]

Various as are the modifications of this doctrine as presented by different writers of this general school, regeneration is by all of them understood to be the communication of the life of Christ to the soul. By the life of Christ is meant his manhood, his human nature, which was at the same time divine, and therefore is theanthropic. It may be called human, and it may be called divine, for although being one, one life, it is truly divine by being perfectly human. We are all partakers of humanity as polluted and degraded by the apostasy of Adam. Christ, or rather, the Eternal Son of God, assumed human nature, in that He became man, and being God, humanity in Him was filled with the treasures of wisdom and knowledge and grace and power; of that humanity we must partake in order to have any part in the salvation of Christ. The communication of this life to us, which is our regeneration, is through the Church, which is his body, because animated by his human life. As we derive our deteriorated humanity by descent from Adam, we are made partakers of this renovated, divine humanity by union with the Church, in which Christ as a man, and God-man, lives and dwells. And as the communication of humanity as it existed in fallen Adam to his descendants is by a natural process of organic development; so the communication of the renovated humanity as it exists in Christ, to his people, and through the world, is also a natural process. It supposes no special interference or intervention on the part of God, any more than any other organic development in the vegetable or animal world. The only thing supernatural about it is the starting point in Christ.

Doctrine of the Latin Church.

In the later Latin Church the word regeneration is used as synonymous with justification, and is taken in a wide sense as including everything involved in the translation of the soul from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. In regeneration the sinner

becomes a child of God. It is made therefore, to include, (1.) The removal of the "reatus" or guilt of sin. (2.) The cleansing away of inherent moral corruption. (3.) The "infusion of new habits of grace;" and (4.) Adoption, or recognition of the renewed as sons of God. The Council of Trent says, [58] "Justificatio . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio, et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ, et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico amicus, ut sit heres secundum spem vitæ æternæ." The instrumental cause of justification in this sense, is declared to be "sacramentum baptismi, quod est sacramentum fidei, sine qua nulli umquam contigit justificatio." As to the effect of baptism, it is taught [59] that it takes away not only guilt, but everything of the nature of sin, and communicates a new life. "Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini gratiam; quæ in baptismate confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit, non tolli totum id, quod veram, et propriam peccati rationem habet; sed illud dicit tantum radi, aut non imputari: anathema sit. In renatis enim nihil odit Deus, quia nihil est damnationis iis qui vere consepulti sunt cum Christo per baptisma in mortem: qui non secundum carnem ambulant, sed veterem hominem exuentes, et novum, qui secundum Deum creatus est, induentes, innocentes, immaculati, puri, innoxii, ac Deo dilecti effecti sunt, heredes quidem Dei, coheredes autem Christi, ita ut nihil prorsus eos ab ingressu coeli remoretur." [60]

Regeneration, therefore, as effected in baptism, is the removal of the guilt and pollution of sin, the infusion of new habits of grace, and introduction into the family of God. It is in baptism that all the benefits of the redemption of Christ are conveyed to the soul, and this is its regeneration or birth into the kingdom of God.

Doctrine of the Church of England.

1. There has always been a class of theologians in the English Church who hold the theology of the Church of Rome in its leading characteristics. They accept, therefore, the definition of regeneration, or justification, as they call it, as given by the Council of Trent, and quoted above.

2. Others make a distinction between conversion and regeneration. The latter is that grace which attends baptism, and as that sacrament without sacrilege cannot be repeated, so regeneration can be experienced only once. Conversion is "a change of heart and life from sin to holiness." "To the heathen and infidel conversion is absolutely and always necessary to salvation." To the baptized Christian conversion is not always necessary. "Some persons have confused conversion with regeneration, and have taught that all men, the baptized, and therefore in fact regenerate, must be regenerated afterwards, or they cannot be saved. Now this is in many ways false: for regeneration, which the Lord Jesus Christ himself has connected with holy baptism, cannot be repeated: moreover, not all men (though indeed most men do) fall into such sin after baptism, that conversion, or as they term it, regeneration, is necessary to their salvation; and if a regeneration were necessary to them, it could only be obtained through repetition of baptism, which were an act of sacrilege." "They who object to the expression baptismal regeneration, by regeneration mean, for the most part, the first influx of irresistible and indefectible grace; grace that cannot be repelled by its subject, and which must issue in its final salvation. Now, of such grace our Church knows nothing, and of course, therefore, means not by regeneration at baptism, the first influx of such grace. That the sins, original and actual, of the faithful recipient of baptism, are washed away, she doth indeed believe; and also that grace is given to him by the immediate

agency of the Holy Spirit; yet so that the conscience thus cleansed may be again defiled, and that the baptized person may, and often does, by his own fault, fall again into sin, in which if he die he shall without doubt perish everlastingly; his condemnation not being avoided, but rather increased, by his baptismal privilege." [61]

3. A third form of doctrine on this subject, held by some divines of this church, is that regeneration properly expresses an external change of relation, and not an internal change of the state of the soul and of its relation to God. As a proselyte was regenerated when he professed himself a Jew, so any one initiated into the visible Church is thereby regenerated. This is held to be entirely different from spiritual renovation. Regeneration, in this outward sense, is admitted to be by baptism; renovation is by the Spirit.

4. A large class of English theologians have ever remained faithful to the evangelical doctrine on this subject, in accordance with the views of the Reformers in their Church, who were in full sympathy both in doctrine and in ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship with other Protestant churches.

---

[4] Sermon 51, Works, edit. Boston, 1842, vol. v. p. 112.

[5] Ibid. p. 114.

[6] Sermon 51, Works, edit. Boston, 1842, vol. v. p. 116.

[7] Ibid. p. 116.

[8] Ibid. pp. 117, 118.

[9] Lectures on Systematic Theology, by Charles G. Finney, edit. Oberlin, Boston, and New York, 1846, p. 364.

[10] Ibid. p. 500.

[11] Lectures on Systematic Theology, by Charles G. Finney, edit. Oberlin, Boston, and New York, 1846, p. 26.

[12] Ibid. p. 33.

[13] Ibid. p. 4.

[14] Ibid. p. 44.

[15] Ibid. p. 26.

[16] Ibid. p. 36.

[17] Ibid. p. 149.

[18] Ibid. p. 157.

[19] Ibid. p. 45.

[20] Ibid. p. 48.

[21] Ibid. p. 120.

[22] Lectures on Systematic Theology, by Charles G. Finney, edit.

Oberlin, Boston, and New York, 1846, p. 122.

[23] Ibid. p. 164.

[24] Ibid. p. 213.

[25] Ibid. p. 278.

[26] Ibid. p. 521.

[27] Ibid. p. 317, 318.

[28] Ibid. p. p. 355.

[29] Lectures on Systematic Theology, by Charles G. Finney, edit.

Oberlin, Boston, and New York, 1846, p. 296.

[30] Ibid. p. 64.

[31] Ibid. p. 91.

[32] Ibid. p. 99.

[33] Christian Spectator, vol. i. New Haven, 1829, pp. 16-19.

[34] Ibid. p. 21.

[35] Christian Spectator, 1829, p. 223.

[36] Ibid. p. 17.

[37] Ibid. p. 433.

[38] Dialektik, sect. 290-295; Works, Berlin, 1839, 3d div. vol. iv.

part 2. pp. 245-255.

[39] Psychology, New York, 1840, pp. 169, 173.

[40] Commentary, 1 Cor. xv. 20.

[41] Mystical Presence, edit Philadelphia, 1846, p. 171.

[42] Mystical Presence, edit. Philadelphia, 1846, p. 172.

[43] Mercersburg Review, 1850, vol. ii. p. 550.

[44] Dorner's Christologie, 1st edit., Stuttgart, 1839, p. 488.

[45] "Charakter des Christenthums," Studien und Kritiken, 1845, erstes Heft, p. 59. See also a translation of this article at the beginning of The Mystical Presence, by J. W. Nevin, D. D. Philadelphia, 1846.

[46] Mystical Presence, edit. Philadelphia, 1846, pp. 225-229.

[47] Dogmatik, edit. Königsberg, 1852, vol. ii. p. 320.

[48] Ibid. p. 300.

[49] Institutio, IV. xvii. 5, edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. ii. p. 403.

[50] Dogmatik, vol. ii. p. 310.

[51] Ibid. p. 315.

[52] Mystical Presence, by J. W. Nevin, D. D., Philadelphia, 1846, p. 191.

[53] A System of Biblical Psychology, by Franz Delitzsch, D. D., translated by R. R. Wallis, Ph. D.; Edinburgh, 1867, p. 381.

[54] Ibid. p. 382.

[55] A System of Biblical Psychology, by Franz Delitzsch, D. D., translated by R. R. Wallis, Ph. D.; Edinburgh, 1867, p. 398.

[56] Ibid. p. 402.

[57] Ibid. p. 403.

[58] Sessio. VI. cap. 7.

[59] Ibid. v. 5.

[60] Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, pp. 24, 25, 28.

[61] A Church Dictionary, by Walter Farquhar Hook, D. D., Vicar of

Leeds, article, "Conversion"; 6th edit., Philadelphia, 1854.

---

§ 3. The Evangelical Doctrine.

In the Lutheran Symbols the doctrine of Regeneration, which is made to include conversion, is thus stated: "Conversio hominis talis est immutatio, per operationem Spiritus Sancti, in hominis intellectu, voluntate et corde, qua homo (operatione videlicet Spiritus Sancti) potest oblatam gratiam apprehendere." [62]

"Hominis autem nondum renati intellectus et voluntas tantum sunt subjectum convertendum, sunt enim hominis spiritualiter mortui intellectus et voluntas, in quo homine Spiritus Sanctus conversionem et renovationem operatur, ad quod opus hominis convertendi voluntas nihil confert, sed patitur, ut Deus in ipsa operetur, donec regeneretur. Postea vero in aliis sequentibus bonis operibus Spiritui Sancto cooperatur, ea faciens, quæ Deo grata sunt." [63]

"Sicut igitur homo, qui corporaliter mortuus est, seipsum propriis viribus præparare aut accommodare non potest, ut vitam externam recipiat: ita homo spiritualiter in peccatis mortuus, seipsum propriis viribus ad consequendam spiritualem et coelestem justitiam et vitam præparare, applicare, aut vertere non potest, nisi per Filium Dei a morte peccati liberetur et vivificetur." [64]

"Rejicimus errorem eorum qui fingunt, Deum in conversione et regeneratione hominis substantiam et essentiam veteris Adami, et præcipue animam rationalem penitus abolere, novamque anima essentiam ex nihilo, in illa conversione et regeneratione creare." [65]

With these statements the doctrines taught in the Symbols and by the theologians of the Reformed churches, perfectly agree. It is sufficient to quote the standards of our own Church. The "Westminster Confession" says, "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all

ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." "When God converts a sinner, and translates him into the state of grace, He freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good." "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his Almighty power, determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace." "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Ghost, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." [66]

The Larger Catechism [67] says, "What is effectual calling? Effectual calling is the work of God's almighty power and grace, whereby (out of his free and especial love to his elect, and from nothing in them moving Him thereunto) He doth in his accepted time invite and draw them to Jesus Christ by his Word and Spirit; savingly enlightening their minds, renewing and powerfully determining their wills, so as they (although in themselves dead in sin) are hereby made willing and able, freely to answer his call, and to accept and embrace the grace offered and conveyed therein."

Exposition of the Doctrine.

According to the common doctrine of Protestants, i.e., of Lutherans and Reformed, as appears from the above quotations --

Regeneration an Act of God.

1. Regeneration is an act of God. It is not simply referred to Him as its giver, and, in that sense, its author, as He is the giver of faith and of repentance. It is not an act which, by argument and persuasion, or by moral power, He induces the sinner to perform. But it is an act of which He is the agent. It is God who regenerates. The soul is regenerated. In this sense the soul is passive in regeneration, which (subjectively considered) is a change wrought in us, and not an act performed by us.

Regeneration an Act of God's Power.

2. Regeneration is not only an act of God, but also an act of his almighty power. Agreeably to the express declarations of the Scriptures, it is so presented in the Symbols of the Protestant churches. If an act of omnipotence, it is certainly efficacious, for nothing can resist almighty power. The Lutherans indeed deny this. But the more orthodox of them mean simply that the sinner can keep himself aloof from the means through which, or, rather, in connection with which it pleases God to exercise his power. He can absent himself from the preaching of the Word, and the use of the sacraments. Or he may voluntarily place himself in such an inward posture of resistance as determines God not to exert his power in his regeneration. The assertion that regeneration is an act of God's omnipotence, is, and is intended to be, a denial that it is an act of moral suasion. It is an affirmation that it is "physical" in the old sense of that word, as opposed to moral; and that it is immediate, as opposed to mediate, or through or by the truth. When either in Scripture or in theological

writings, the word regeneration is taken in a wide sense as including conversion or the voluntary turning of the soul to God, then indeed it is said to be by the Word. The restoration of sight to the blind by the command of Christ, was an act of omnipotence. It was immediate. Nothing in the way of instrumentary or secondary coöperating influence intervened between the divine volition and the effect. But all exercises of the restored faculty were through and by the light. And without light sight is impossible. Raising Lazarus from the dead was an act of omnipotence. Nothing intervened between the volition and the effect. The act of quickening was the act of God. In that matter Lazarus was passive. But in all the acts of the restored vitality, he was active and free. According to the evangelical system it is in this sense that regeneration is the act of God's almighty power. Nothing intervenes between his volition that the soul, spiritually dead, should live, and the desired effect. But in all that belongs to the consciousness; all that precedes or follows the imparting of this new life, the soul is active and is influenced by the truth acting according to the laws of our mental constitution.

Regeneration in the Subjective Sense of the Word not an Act.

3. Regeneration, subjectively considered, or viewed as an effect or change wrought in the soul, is not an act. It is not a new purpose created by God (if that language be intelligible), or formed by the sinner under his influence. Nor is it any conscious exercise of any kind. It is something which lies lower than consciousness.

Not a Change of Substance.

4. It is not, however, according to the Church doctrine, any change in the substance of the soul. This is rejected universally as Manicheism, and as inconsistent with the nature of sin and holiness. It is, indeed, often assumed that there is nothing in the soul but its substance and

its acts; and, therefore, if regeneration be not a change in the acts, it must be a change of the substance of the soul. This assumption, however, is not only arbitrary, but it is also opposed to the intimate convictions of all men. That is, of all men in their normal state, when not speculating or theorizing. That such is the common judgment of men has already been proved under the heads of original righteousness and original sin. Every one recognizes, in the first place, that such constitutional principles as parental love, the social affections, a sense of justice, pity, etc., are immanent states of the soul which can be resolved neither into its essence nor acts. So also acquired habits are similar permanent and immanent states which are not acts, much less modifications or changes of the essence. The same is true of dispositions, amiable and unamiable. The refinement of taste and feeling due to education and culture, is not a change in the essence of the mind. It cannot reasonably be denied that a state of mind produced by culture, may be produced by the volition of God. What is true in every other department of our inner life, is true of our moral and religious nature. Besides those acts and states which reveal themselves in the consciousness, there are abiding states, dispositions, principles, or habits, as they are indifferently called, which constitute character and give it stability, and are the proximate determining cause why our voluntary exercises and conscious states are what they are. This is what the Bible calls the heart, which has the same relation to all our acts that the nature of a tree, as good or bad, has to the character of its fruit. A good tree is known to be good if its fruit be good. But the goodness of the fruit does not constitute or determine the goodness of the tree, but the reverse. In like manner, it is not good acts which make the man good; the goodness of the man determines the character of his acts.

It is a New Life.

5. While denying that regeneration is a change either in the essence or acts of the soul, evangelical Christians declare it to be, in the language of Scripture, "a quickening," a zoopoiein, a communication of a new principle of life. It is hard, perhaps impossible, to define what life is. Yet every man is familiar with its manifestations. He sees and knows the difference between death and life, between a dead and living plant or animal. And, therefore, when the Bible tells us that in regeneration God imparts a new form of life to the soul, the language is as intelligible as human language can be in relation to such a subject. We know that when a man is dead as to the body he neither sees, feels, nor acts. The objects adapted to impress the senses of the living make no impression upon him. They awaken no corresponding feeling, and they call forth no activity. The dead are insensible and powerless. When the Scriptures declare that men are spiritually dead they do not deny to them physical, intellectual, social, or moral life. They admit that the objects of sense, the truths of reason, our social relations and moral obligations, are more or less adequately apprehended; these do not fail to awaken feeling and to excite to action. But there is a higher class of objects than these, what the Bible calls "The things of God, "The things of the Spirit," "The things pertaining to salvation." These things, although intellectually apprehended as presented to our cognitive faculties, are not spiritually discerned by the unrenewed man. A beautiful object in nature or art may be duly apprehended as an object of vision by an uncultivated man, who has no perception of its æsthetic excellence, and no corresponding feeling of delight in its contemplation. So it is with the unrenewed man. He may have an intellectual knowledge of the facts and doctrines of the Bible, but no spiritual discernment of their

excellence, and no delight in them. The same Christ, as portrayed in the Scriptures, is to one man without form or comeliness that we should desire Him; to another He is the chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely; "God manifest in the flesh," whom it is impossible not to adore, love, and obey.

This new life, therefore, manifests itself in new views of God, of Christ, of sin, of holiness, of the world, of the gospel, and of the life to come; in short, of all those truths which God has revealed as necessary to salvation. This spiritual illumination is so important and so necessary and such an immediate effect of regeneration, that spiritual knowledge is not only represented in the Bible as the end of regeneration (Col. iii. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 4), but the whole of conversion (which is the effect of regeneration) is summed up in knowledge. Paul describes his conversion as consisting in Christ's being revealed to Him (Gal. i. 16); and the Scriptures make all religion, and even eternal life, to be a form of knowledge. Paul renounced everything for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ (Phil. iii. 8), and our Lord says that the knowledge of Himself and of the Father is eternal life. (John xvii. 8). The whole process of salvation is described as a translation from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light. There is no wonder, therefore, that the ancients called regeneration a photismos, an illumination. If a man born blind were suddenly restored to sight, such a flood of knowledge and delight would flow in upon him, through the organ of vision, that he might well think that all living consisted in seeing. So the New Testament writers represent the change consequent on regeneration, the opening the eyes on the certainty, glory, and excellence of divine things, and especially of the revelation of God in the person of his Son, as comprehending almost everything which pertains to spiritual life. Inseparably connected with

this knowledge and included in it, is faith, in all the forms and exercises in which spiritual truths are its objects. Delight in the things thus revealed is the necessary consequence of spiritual illumination; and with delight come satisfaction and peace, elevation above the world, or spiritual mindedness, and such a sense of the importance of the things not seen and eternal, that all the energies of the renewed soul are (or, it is acknowledged, they should be) devoted to securing them for ourselves and others.

This is one of the forms in which the Bible sets forth the doctrine of regeneration. It is raising the soul dead in sin to spiritual life. And this spiritual life unfolds or manifests itself just as any other form of life, in all the exercises appropriate to its nature.

It is a New Birth.

The same doctrine on this subject is taught in other words when regeneration is declared to be a new birth. At birth the child enters upon a new state of existence. Birth is not its own act. It is born. It comes from a state of darkness, in which the objects adapted to its nature cannot act on it or awaken its activities. As soon as it comes into the world all its faculties are awakened; it sees, feels, and hears, and gradually unfolds all its faculties as a rational and moral, as well as physical being. The Scriptures teach that it is thus in regeneration. The soul enters upon a new state. It is introduced into a new world. A whole class of objects before unknown or unappreciated are revealed to it, and exercise upon it their appropriate influence. The "things of the Spirit" become the chief objects of desire and pursuit, and all the energies of the new-born soul are directed towards the spiritual, as distinguished from the seen and temporal. This representation is in accordance with the evangelical doctrine on this subject. It is not consistent with any of the false theories of

regeneration, which regard regeneration as the sinner's own act; as a mere change of purpose; or as a gradual process of moral culture.

A New Heart.

Another mode in which this doctrine is set forth is found in those passages in which God is represented as giving his people a new heart. The heart in Scripture is that which thinks, feels, wills, and acts. It is the soul; the self. A new heart is, therefore, a new self, a new man. It implies a change of the whole character. It is a new nature. Out of the heart proceed all conscious, voluntary, moral exercises. A change of heart, therefore, is a change which precedes these exercises and determines their character. A new heart is to a man what goodness is to the tree in the parable of our Lord.

In regeneration, therefore, there is a new life communicated to the soul; the man is the subject of a new birth; he receives a new nature or new heart, and becomes a new creature. As the change is neither in the substance nor in the mere exercises of the soul, it is in those immanent dispositions, principles, tastes, or habits which underlie all conscious exercises, and determine tht character of the man and of all his acts.

The whole Soul the Subject of this change.

6. According to the evangelical doctrine the whole soul is the subject of regeneration. It is neither the intellect to the exclusion of the feelings, nor the feelings to the exclusion of the intellect; nor is it the will alone, either in its wider or in its more limited sense, that is the subject of the change in question. This is evident, --

(1.) Because the soul is a unit, and is so recognized in Scripture. Its faculties are not so dissociated that one can be good and another bad, one saved and another lost, one active in the sphere of morals and religion and the others inactive. In every such exercise the

intelligence, the feelings, the will, and the conscience, or moral consciousness, are of necessity involved.

(2.) In the description of this work all the faculties of the soul are represented as affected. The mind is illuminated, the eyes of the understanding are opened; the heart is renewed; the will is conquered, or, the man is made willing.

(3.) When Lazarus was restored to life, it was not one member of the body, or one faculty that received the vivifying influence. It was not the heart that was set in motion, the brain and lungs being restored by its action. It was the whole man that was made alive. And it is the whole soul that is regenerated.

(4.) This is further evident from the effects ascribed to regeneration. These effects are not confined to any one department of our nature. Regeneration secures right knowledge as well as right feeling; and right feeling is not the effect of right knowledge, nor is right knowledge the effect of right feeling. The two are the inseparable effects of a work which affects the whole soul.

(5.) When our Lord teaches that the tree must be made good in order that the fruit should be good, it was not any one part of the tree which must be changed, but the whole tree. In like manner it is the soul, in the centre and unity of its life, that is the subject of that life-giving power of the Holy Ghost, by which it becomes a new creature. The doctrine that regeneration is a change affecting only one of the faculties of the soul has its foundation entirely outside of the Scriptures. It is simply an inference from a particular psychological theory, and has no authority in theology.

---

[62] Form of Concord, II. 83.

[63] Ibid. 91.

[64] Ibid. 71.

[65] Ibid. 14; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1836, pp. 679, 681, 658, 581.

[66] IX. 3, 4; x. 1, 2.

[67] Question 67.

---

§ 4. Objection.

The same objections which are urged against other doctrines of grace are pressed against the Augustinian view of the nature of regeneration. These objections are of three classes.

Denial of Supernaturalism.

1. The first class of objections are founded on the denial of Theism; or at least on the denial of the Scriptural doctrine of the relation of God to the world. It is an assumption common to most of the forms of modern philosophy that the only agency of the Supreme Being (whether personal or impersonal) is according to law. It is ordered, uniform, and in, with, and through second causes, if such causes are admitted. Everything is natural, and nothing supernatural, either in the outward world or in the sphere of things spiritual. There can be no creation "ex nihilo," no miracles, no immediate revelation, no inspiration in the church sense of that term; no supernatural work upon the heart, and therefore no regeneration in the sense of an immediate operation of almighty power on the soul. Those who depart from their principles so far as to admit the person of Christ to be supernatural in its origin contend that the supernatural in Him becomes natural, and that from Him onward the diffusion of spiritual life is by a regular process of development, as simply natural as the development of humanity from Adam through all his posterity.

This is purely a philosophical theory. It has no authority for

Christians. As it is contrary to the express teaching of the Scriptures it cannot be adopted by those who recognize them as the infallible rule of faith and practice. As it contradicts the moral and religious convictions arising from the constitution of our nature, it must be hurtful in all its tendencies, and can be adopted by those only who sacrifice to speculation their interior life.

Resting on False Psychological Theories.

2. A second class of objections are founded on certain psychological theories on free agency, on the nature of the soul, and on the conditions of moral obligation. No theories on these, or any other subjects, have any authority, except those which underlie and are necessarily assumed in the facts and doctrines of the Scripture. If any theory teaches that plenary ability is essential to free agency; that God cannot control with certainty the acts of free agents without destroying their liberty; or that free acts cannot be foreseen, predicted, or foreordained, then such theory must be false if the Scriptures assert facts which imply the contrary. If a theory teaches that men are responsible only for acts of the will, under their own control, that theory must be rejected if the Bible teaches that we are responsible for states of mind over which the will has no direct power. The facts involved in the evangelical doctrine of regeneration, as stated above, contradict the theories on which the arguments of the Remonstrants, Pelagians, and others against that doctrine rest, and therefore those theories must share the fate of every doctrine which contradicts established facts. This has been demonstrated over and over in different ages of the Church. The principles involved in these objections have been discussed in the preceding pages, and need not be again considered.

Objections founded on the Divine Perfection.

3. A third class of objections are drawn from the supposed inconsistency of this doctrine with the moral perfections of God. If all men are dead in sin, destitute of the power to restore themselves to life, then not only is it unjust that they should be condemned, but it is also incompatible with the divine rectitude that God should exert his almighty power in the regeneration of some, while He leaves others to perish. Justice, it is said, demands that all should have an equal opportunity; that all should have, by nature or from grace, power to secure their own salvation. It is obvious that such objections do not bear peculiarly against the Augustinian system. They are urged by atheists against Theism. If there be a personal God of infinite power, why does He permit sin and misery to hold joint supremacy on earth; why are good and evil so unequally distributed, and why is the distribution so arbitrary?

Deists make the same objections against the divine authority of the Bible. They cannot receive it as the Word of God because it represents the Creator and Governor of the world as placing men under circumstances which secure in some way the universality of sin, and then punishing them with inexorable severity even for their idle words.

It is also plain that the different anti-Augustinian systems afford no real relief from these difficulties. Admitting that regeneration is the sinner's own act; admitting that every man has all the knowledge and all the ability necessary to secure his salvation, it remains true that few are saved, and that God does not interpose to prevent the great majority of adult men in the present state of the world perishing in their sins.

Augustinians do not deny these difficulties. They only maintain that they are not peculiar to their system; and they rest content with the solution of them given in the Scriptures. That solution agrees with all

the facts of consciousness and experience, so far as consciousness and experience extend. The Bible teaches that man was created holy; that by his voluntary transgression of the divine law he apostatized from God; that in consequence of this apostasy all men come into the world in a state of spiritual death, both guilty and polluted; that God exercises no influence to lead them into sin, but on the contrary, by his truth, his providence, and by his Spirit exerts all that influence over them which should induce rational beings to repent and seek his pardoning mercy and sanctifying grace; that all those who sincerely and faithfully seek reconciliation with God in the way of his appointment He actually saves; that of his sovereign grace He, in the exercise of his mighty power, renews and sanctifies a multitude which no man can number, who would otherwise have continued in their sins. With these representations of the Scriptures everything within the sphere of our knowledge agrees. Consciousness and experience testify that we are an apostate race; that all men are sinners, and, being sinners, have forfeited all claims on the favour of God; that in continuing in sin and in rejecting the overtures of mercy men act voluntarily, following the desires of their own hearts. Every man's conscience, moreover, teaches him that he has never sought the salvation of his soul with the sincerity and perseverance with which men seek the things of the world, and yet failed in his efforts. Every man who comes short of eternal life knows that the responsibility rests upon himself. On the other hand, the experience of every believer is a witness to him that it is of God and not of himself that he is in Christ (1 Corinthians i. 30); every believer knows that if God had left him to himself he wodd have continued in unbelief and sin. Why God intervenes to save one and not another, when all are equally undeserving; why the things of God are revealed unto babes while hidden from the wise and prudent, can only be

answered in the language of our Lord, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." (Matthew xi. 26.)

The more popular and common objections that the Augustinian doctrine of regeneration leads to the neglect of the means of grace, "to waiting for God's time," to indifference or despair; that it is inconsistent with exhortations and commands addressed to sinners to repent and believe, and incompatible with moral responsibility, have already been repeatedly considered. It is enough to say once more that these objections are founded on the assumption that inability, even when it arises out of our own sinfulness, is incompatible with obligation. Besides, it is the natural and actual tendency of a sense of helplessness under a burden of evil, to lead to earnest and importunate application for relief to Him who is able to afford it, and by whom it is offered.

CHAPTER XVI: FAITH

FAITH

---

§ 1. Preliminary Remarks.

The first conscious exercise of the renewed soul is faith, as the first conscious act of a man born blind whose eyes have been opened, is seeing. The exercise of vision in such a man is indeed attended by so many new sensations and emotions that he cannot determine how much of this new experience comes through the eye, and how much from other sources. It is so with the believer. As soon as his eyes are opened by the renewing of the Holy Ghost he is in a new world. Old things have passed away, all things are become new. The apprehension of "the things of God" as true lies at the foundation of all the exercises of the renewed soul. The discussions on the question, Whether faith precedes repentance, or repentance faith, can have no place if the meaning of the words be agreed upon. Unless faith be limited to some of its special exercises there can be no question that in the order of nature it must precede repentance. Repentance is the turning of the soul from sin unto God, and unless this be produced by the believing apprehension of the truth it is not even a rational act. As so much prominence is assigned to faith in the Scriptures, as all the promises of God are addressed to believers, and as all the conscious exercises of spiritual life involve the exercise of faith, without which they are impossible, the importance of this grace cannot be overestimated. To the theologian and to the practical Christian it is indispensable that clear and correct ideas should be entertained on the subject. It is one of special difficulty. This difficulty arises partly from the nature of

the subject; partly from the fact that usage has assigned the word faith so many different meanings; partly from the arbitrary definitions given of it by philosophers and theologians; and partly from the great diversity of aspects under which it is presented in the Word of God. The question, What is Faith? is a very comprehensive one In one view it is a metaphysical question. What is the psychological name of the act or state of the mind which we designate faith, or belief? In this aspect the discussion concerns the philosopher as much as the theologian. Secondly, faith may be viewed as to its exercise in the whole sphere of religion and morality. Thirdly, it may be considered as a Christian grace, the fruit of the Spirit; that is, those exercises of faith which are peculiar to the regenerated people of God. This is what is meant by saving faith. Fourthly, it may be viewed in its relation to justification, sanctification, and holy living, or, as to those special exercises of faith which are required as the necessary conditions of the sinner's acceptance with God, or as essential to holiness of heart and life.

---

§ 2. The Psychological Nature of Faith.

Faith in the widest sense of the word, is assent to the truth, or the persuasion of the mind that a thing is true. In ordinary popular language we are said to believe whatever we regard as true. The primary element of faith is trust. The Hebrew word 'mn means to sustain, to uphold. In the Niphal, to be firm, and, in a moral sense, to be trustworthy. In the Hiphil, to regard as firm, or trustworthy, to place trust or confidence in. In like manner the Greek pisteuo (from pistis, and that from peitho, to persuade), means to trust, i.e., to be persuaded that a person or thing is trustworthy. Hence the epithet pistos is applied to any one who is, and who shows himself to be,

worthy of trust. In Latin credere (whence our word credit) has the same meaning. In mercantile matters it means to lend, to trust to; and then in general, to exercise trust in. "Crede mihi," trust me, rely on my word. Fides (from fido, and that from peitho), is also trust, confidence exercised in regard to any person or thing; then the disposition, or virtue which excites confidence; then the promise, declaration, or pledge which is the outward ground of confidence. In the cognate words, fidens, fidelis, fiducia, the same idea is prominent. The German word "Glaube" has the same general meaning. It is defined by Heinsius (Wörterbuch): "der Zustand des Gemüthes, da man eine Sache für wahr hält und sich darauf verlässt," i.e., "that state of mind in which a man receives and relies upon a thing as true." The English word "faith" is said to be from the Anglo-Saxon "fægan" to covenant. It is that state ef mind which a covenant requires or supposes; that is, it is confidence in a person or thing as trustworthy. "To believe," is defined by the Latin "credere, fidem dare sive habere." "The etymologists," says Richardson, "do not attempt to account for this important word: it is undoubtedly formed on the Dut. Leven; Ger. Leben; A.-S. Lif-ian, Be-lif-ian; Goth. Liban, vivere, to live, or be-live, to dwell. Live or leve, be- or bi-live or leve, are used indifferently by old writers, whether to denote vivere or credere. . . . . To believe, then, is to live by or according to, to abide by; to guide, conduct, regulate, govern, or direct the life by; to take, accept, assume or adopt as a rule of life; and, consequently, to think, deem, or judge right; to be firmly persuaded of, to give credit to; to trust, or think trustworthy; to have or give faith or confidence; to confide, to think or deem faithful."

The Primary Idea of Faith is Trust.

From all this it appears that the primary idea of faith is trust. The

primary idea of truth is that which is trustworthy; that which sustains our expectations, which does not disappoint, because it really is what it is assumed or declared to be. It is opposed to the deceitful, the false, the unreal, the empty, and the worthless. To regard a thing as true, is to regard it as worthy of trust, as being what it purports to be. Faith, in the comprehensive and legitimate meaning of the word, therefore, is trust.

In accordance with this general idea of faith, Augustine [68] says, "Credere, nihil aliud est, quam cum assensione cogitare." Thus, also, Reid [69] says, "Belief admits of all degrees, from the slightest suspicion to the fullest assurance. . . . . There are many operations of the mind in which . . . . we find belief to be an essential ingredient. . . . . Belief is an ingredient in consciousness, in perception, and in remembrance. . . . . We give the name of evidence to whatever is a ground of belief. . . . . What this evidence is, is more easily felt than described. . . . . The common occasions of life lead us to distinguish evidence into different kinds, ... such as the evidence of sense, the evidence of memory, the evidence of consciousness, the evidence of testimony, the evidence of axioms, the evidence of reasoning. . . . . They seem to me to agree only in this, that they are all fitted by nature to produce belief in the human mind."

The more limited Sense of the Word.

There is, however, in most cases a great difference between the general signification of a word and its special and characteristic meaning. Although, therefore, there is an element cf belief in all our cognitions, there is an important difference between what is strictly and properly called faith, and those states or acts of the mind which we designate as sight or perception, intuition, opinions, conclusions,

or apodictic judgments. What that characteristic difference is, is the point to be determined. There are modes of statement on this subject current among a certain class of philosophers and theologians, which can hardly be regarded as definitions of faith. They take the word out of its ordinary and established meaning, or arbitrarily limit it to a special sphere of our mental operations. Thus Morell [70] says, "Faith is the intuition of eternal verities." But eternal verities are not the only objects of faith; nor is intuition the only mode of apprehending truth which is of the nature of belief. The same objections bear against the assertion that "Faith is the organ for the supernatural and divine; "or, as Eschenmayer expresses it, [71] "Ein vom Denken, Fühlen und Wollen verschiedenes, eigenthümliches Organ für das Ewige und Heilige; a special organ for the eternal and the holy." The supernatural and divine, however, are not the exclusive objects even of religious faith. It is by faith we know that the worlds were made by the word of God; it was by faith Noah prepared the ark, and Abraham, being called of God, went out not knowing whither he went. The objects of faith in these cases are not what is meant by "eternal verities." It is, moreover, an arbitrary assumption that faith is "a special organ," even when things supernatural and divine are its object. Our nature is adapted to the reception of all kinds of truth of which we can have any idea. But it is not necessary to assume a special organ for historical truths, a special organ for scientific truths, and another for the general truths of revelation, and still another for "the eternal and the holy." God has constituted us capable of belief, and the complex state of mind involved in the act of faith is of course different according to the nature of the truth believed, and the nature of the evidence on which our faith is founded. But this does not necessitate the assumption of a distinct organ for each kind of truth.

Faith not to be regarded as simply a Christian Grace.

No less unsatisfactory are those descriptions of faith which regard it only in its character as a Christian and saving grace. Delitzsch, for example, [72] describes faith as the most central act of our being; the return to God, the going out of our inner life to Him. "This longing after God s free, merciful love, as his own Word declares it, a longing, reaching forth, and grasping it; this naked, unselfish craving, feeling itself satisfied with nothing else than God's promised grace; this eagerness, absorbing every ray of light that proceeds from God's reconciled love; this convinced and safety-craving appropriation and clinging to the word of grace; this is faith. According to its nature, it is the pure receptive correlative of the word of promise; a means of approaching again to God, which, as the word itself, is appointed through the distance of God in consequence of sin; for faith has to confide in the word, in spite of all want of comprehension, want of sight, want of experience. No experimental actus reflexi belong to the nature of faith. It is, according to its nature, actia directa, to wit, fiducia supplex." All this is doubtless true of the believer. He does thus long after God, and appropriate the assurance of his love, and cling to his promises of grace; but faith has a wider range than this. There are exercises of faith not included in this description, recorded in Scripture, and especially in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Erdmann [73] says that religious faith, the faith on which the Scriptures lay so much stress, is, "Bewusstseyn der Versöhnung mit Gott, consciousness of reconciliation with God." He insists that faith cannot be separated from its contents. It is not the man who holds this or that to be true, who is a believer; but the man who is convinced of a specific truth, namely, that he is reconciled with God. Calling faith

a consciousness is not a definition of its nature. And limiting it to a consciousness of reconciliation with God is contrary to the usage of Scripture and of theology.

Definitions of Faith founded on its Subjective Nature.

The more common and generally received definitions of faith, may perhaps be reduced to three classes, all of which include the general idea of persuasion of the truth. But some seek the distinguishing character of faith in its subjective nature, others, in the nature of its object; others, in the nature of the evidence, or ground on which it rests.

Faith as distinguished from Opinion and Knowledge.

To the first of these classes belong the following definitions: Faith or belief is said to be a persuasion of the truth stronger than opinion, and weaker than knowledge. Metaphysicians divide the objects of our cognitions into the possible, the real, and the necessary. With regard to the merely possible we can form only conjectures, or opinions, more or less plausible or probable. With regard to things which the mind with greater or less confidence views as certain, although it cannot justify that confidence to itself or others, i.e., cannot demonstrate the certainty of the object, it is said to believe. What it is perfectly assured of, and can demonstrate to be true so as to coerce conviction, it is said to know. Thus Locke defines faith to be the assent of the mind to propositions which are probably, but not certainly true. Bailey [74] says, "I propose to confine it [belief or faith] first, to the effect on the mind of the premises in what is termed probable reasoning, or what I have named contingent reasoning -- in a word the premises in all reasoning, but that which is demonstrative; and secondly, to the state of holding true when that state, far from being the effect of any premises discerned by the mind,

is dissociated from all evidence." To believe is to admit a thing as true, according to Kant, on grounds sufficient subjectively, insufficient objectively. Or, as more fully stated, "Holding for true, or the subjective validity of a judgment in relation to conviction (which is, at the same time, objectively valid) has the three following degrees: opinion, belief, and knowledge. Opinion is a consciously insufficient judgment, subjectively as well as objectively. Belief is subjectively sufficient, but is recognized as being objectively insufficient. Knowledge is both subjectively and objectively sufficient. Subjective sufficiency is termed conviction (for myself); objective sufficiency is termed certainty (for all)." [75] Erdmann [76] says, "Man versteht unter Glauben eine jede Gewissheit, die geringer ist als das Wissen, und etwa stärker ist als ein blesses Meinen oder Fürmöglichhalten (z. B. ich glaube, dass es heute regnen wird)." "By faith is understood any persuasion which is weaker than knowledge, but somewhat stronger than a mere deeming possible or probable, as, e.g., I believe it will rain to-day." This he gives as the commonly accepted meaning of the word, although he utterly repudiates it as a definition of religious faith.

It is urged in support of this definition of faith that with regard to everything of which we are not absolutely sure, and yet are persuaded or convinced of its truth, we say we believe. Thus with respect to things remembered; if the recollection is indistinct and uncertain, we say we think, e.g., we think we saw a certain person at a given time and place; we are not sure, but such is our impression. If our persuasion of the fact be stronger, we say we believe it. If we have, and can have, no doubt about it, we say we know it. In like manner the testimony of our senses may be so weak as to produce only a probability that the thing is as it appears; if clearer, it produces a belief more

or less decided; if so clear as to preclude all doubt, the effect is knowledge. If we see a person at a distance, and we are entirely uncertain who it is, we can only say we think it is some one whom we know. If that persuasion becomes stronger, we say, we believe it is he. If perfectly sure, we say, we know it. In all these cases the only difference between opinion, belief, and knowledge, is their relative strength. The objects are the same, their relation to the mind is the same, and the ground or evidence on which they severally rest is of the same kind. It is said that it would be incorrect to say, "We believe that we slept in our house last night;" if perfectly sure of the fact. If a witness in a court of justice simply says, "I believe I was at a certain place at a given time," his testimony would be of no value. He must be able to say that he is sure of the fact -- that he knows it.

Objections to this Definition.

Of this definition of faith, it may be remarked, --

1. That the meaning which it assigns to the word is certainly legitimate, sustained by established usage. The states of mind expressed by the words, I think a thing to be true; I believe it; I know it, are distinguished from each other simply by the different degrees of certainty which enter into them respectively. The probable ground of this use of the word to believe, is, that there is more of the element of trust (or a voluntarily giving to evidence a greater influence on the mind than of necessity belongs to it), manifest in our consciousness, than is expressed by saying we think, or, we know. However this may be, it cannot be denied that the word belief often expresses a degree of conviction greater than opinion and less than knowledge.

2. But this is not the distinguishing characteristic of faith, or its differentia. There are exercises of faith into which this uncertainty

does not enter. Some of the strongest convictions of which the mind is capable are beliefs. Even our assurance of the veracity of consciousness, the foundation of all other convictions, is of the nature of faith. So the primary truths which are, and must be assumed in all our researches and arguments, are beliefs. They are taken on trust. They cannot be proved. If any man denies them, there is nothing more to be said. He cannot be convinced. Sir William Hamilton [77] says, "St. Austin accurately says, We know what rests upon reason; we believe what rests upon authority.' But reason itself must at last rest upon authority; for the original data of reason do not rest on reason, but are necessarily accepted by reason on the authority of what is beyond itself. These data are, therefore, in rigid propriety, beliefs or trusts. Thus it is that, in the last resort, we must, perforce, philosophically admit, that belief is the primary condition of reason, and not reason the ultimate ground of belief. We are compelled to surrender the proud Intellige ut credas of Abelard, to content ourselves with the humble Crede ut intelligas of Anselm."

The same is true in other spheres. The effect on the mind produced by human testimony is universally recognized as faith. If that testimony is inadequate it does not preclude doubt; but it may be so strong as to make all doubt impossible. No sane man ean doubt the existence of such cities as London and Paris. But to most men that existence is not a matter of knowledge either intuitive or discursive. It is something taken on trust, on the authority of others; which taking on trust is admitted by philosophers, theologians, and the mass of men, to be a form of faith. Again, in some moral states of mind a man's conviction of the reality of a future state of reward and punishment is as strong as his belief in his own existence, and much stronger than his confidence in the testimony of his senses. And yet a future state of

existence is not a matter of knowledge. It is an object of faith, or a thing believed. We accordingly find that the Scriptures teach that there is a full assurance of faith; a faith which precludes the possibility of doubt. Paul says, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (2 Tim. i. 12.) As Job had said ages before, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." The Apostle declares, Hebrews xi. 1, faith to be an hupostasis and elenchos, than which no stronger terms could be selected to express assured conviction. The power, also, which the Bible attributes to faith as the controlling principle of life, as overcoming the world, subduing kingdoms, stopping the mouths of lions, quenching the violence of fire, turning to flight the armies of the aliens, is proof enough that it is no weak persuasion of the truth. That definition, therefore, which makes the characteristic of faith to be a measure of confidence greater than opinion, but less than knowledge, cannot be deemed satisfactory.

Faith not a Voluntary Conviction.

A second definition of faith, founded on its nature, is that which makes it "a voluntary conviction or persuasion of the truth." This is a very old view of the matter. According to Theodoret, [78] pistis estin hekousios tes psuches sunkatatheitis, i.e., "a voluntary assent of the mind." And Thomas Aquinas says, [79] "Credere est actus intellectus assentientis veritati divinæ ex imperio voluntatis a Deo motæ per gratiam." [80] He distinguishes between knowledge and faith by representing the former as the conviction produced by the object itself seen intuitively or discursively ("sicut patet in principiis primis, ... vel . . . . sicut patet de conclusionibus") to be true; whereas in the latter the mind is not sufficiently moved to assent "ab objecto proprio, sed per quandam electionem, voluntarie declinans in

unam partem magis quam in alteram. Et siquidem hæc sit cum dubitatione et formidine alterius partis, erit opinio. Si autem sit cum certitudine absque tali formidine, erit fides."

This definition admits of different explanations. The word "voluntary," if its meaning be determined by the wide sense of the word "will," includes every operation of the mind not purely intellectual. And therefore to say that faith is a voluntary assent is to say that faith is not merely a speculative assent, an act of the judgment pronouncing a thing to be true, but includes feeling. Nitsch, therefore, defines faith to be a "gefühlsmassiges Erkennen." "Die Einheit des Gefühls und der Erkenntniss; [81] a knowledge or persuasion of truth combined with feeling, -- the unity of feeling and knowledge." But if the word "will" be taken in the sense of the power of self-determination, then nothing is voluntary which does not involve the exercise of that power. If in this sense faith be voluntary, then we must have the power to believe or disbelieve at pleasure. If we believe the truth, it is because we choose or determine ourselves to receive it; if we reject it, it is because we will to disbelieve it. The decision is determined neither by the nature of the object nor by the nature or degree of the evidence. Sometimes both of these meanings of the word voluntary seem to be combined by those who define faith to be a voluntary assent of the mind, or an assent of the intellect determined by the will. This appears from what Aquinas, for example, says when he discusses the question whether faith is a virtue. He argues that if faith be a virtue, which he admits it to be, it must include love, because love is the form or principle of all the virtues; and it must be self-determined because there could be no virtue in faith if it were the inevitable effect of the evidence or testimony. If a virtue, it must include an act of self-determination; we must decide to do what we

have the power not to do.

Remarks on this Definition of Faith.

This definition of faith contains many elements of truth. In the first place: it is true that faith and feeling are often inseparable. They together constitute that state of mind to which the name faith is given. The perception of beauty is of necessity connected with the feeling of delight. Assent to moral truth involves the feeling of moral approbation. In like manner spiritual discernment (faith when the fruit of the Spirit) includes delight in the things of the Spirit, not only as true, but as beautiful and good. This is the difference between a living and dead faith. This is the portion of truth involved in the Romish doctrine of a formed and unformed faith. Faith (assent to the truth) connected with love is the fides formata; faith without love is fides informis. While, however, it is true that faith is often necessarily connected with feeling, and, therefore, in one sense of the term, is a voluntary assent, yet this is not always the csse. Whether feeling attends and enters into the exercise of faith, depends upon its object (or the thing believed) and the evidence on which it is founded. When the object of faith is speculative truth, or some historical event past or future; or when the evidence or testimony on which faith is founded is addressed only to the understanding and not to the conscience or to our emotional or religious nature, then faith does not involve feeling. We believe the great mass of historical facts to which we assent as true, simply on historical testimony, and without any feeling entering into, or necessarily connected with it. The same is true with regard to a large part of the contents of the Bible. They, to a great extent, are historical, or the predictions of historical events. When we believe what the Scriptures record concerning the creation, the deluge, the calling of Abraham, the overthrow of the

cities of the plain, the history of Joseph, and the like, our faith does not include feeling. It is not an exercise of the will in either sense of that word. It is simply a rational conviction founded on sufficient evidence. It may be said, as Aquinas does say, that it is love or reverence towards God which inclines the will to believe such facts on the authority of his Word. But wicked men believe them, and cannot help believing them. A man can hardly be found who does not believe that the Israelites dwelt in Egypt, escaped from bondage, and took possession of the land of Canaan.

In the second place, it is true not only that faith is in many cases inseparable from feeling, but also that feeling has much influence in determining our faith. This is especially true when moral and religious truths are the objects of faith. Want of congeniality with the truth produces insensibility to the evidence by which it is supported. Our Lord said to the Jews, "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep." (John x. 26.) And in another place, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (vii. 17.) And the Apostle says of those that are lost, "The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." (2 Cor. iv. 4.) The truth was present, attended by appropriate and abundant evidence, but there was no susceptibility. The defect was in the organ of vision, not in the want of light. The Scriptures uniformly refer the unbelief of those who reject the gospel to the state of their hearts. There can be no doubt that all the true children of God received Christ as their God and Saviour on the evidence which He gave of him divine character and mission, and that He was rejected only by the unrenewed and the wicked, and because of their wickedness. Hence unbelief is so great a sin. Men are condemned because they

believe not on the only begotten Son of God. (John iii. 18.) All this is true. It is true of saving faith. But it is not true of all kinds of even religious faith; that is, of faith which has religious truth for its object. And, therefore, it cannot furnish the differentia or criterion to distinguish faith from other forms of assent to truth. There are states of mind not only popularly, but correctly called belief, of which it is not true that love, or congeniality, is an element. There is such a thing as dead faith, or orthodoxy. There is such a thing as speculative faith. Simon Magus believed. Even the devils believe. And if we turn to other than religious truths it is still more apparent that faith is not necessarily a voluntary assent of the mind. A man may hear of something most repugnant to his feelings, as, for example, of the triumph of a rival. He may at first refuse to believe it; but the testimony may become so strong as to force conviction. This conviction is, by common consent, faith or belief. It is not sight; it is not intuition; it is not a deduction; it is belief; a conviction founded on testimony. This subject, i.e., the connection between faith and feeling, will come up again in considering other definitions.

In the third place, if we take the word voluntary in the sense which implies volition or self-determination, it is still more evident that faith cannot be defined as voluntary assent. It is, indeed, a proverb that a man convinced, against his will remains unconvinced. But this is only a popular way of expressing the truth just conceded, namely, that the feelings have, in many cases, great influence in determining our faith. But, as just remarked, a man may be constrained to believe against his will. He may struggle against conviction; he may determine he will not believe, and yet conviction may be forced upon him. Napoleon, at the battle of Waterloo, hears that Grouchy is approaching.

He gladly believes it. Soon the report reaches him that the advancing columns are Prussians. This he will not believe. Soon, however, as courier after courier confirms the unwelcome fact, he is forced to believe it. It is not true, therefore, that in faith as faith there is always, as Aquinas says, an election "voluntarie declinans in unam partem magis quam in alteram." There is another frequent experience. We often hear men say they would give the world if they could believe. The dying Grotius said he would give all his learning for the simple faith of his unlettered servant. To tell a man he can believe if he will is to contradict his consciousness. He tries to believe. He earnestly prays for faith; but he cannot exercise it. It is true, as concerns the sinner in relation to the gospel, that this inability to believe arises from the state of his mind. But this state of the mind lies below the will. It cannot be determined or changed by the exercise of any voluntary power. On these grounds the definition of faith, whether as generic or religious, as a voluntary assent to truth, must be considered unsatisfactory.

Definitions founded on the Object of Faith.

The preceding definitions are all founded on the assumed subjective nature of faith. The next definition is of a different kind. It is founded on the nature of its object. Faith is said to be the persuasion of the truth of things not seen. This is a very old and familiar definition. "Quid est fides," asks Augustine, [82] "nisi credere quod non vides." And Lombard [83] says, "Fides est virtus qua creduntur quæ non videntur." Hence faith is said to be swallowed up in vision; and the one is contrasted with the other; as when the Apostle says, "We walk by faith, not by sight." And in Hebrews, eleventh chapter, all the objects of faith under the aspect in which it is considered in that chapter, are included under the categories of ta elpizomena and ta ou

blepomena, "things hoped for, and things not seen." The latter includes the former. "We hope," says the Apostle, "for that we see not." (Romans viii. 25.) The word sight, in this connection, may be taken in three senses. First, in its literal sense. We are not said to believe what we see with our eyes. What we see we know to be true. We believe that the planet Saturn is surrounded by a belt, and that Jupiter has four satellites, on the unanimous testimony of astronomers. But if we look through a telescope and see the belt of the one and the satellites of the other, our faith passes into knowledge. We believe there is such a city as Rome, and that it contains the Colosseum, Trajan's Arch, and other monuments of antiquity. If we visit that city and see these things for ourselves, our faith becomes knowledge. The conviction is no stronger in the one case than in the other. We are just as sure there is such a city before having seen it, as though we had been there a hundred times. But the conviction is of a different kind. Secondly, the mind is said to see when it perceives an object of thought to be true in its own light, or by its own radiance. This mental vision may be either immediate or mediate -- either intuitive or through a process of proof. A child may believe that the angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles, on the authority of his teacher. When he understands the demonstration of that proposition, his faith becomes knowledge. He sees it to be true. The objects of sense-perception, the objects of intuition, and what we recognize as true on a process of proof, are not, according to this definition of the term, objects of faith. We know what we see to be true; we believe when we recognize as true what we do not see. It is true that the same thing may be an object of faith and an object of knowledge, but not at the same time. We may recognize as true the being of God, or the immortality of the soul, because the propositions, "God is," "the soul is immortal," are

susceptible of proof. The arguments in support of those propositions may completely satisfy our minds. But they are truths of revelation to be believed on the authority of God. These states of mind which we call knowledge and faith, are not identical, neither are they strictly coexisting. The effect produced by the demonstration is one thing. The effect produced by the testimony of God's word, is another thing. Both include a persuasion of the truth. But that persuasion is in its nature different in the one case from what it is in the other, as it rests on different grounds. When the arguments are before the mind, the conviction which they produce is knowledge. When the testimony of God is before the mind, the conviction which it produces is faith. On this subject Thomas Aquinas says, [84] "Necessarium est homini accipere per modum fidei non solum ea, quæ sunt supra rationem: sed etiam ea, quæ per rationem cognosci possunt. Et hoc propter tria, Primo quidem, ut citius homo ad veritatis divinæ cognitionem perveniat. . . . . Secundo, ut cognitio Dei sit communior. Multi enim in studio scientiæ proficere non possunt. . . . . Tertio modo proptor certitudinem. Ratio enim humana in rebus divinis est multum deficiens."

Thirdly, under the "things not seen," some would include all things not present to the mind. A distinction is made between presentative and representative knowledge. In the former the object is present at the time; we perceive it, we are conscious of it. In representative knowledge there is an object now present, representing an absent object. Thus we have the conception of a person or thing. That conception is present, but the thing represented is absent. It is not before the mind. It belongs to the category of things not seen. The conception which is present is the object of knowledge; the thing represented is an object of faith. That is, we know we have the conception; we believe that the thing which it represents, does or did

exist. If we visit a particular place while present to our senses we know that it exists; when we come away and form an idea or conception of it, that is, when we recall it by an effort of memory, then we believe in its existence. "Whenever we have passed beyond presentative knowledge, and are assured of the reality of an absent object, there faith . . . . has entered as an element." [85]

Sir William Hamilton [86] says, "Properly speaking, we know only the actual and the present, and all real knowledge is an immediate knowledge. What is said to be mediately known, is, in truth, not known to be, but only believed to be." This, it may be remarked in passing, would apply to all the propositions of Euclid. For they are "mediately known," i.e., seen to be true by means of a process of proof. Speaking of memory, Hamilton says, "It is not a knowledge of the past at all; but a knowledge of the present and a belief of the past." "We are said," according to Dr. McCosh, "to know ourselves, and the objects presented to the senses and the representations (always however as presentations) in the mind; but to believe in objects which we have seen in time past, but which are not now present, and in objects which we have never seen, and very specially in objects which we can never fully know, such as an Infinite God." [87]

Objections to this Definition.

According to this view, we know what is present to the mind, and believe what is absent. The first objection to this representation is the ambiguity of the words present and absent as thus used. When is an object present? and when is it absent? It is easy to answer this question when the object is something material or an external event. Such objects are present ("præsensibus") when they affect the senses; and absent when they do not. A city or building is present when we actually see it; absent, when we leave the place where it is, and

recall the image of it. But how is it with propositions? The Bible says all men are sinners. The truth thus announced is present to the mind. We do not know it. We cannot prove it. But we believe it upon the authority of God. The Scriptures teach that Christ died as a ransom for many. Here, not only the historical fact that He died is announced, but the purpose for which He died. Here again, we have a truth present to the mind, which is an object of faith.

The second objection is involved in the first. The terms present and absent are not only ambiguous in this connection, but it is not true, as just stated, that an object must be absent in order to be an object of faith. The differentia, in other words, between knowledge and faith, is not found in the presence or absence of their objects. We can know what is absent, and we can believe what is present.

The third objection is, that the conviction we have of the reality or truth of what we distinctly remember is knowledge, and not distinctively faith, unless we choose to establish a new and arbitrary definition of the word knowledge. We know what is perceived by the senses; we know what the mind sees, either intuitively or discursively, is and must be true; and we know what we distinctly remember. The conviction is in all these cases of the same nature. In all it resolves itself into confidence in the veracity of consciousness. We are conscious that we perceive sensible objects. We are conscious that we cognize certain truths. We are conscious that we remember certain events. In all these cases this consciousness involves the conviction of the reality or truth of what is seen, mentally apprehended or remembered. This conviction is, or may be, as strong in any one of these cases as in either of the others; and it rests in all ultimately on the same ground. There is, therefore, no reason for calling one knowledge and the other belief. Memory is as much a knowledge of the

past, as other forms of consciousness are a knowledge of the present.

The fourth objection is that to deny that memory gives us the knowledge of the past, is contrary to established usage. It is true we are said to believe that we remember such and such events, when we are uncertain about it. But this is because in one of the established meanings of the word, belief expresses a less degree of certainty than knowledge. But men never speak of believing past events in their experience concerning which they are absolutely certain. We know that we were alive yesterday. No man says he believes he has seen his father or mother or any intimate friend, whom he had known for years. Things distinctly remembered are known, and not merely believed.

The definition which makes faith to be the persuasion of the truth of things not seen, is, however, correct, if by "things not seen" are meant things which are neither objects of the senses, nor of intuition, nor of demonstrative proof. But it does not seem to be correct to include among the "things not seen," which are the special objects of faith, things remembered and not now present to mind. This definition of faith, while correct in limiting it as to its objects to things not seen, in the sense above stated, is nevertheless defective in not assigning the ground of our conviction of their truth. Why do we believe things to be true, which we have never seen and which we cannot prove? Different answers are given to that question; and, therefore, the definition which gives no answer to it, must be considered defective.

Definitions founded on the Nature of the Evidence on which Faith rests.

Some of the definitions of faith, as we have seen, are founded on its subjective nature; others on its objects. Besides these there are others which seek its distinguishing characteristic in the ground on which the conviction which it includes, rests. The first of these is

that which makes faith to be a conviction or persuasion of truth founded on feeling. This is by many regarded as the one most generally received. Hase [88] says, "Every cultivated language has a word for that form of conviction which, in opposition to the self-evident and demonstrable, rests on moral and emotional grounds." That word in Greek is pistis; in English "faith." In his "Hutterus Redivivus," [89] he says, "The common idea of faith is: unmittelbar Fürwahrhalten, ohne Vermittelung eines Schlussbeweises, durch Neigung und Bedürfniss," i.e., "A persuasion of the truth, without the intervention of argument, determined by inclination and inward necessity." He quotes the definition of faith by Twesten, as "a persuasion or conviction of truth produced by feeling;" and that of Nitzsch, given above, "the unity of knowledge and feeling." Strauss [90] says, "The way in which a man appropriates the contents of a revelation, the inward ascent which he yields to the contents of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church, not because of critical or philosophical research, but often in opposition to them overpowered by a feeling which the Evangelical Church calls the testimony of the Spirit, but which in fact is only the perception of the identity of his own religious life with that portrayed in the Scripture and prevailing in the Church, -- this assent determined by feeling -- in ecclesiastical language, is called Faith." Again, [91] he says, "The pious man receives religious truth because he feels its reality, and because it satisfies his religious wants," and, therefore, he adds, "No religion was ever propagated by means of arguments addressed to the understanding, or of historical or philosophical proofs, and this is undeniably true of Christianity." Every preacher of a new religion assumes in those to whom he presents it, an unsatisfied religious necessity, and all he has to do is to make them feel that such necessity is met by the religion which he proposes.

Celsus, he tells us, made it a ground of reproach against the Christians that they believed blindly, that they could not justify the doctrines which they held at the bar of reason. To this Origen answered, that this was true only of the people; that with the educated, faith was elevated into knowledge, and Christianity transformed into a philosophy. The Church was divided between believers and knowers. The relation between faith and knowledge, between religion and philosophy, has been the subject of controversy from that day to this. Some took the ground of Origen and of the Alexandrian school generally, that it is incumbent on educated Christians to justify their doctrines at the bar of reason, and prove them to be true of philosophical grounds. Others held that the truths of revelation were, at least in many cases, of a kind which did not admit of philosophical demonstration, although they were not on that account to be regarded as contrary to reason, but only as beyond its sphere. Others, again, taught that there is a direct conflict between faith and knowledge; that what the believing Christian holds to be true, can be shown by the philosopher to be false. This is Strauss's own doctrine, and, therefore, he concludes his long discussion of this point by saying, "The believer should let the knower go his own way in peace, just as the knower does the believer. We leave them their faith, let them leave us our philosophy. . . . . There have been enough of false irenical attempts. Henceforth only separation of opposing principles can lead to any good." [92] On the same page he admits the great truth, "That human nature has one excellent characteristic: what any man feels is for him a spiritual necessity, he allows no man to take from him."

Remarks on this Definition.

With regard to the definition of faith which makes it a conviction founded on feeling, it may be remarked, --

First, That there are forms of faith of which this is not true. As remarked above, when treating of the cognate definition of faith as a voluntary assent of the mind, it is not true of faith in general. We often believe unwillingly, and what is utterly repugnant to our feelings.

Secondly, It is not true even of religious faith, or faith which has religious truth for its object. For there may be faith without love, i.e., a speculative, or dead faith.

Thirdly, It is not true of many of the exercises of faith in good men. Isaac believed that Jacob would be preferred to Esau, sorely against his will. Jacob believed that his descendants would be slaves in Egypt. The prophets believed in the seventy years captivity of their countrymen. The Apostles believed that a great apostasy in the Church was to occur between their age and the second coming of the Lord. The answer of Thomas Aquinas to this, is, that a man is constrained by his will (i.e., his feelings) to believe in the Scriptures, and then he believes all the Scriptures contain. So that his faith, even in the class of truths just referred to, rests ultimately on feeling. But this answer is unsatisfactory. For if the question is asked, Why did the prophets believe in the captivity, and the Apostles in the apostasy? the answer would be, not from the effect of these truths upon their feelings, but on the authority of God. And if it be further asked, Why did they believe the testimony of God? the answer may be because God's testimony carries conviction. He can make his voice heard even by the deaf or the dead. Or, the answer may be, because they were good men. But in either case, the question carries us beyond the ground of their faith. They believe because God had revealed the facts referred to. Their goodness may have rendered them susceptible to the evidence afforded, but it did not constitute that evidence.

Fourthly, It is admitted that the exercise of saving faith, i.e., of that faith which is the fruit of the Spirit and product of regeneration, is attended by feeling appropriate to its object. But this is to be referred to the nature of the object. If we believe a good report, the effect is joy; if an evil report, the effect is sorrow. The perception of beauty produces delight; of moral excellence, a glow of approbation, of spiritual things, in many cases. a joy that is unspeakable and full of glory.

Fifthly, It is also true that all these truths, if not all truth, have a sell-evidencing light, which cannot be apprehended without a conviction that it really is what it is apprehended as being. It may also be admitted, that so far as the consciousness of true believers is concerned, the evidence of truth is the truth itself; in other words, that the ground of their faith is, in one sense, subjective. They see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and therefore believe that He is God manifested in the flesh. They see that the representations made by the Scriptures of the sinfulness, guilt, and helplessness of fallen man, correspond with their own inward experience, and they are therefore constrained to receive these representations as true. They see that the plan of salvation proposed in the Bible suits their necessities, their moral judgments and religious aspirations, they therefore embrace it. All this is true, but it does not prove faith to be a conviction founded on feeling; for there are many forms of faith which confessedly are not founded on feeling; and even in the case of true believers, their feelings are not the ultimate ground of faith. They always fall back on the authority of God, who is regarded as the author of these feelings, through which the testimony of the Spirit is revealed to the consciousness. "We may be moved and induced," says the "Westminster Confession," [93] "by the

testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellences, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts." The ultimate ground of faith, therefore, is the witness of the Spirit.

Faith a Conviction of the Truth founded on Testimony.

The only other definition of faith to be considered, is that which makes it, a conviction of truth founded on testimony. We have already seen that Augustine says, "We know what rests upon reason; we believe what rests upon authority." A definition to which Sir William Hamilton gives his adhesion. [94] In the Alexandrian School also, the Christian pistis, was Auctoritäts-Glaube, a faith founded on authority, opposed, on the one hand, to the heathen episteme, and on the other to the Christian gnosis, or philosophical explanation and proof of the truths believed. Among the school-men also, this was the prevalent idea. When they defined faith to be the persuasion of things not seen, they meant things which we receive as true on authority, and not because we either know or can prove them. Hence it was constantly said, faith is human when it rests on the testimony of men; divine when it rests on the testimony of God. Thomas Aquinas [95] says, "Non fides, de qua loquimur, assentit alicui, nisi quia est a Deo revelatum." "Faith, of which we speak, assents to nothing except because it is revealed by

God." We believe on the authority of God, and not because we see, know, or feel a thing to be true. This is the purport of the teaching of the great body of the scholastic divines. Such also was the doctrine of the Reformers, and of the theologians of the subsequent age, both Lutheran and Reformed. Speaking of assent, which he regards as the second act or element of faith, Aquinas says, "Hic actus fidei non rerum evidentia aut causarum et proprietatum notitia, sed Dei dicentis infallibili auctoritate." Turrettin [96] says, "Non quæritur, An fides sit scientia, quæ habeat evidentiam: Sic enim distinguitur a scientia, quæ habet assensum certum et evidentem, qui nititur ratione clara et certa, et ab opinione, quæ nititur ratione tantum probabili; ubi fides notat assensum certum quidem, sed inevidentem, qui non ratione, sed testimonio divino nititur." De Moor [97] says, "Fides subjectiva est persuasio de veritate rei, alterius testimonio nixa, quomodo fides illa generatim descripta, scientiæ et conjecturæ opponitur. . . . . Dividitur . . . . in fidem divinam, quæ nititur testimonio divino, et humanam, quæ fundata est in testimonio humano fide accepto." Owen, [98] "All faith is an assent upon testimony; and divine faith is an assent upon a divine testimony." John Howe [99] asks, "Why do I believe Jesus to be the Christ? Because the eternal God hath given his testimony concerning Him that so He is." "A man's believing comes all to nothing without this, that there is a divine testimony." Again, [100] "I believe such a thing, as God reveals it, because it is reported to me upon the authority of God." Bishop Pearson [101] says, "When anything propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding, in and of itself, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connection with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any real arguments or reference to other acknowledged truths,

and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of itself, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said properly to be credible; and an assent unto this, upon such credibility, is in the proper notion faith or belief."

This View almost universally Held.

This view of the nature of faith is all but universally received, not by theologians only, but by philosophers, and the mass of Christian people. The great question has ever been, whether we are to receive truth on authority, or only upon rational evidence. Leibnitz begins his "Discours de la Conformité de la Foi avec la Raison," by saying, "Je suppose, que deux vérités ne sauroient se contredire; que l'objet de la foi est la vérité que Dieu a révélée d'une manière extraordinaire, et que la raison est l'enchainment des vérités, mais particulièrement (lorsqu'elle est comparés avec la foi) de celles où l'esprit humain peut atteindre naturellement, sans être aidé des lumières de la foi." [102]

It has already been admitted that the essential element of faith is trust; and, therefore, in the general sense of the word to believe, is to trust. Faith is the reliance of the mind on anything as true and worthy of confidence. In this wide sense of the word, it matters not what may be the objects, or what the grounds of this trust. The word, however, is commonly used in reference to truths which we receive on trust without being able to prove them. Thus we are said to believe in our own existence, the reality of the external world, and all the primary truths of the reason. These by common consent are called beliefs. Reason begins with believing, i.e., with taking on trust what it neither comprehends nor proves. Again, it has been admitted that the word belief is often and legitimately used to express a degree of

certainty less than knowledge and stronger than probability; as when we say, we are not sure, but we believe that a certain thing happened.

The Strict Sense of the Word "Faith."

But in the strict and special sense of the word, as discriminated from knowledge or opinion, faith means the belief of things not seen, on the ground of testimony. By testimony, however, is not meant merely the affirmation of an intelligent witness. There are other methods by which testimony may be given than affirmation. A seal is a form of testimony; so is a sign. So is everything which pledges the authority of the attester to the truth to be established. When Elijah declared that Jehovah was God, and Baal a lie, he said, "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God." The descent of the fire was the testimony of God to the truth of the prophet's declaration. So in the New Testament God is said to have borne witness to the truth of the Gospel by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost (Heb. ii. 4); and the Spirit of God is said to witness with our spirits that we are the children of God (Rom. viii. 16). The word in these cases is marture, w, to testify. This is not a lax or improper use of the word testimony; for an affirmation is testimony only because it pledges the authority of him who makes it to the truth. And therefore whatever pledges that authority, is as truly of the nature of testimony, as an affirmation. When, therefore, it is said that faith is founded on testimony, it is meant that it is not founded on sense, reason, or feeling, but on the authority of him by whom it is authenticated.

Proof from the General Use of the Word.

That such is the foundation and the distinctive characteristic of faith, may be argued, -- 1. From the general use of the word We are said to know what we see or can prove; and to believe what we regard as true on the authority of others. This is admitted to be true of what is

called historical faith. This includes a great deal; all that is recorded of the past; all that is true of present actualities, which does not fall within the sphere of our personal observation; all the facts of science as received by the masses; and almost all the contents of the Bible, whether of the Old or of the New Testament. The Scriptures are a record of the history of the creation, of the fall, and of redemption. The Old Testament is the history of the preparatory steps of this redemption. The New Testament is a history of the fulfilment of the promises and types of the Old in the incarnation, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Son of God. Whoever believes this record has set to his seal that God is true, and is a child of God.

Proof from Consciousness.

2. In the second place, consciousness teaches us that such is the nature of faith not only when historical facts are its objects, but when propositions are the things believed. The two indeed are often inseparable. That God is the creator of the world, is both a fact and a doctrine. It is as the Apostle says, a matter of faith. We believe on the authority of the Scriptures, which declare that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." That God set forth his Son to be a propitiation for our sins, is a doctrine. It rests solely on the authority of God. We receive it upon his testimony. So with all the great doctrines of grace; of regeneration, of justification, of sanctification, and of a future life. How do we know that God will accept all who believe in Christ? Who can know the things of God, save the Spirit of God, and he to whom the Spirit shall reveal them (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11)? From the nature of the case, "the things of the Spirit," the thoughts and purposes of God, can be known only by revelation, and they can be received only on the authority of God. They are objects

neither of sense nor of reason.

Proof from Scripture.

3. It is the uniform teaching of the Bible that faith is founded on the testimony or authority of God.

The first proof of this is the fact that the Scriptures come to us under the form of a revelation of things we could not otherwise know. The prophets of the Old Testament were messengers, the mouth of God, to declare what the people were to believe and what they were to do. The New Testament is called "The testimony of Jesus." Christ came, not as a philosopher, but as a witness. He said to Nicodemus, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." (John iii. 11). "He that cometh from above is above all. . . . . And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true (verses 31-33). In like manner the Apostles were witnesses. As such they were ordained (Luke xxiv. 48). After his resurrection, and immediately before his ascension, our Lord said to them, "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. (Acts i. 8). When they declared the death and resurrection of Christ, as facts to be believed, they said, "Whereof we are witnesses" (Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, v. 32). In this last passage the Apostles say they were witnesses not only of the fact of Christ's resurrection but that God had "exalted" Him "with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." See Acts x. 39-43, where it is said, "He commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness,

that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

The great complaint against the Apostles, especially in the Grecian cities, was that they did not present their doctrines as propositions to be proved; they did not even state the philosophical grounds on which they rested, or attempt to sustain them at the bar of reason. The answer given to this objection by St. Paul is twofold: First, that philosophy, the wisdom of men, had proved itself utterly incompetent to solve the great problems of God and the universe, of sin and redemption. It was in fact neither more nor less than foolishness, so far as all its speculations as to the things of God were concerned. Secondly, that the doctrines which He taught were not the truths of reason, but matters of revelation; to be received not on rational or philosophical grounds, but upon the authority of God; that they, the Apostles, were not philosophers, but witnesses; that they did not argue using the words of man's wisdom, but that they simply declared the counsels of God, and that faith in their doctrines was to rest not on the wisdom of men, but on the powerful testimony of God.

The second proof, that the Scriptures teach that faith is the reception of truth on the ground of testimony or on the authority of God, is, that the thing which we are commanded to do, is to receive the record which God has given of his Son. This is faith; receiving as true what God has testified, and because He has testified it. "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." The Greek here is, hou pepisteuken eis ten marturian hen memartureken ho Theos peri tou huiou hautou, "believeth not the testimony which God testified concerning his Son." "And this is the testimony, (he marturian) that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life ii in his Son" (1 John v. 10, 11). There could hardly be

a more distinct statement of the Scriptural doctrine as to the nature of faith. Its object is what God has revealed. Its ground is the testimony of God. To receive that testimony, is to set to our seal that God is true. To reject it, is to make God a liar. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his son."

Such is the constant teaching of Scripture. The ground on which we are authorized and commanded to believe is, not the conformity of the truth revealed to our reason, nor its effect upon our feelings, nor its meeting the necessities of our nature and condition, but simply, "Thus saith the Lord." The truths of revelation do commend themselves to the reason; they do powerfully and rightfully affect our feelings; they do meet all the necessities of our nature as creatures and as sinners; and these considerations may incline us to believe, may strengthen our faith, lead us to cherish it, and render it joyful and effective; but they are not its ground. We believe on the testimony or authority of God.

It is objected to this view that we believe the Bible to be the Word of God on other ground than testimony. The fulfilment of prophecies, the miracles of its authors, its contents, and the effects which it produces, are rational grounds for believing it to be from God. To this objection two answers may be made: First, that supernatural occurrences, such as prophecies and miracles, are some of the forms in which the divine testimony is given. Paul says that God bears "witness both with signs and wonders" (Hebrews ii. 4). And, secondly, that the proximate end of these manifestations of supernatural foresight and power was to authenticate the divine mission of the messengers of God. This being established, the people were called upon to receive their message and to believe on the authority of God, by whom they were sent.

The third proof, that the Scriptures teach that faith is a reception of truth on the ground of testimony, is found in the examples and illustrations of faith given in the Scriptures. Immediately after the fall the promise was made to our first parents that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. On what possible ground could faith in this promise rest except on the authority of God. When Noah was warned of God of the coming deluge, and commanded to prepare the ark, he believed, not because he saw the signs of the approaching flood, not because his moral judgment assured him that a just God would in that way avenge his violated law; but simply on the testimony of God. Thus when God promised to Abraham the possession of the land of Canaan, that he, a childless old man, should become the father of many nations, that through his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, his faith could have no other foundation than the authority of God. So of every illustration of faith given by the Apostle in the eleventh chapter of his epistle to the Hebrews. The same is true of the whole Bible. We have no foundation for our faith in a spiritual world, in the heaven and hell described in Scripture, in the doctrines of redemption, in the security and ultimate triumph of the Church other than the testimony of God. If faith does not rest on testimony it has nothing on which to rest. Paul tells us that the whole Gospel rests on the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead. If Christ be not risen our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins. But our assurance that Christ rose on the third day rests solely upon the testimony which God in various ways has given to that fact.

This is a point of great practical importance. If faith, or only persuasion of the truths of the Bible, rests on philosophical grounds, then the door is opened for rationalism; if it rests on feeling, then it is open to mysticism. The only sure, and the only satisfying

foundation is the testimony of God, who cannot err, and who will not deceive.

Faith may, therefore, be defined to be the persuasion of the truth founded on testimony. The faith of the Christian is the persuasion of the truth of the facts and doctrines recorded in the Scriptures on the testimony of God.

---

[68] De Prædestinatioe Sanctorum [II.], 5; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1838, vol. x. p. 1849 b.

[69] On the Intellectual Powers, Essay II. ch. xx.; Works, Edinburgh, 1849, pp. 237 b, 328 a, b.

[70] Philosophy of Religion.

[71] Die einfachste Dogmatik, Sec. 338; Tübingen, 1826, p. 376.

[72] Biblical Psychology, p. 174.

[73] Vorlesungen über Glauben und Wissen, von Johann Eduard Erdmann, Berlin, 1837, p. 30.

[74] Letters on the Philosophy of the Human Mind, London, 1855, pp. 75, 76.

[75] Meiklejohn's Translation of Critic of Pure Reason, London, 1855, p. 498.

[76] Glauben und Wissen, Berlin, 1837, p. 29.

[77] Reid's Works; edit. Edinburgh, 1849, note A, § 5, p. 760 b.

[78] Græcarum Affectionum Curatio, sermo. i. edit. Commelinus, Heidelberg(?) 1592, p. 16, lines 11, 12.

[79] Summa, II. ii. quæst. ii. art. 9, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 8 b, of third set.

[80] Ibid. quæst. i. art. 4, pp. 3 b, 4 a, of third set.

[81] System der Christlichen Lehre, Einl. II. A. § 8. 3, 5th edit. Bonn, 1844, p. 18.

[82] In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus, XL. 9; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1837, vol. iii. p. 2088 b.

[83] Liber Sententiarum, III. xxiii. B., edit. 1472(?).

[84] Summa, II. ii. quæst. ii. art. 4, edit. Cologne, 1636, pp. 6 b, 7 a, of third set.

[85] McCosh, Intuitions of the Mind, part II. book ii. ch. 1, edit. New York, 1860, p. 197.

[86] Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, vol. i. "Metaphysics," lect. xii. sub fin., edit. Boston, 1859, pp. 152, 153.

[87] Intuitions of the Mind, p. 198.

[88] Dogmatik, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1842, p. 307.

[89] Sixth edit. Leipzig, 1845, p. 4.

[90] Dogmatik, § 20, edit. Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1840, vol. i. p. 282.

[91] Dogmatik, edit. Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1840, vol. i. p. 298.

[92] Ibid. p. 356.

[93] Chapter i. § 5.

[94] See page 46.

[95] Summa, II. ii. quæst. 1. art 1. Cologne, 1640, p. 2, a, of third set.

[96] Institutio, XV. ix. 3, edit. Edinburgh, 1847, vol. ii. p. 497.

[97] Commentarius in Johannis Marckii Compendium, cap. xxii. § 4, Leyden, 1766, vol. iv. p. 299.

[98] Doctrine of Justification, ch. i. edit. Philadelphia, 1841, p. 84.

[99] Works, vol. ii. p. 885, Carter's edition, New York, 1869.

[100] Ibid. p. 1170.

[101] An Exposition of the Creed, 7th edit. London, 1701, p. 3.

[102] Théodicée, Works, edit. Berlin, 1840, 1839, part ii. p. 479.

§ 3. Different Kinds of Faith.

Though the definition above given be accepted, it is to be admitted that there are different kinds of faith. In other words, the state of mind which the word designates is very different in one case from what it is in others. This difference arises partly from the nature of its objects, and partly from the nature or form of the testimony on which it is founded. Faith in a historical fact or speculative truth is one thing; faith in æsthetic truth another thing; faith in moral truth another thing; faith in spiritual truth, and especially faith in the promise of salvation made to ourselves another thing. That is, the state of mind denominated faith is very different in any one of these cases from what it is in the others. Again, the testimony which God bears to the truth is of different kinds. In one form it is directed especially to the understanding; in another to the conscience; in another to our regenerated nature. This is the cause of the difference between speculative, temporary, and saving faith.

Speculative or Dead Faith.

There are many men who believe the Bible to be the Word of God; who receive all that it teaches; and who are perfectly orthodox in their doctrinal belief. If asked why they believe, they may be at a loss for an answer. Reflection might enable them to say they believe because others believe. They receive their faith by inheritance. They were taught from their earliest years thus to believe. The Church to which they belong inculcates this faith, and it is enjoined upon them as true and necessary. Others of greater culture may say that the evidence of the divine origin of the Bible, both external and internal, satisfies their minds, and produces a rational conviction that the Scriptures are a revelation from God, and they receive its contents on his authority. Such a faith as this, experience teaches, is perfectly compatible with

a worldly or wicked life. This is what the Bible calls a dead faith.

Temporary Faith.

Again, nothing is more common than for the Gospel to produce a temporary impression, more or less deep and lasting. Those thus impressed believe. But, having no root in themselves, sooner or later they fall away. It is also a common experience that men utterly indifferent or even skeptical, in times of danger, or on the near approach of death, are deeply convinced of the certainty of those religious truths previously known, but hitherto disregarded or rejected. This temporary faith is due to common grace; that is, to those influences of the Spirit common in a measure greater or less to all men, which operate on the soul without renewing it, and which reveal the truth to the conscience and cause it to produce conviction.

Saving Faith.

That faith which secures eternal life; which unites us to Christ as living members of his body; which makes us the sons of God; which interests us in all the benefits of redemption; which works by love, and is fruitful in good works; is founded, not on the external or the moral evidence of the truth, but on the testimony of the Spirit with and by the truth to the renewed soul.

What is meant by the Testimony of the Spirit

It is necessary, before going further, to determine what is meant by the testimony of the Spirit, which is said to be the ground of saving faith.

God, or the Spirit of God, testifies to the truth of the Scriptures and of the doctrines which they contain. This testimony, as has been seen, is partly external, consisting in prophecies and miracles, partly in the nature of the truths themselves as related to the intellectual and moral elements of the soul, and partly special and supernatural.

Unrenewed men may feel the power of the two former kinds of testimony, and believe with a faith either merely intellectual and speculative, or with what may be called from its ground, a moral faith, which is only temporary. The spiritual form of testimony is confined to the regenerated. It is, of course, inscrutable. The operations of the Spirit do not reveal themselves in the consciousness otherwise than by their effects. We know that men are born of the Spirit, that the Spirit dwells in the people of God and continually influences their thoughts, feelings, and actions. But we know this only from the teaching of the Bible, not because we are conscious of his operations. "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." (John iii. 8.)

This witness of the Spirit is not an affirmation that the Bible is the Word of God. Neither is it the production of a blind, unintelligent conviction of that fact. It is not, as is the case with human testimony, addressed from without to the mind, but it is within the mind itself. It is an influence designed to produce faith. It is called a witness or testimony because it is so called in Scripture; and because it has the essential nature of testimony, inasmuch as it is the pledge of the authority of God in support of the truth.

The effects of this inward testimony are, (1.) What the Scriptures call "spiritual discernment." This means two things: A discernment due to the influence of the Spirit; and a discernment not only of the truth, but also of the holiness, excellence, and glory of the things discerned. The word spiritual, in this sense, means conformed to the nature of the Spirit. Hence the law is said to be spiritual, i.e., holy, just, and good. (2.) A second effect flowing necessarily from the one just mentioned is delight and complacency, or love. (3.) The

apprehension of the suitableness of the truths revealed, to our nature and necessities. (4.) The firm conviction that these things are not only true, but divine. (5.) The fruits of this conviction, i.e., of the faith thus produced, good works, -- holiness of heart and life.

When, therefore, a Christian is asked, Why he believes the Scriptures and the doctrines therein contained, his simple answer is, On the testimony or authority of God. How else could he know that the worlds were created by God, that our race apostatized from God, that He sent his Son for our redemption, that faith in Him will secure salvation.

Faith in such truths can have no other foundation than the testimony of God. If asked, How God testifies to the truth of the Bible? If an educated man whose attention has been called to the subject, he will answer, In every conceivable way: by signs, wonders, and miracles; by the exhibition which the Bible makes of divine knowledge, excellence, authority, and power. If an uneducated man, he may simply say, "Whereas I was blind, now I see." Such a man, and indeed every true Christian, passes from a state of unbelief to one of saving faith, not by any process of research or argument, but of inward experience. The change may, and often does, take place in a moment. The faith of a Christian in the Bible is, as before remarked, analogous to that which all men have in the moral law, which they recognize not only as truth, but as having the authority of God. What the natural man perceives with regard to the moral law the renewed man is enabled to perceive in regard to "the things of the Spirit," by the testimony of that Spirit with and by the truth to his heart.

Proof from Express Declarations of Scripture.

1. That this is the Scriptural doctrine on the subject is plain from the express declarations of the Scriptures. Our Lord promised to send the Spirit for this very purpose. "He will reprove the world of sin,"

especially of the sin of not believing in Christ; "and of righteousness," that is, of his righteousness, -- the rightfulness of his claims to be regarded and received as the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh, and the Saviour of the world, "and of judgment," that is, of the final overthrow of the kingdom of darkness and triumph of the kingdom of light. (John xvi. 8.) Faith, therefore, is always represented in Scripture as one of the fruits of the Spirit, as the gift of God, as the product of his energy (pistis tes energeias tou Theou) (Colossians ii. 12). Men are said to believe in virtue of the same power which wrought in Christ, when God raised Him from the dead. (Eph i. 19, 20.) The Apostle Paul elaborately sets forth the ground of faith in the second chapter of First Corinthians. He declares that he relied for success not on the enticing words of man's wisdom, but on the demonstration of the Spirit, in order that the faith of the people might rest not on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God. Faith was not to rest on argument, on historical or philosophical proof, but on the testimony of the Spirit. The Spirit demonstrates the truth to the mind, i.e., produces the conviction that it is truth, and leads the soul to embrace it with assurance and delight. Passages have already been quoted which teach that faith rests on the testimony of God, and that unbelief consists in rejecting that testimony. The testimony of God is given through the Spirit, whose office it is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us. The Apostle John tells his readers, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . . The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you: and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." (1 John ii. 20, 27.) This passage teaches, (1.) That true believers receive from Christ (the Holy

One) an unction. (2.) That this unction is the Holy Ghost. (3.) That it secures the knowledge and conviction of the truth. (4.) That this inward teaching which makes them believers is abiding, and secures them from apostasy.

1 Corinthians ii. 14.

Equally explicit is the passage in 1 Corinthians ii. 14, "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. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." The things of the Spirit, are the things which the Spirit has revealed. Concerning these things, it is taught: (1.) that the natural or unrenewed man does not receive them. (2.) That the spiritual man, i.e., the man in whom the Spirit dwells, does receive them. (3.) That the reason of this difference is that the former has not, and that the latter has, spiritual discernment. (4.) This spiritual discernment is the apprehension of the truth and excellence of the things discerned. (5.) It is spiritual, as just stated, both because due to the operation of the Spirit, and because the conformity of the truths discerned to the nature of the Spirit, is apprehended.

When Peter confessed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of the living God, our Lord said, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 17.) Other men had the same external evidence of the divinity of Christ that Peter had. His faith was due not to that evidence alone, but to the inward testimony of God. Our Lord rendered thanks that God had hidden the mysteries of his kingdom from the wise and prudent and revealed them unto babes. (Matt. xi. 25.) The external revelation was made to both classes. Besides this external revelation,

those called babes received an inward testimony which made them believers. Hence our Lord said, No man can come unto me except he be drawn or taught of God. (John vi. 44, 45.) The Apostle tells us that the same Gospel, the same objective truths, with the same external and rational evidence, which was an offence to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek, was to the called the wisdom and the power of God. Why this difference? Not the superior knowledge or greater excellence of the called, but the inward divine influence, the klesis, of which they were the subjects. Paul's instantaneous conversion is not to be referred to any rational process of argument; nor to his moral suceptibility to the truth; nor to the visible manifestation of Christ, for no miracle, no outward light or splendour could change the heart and transform the whole character in a moment. It was, as the Apostle himself tells us (Gal. i. 15, 16), the inward revelation of Christ to him by the special grace of God. It was the testimony of the Spirit, which being inward and supernatural, enabled him to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The Psalmist prayed that God would open his eyes that he might see wondrous things out of his law. The Apostle prayed for the Ephesians that God would give them the Holy Spirit, that the eyes of their souls might be opened, that they might know the things freely given to them of God. (Eph. i. 17, 18.) Everywhere in the Bible the fact that any one believes is referred not to his subjective state, but to the work of the Spirit on his heart.

Proof from the Way the Apostles acted.

2. As the Scriptures thus expressly teach that the ground of true or saving faith is the inward witness of the Spirit, the Apostles always acted on that principle. They announced the truth and demanded its instant reception, under the pain of eternal death. Our Lord did the same. "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not

believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 18.) Immediate faith was demanded. Being demanded by Christ, and at his command by the Apostles, that demand must be just and reasonable. It could, however, be neither unless the evidence of the truth attended it. That evidence could not be the external proofs of the divinity of Christ and his Gospel, for those proofs were present to the minds of comparatively few of the hearers of the Gospel; nor could it be rational proof or philosophical arguments, for still fewer could appreciate such evidence, and if they could it would avail nothing to the production of saving faith. The evidence of truth, to which assent is demanded by God the moment it is announced, must be in the truth itself. And if this assent be obligatory, and dissent or unbelief a sin, then the evidence must be of a nature, to which a corrupt state of the soul renders a man insensible. "If our gospel be hid," says the Apostle, "it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. . . . . [But] 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." (2 Cor. iv. 3-6.) It is here taught, (1.) That wherever and whenever Christ is preached, the evidence of his divinity is presented. The glory of God shines in his face. (2.) That if any man fails to see it, it is because the God of this world hath blinded his eyes. (3.) That if any do perceive it and believe, it is because of an inward illumination produced by Him who first commanded the light to shine out of darkness.

Proof from the Practice in the Church.

3. As Christ and the Apostles acted on this principle, so have all faithful ministers and missionaries from that day to this. They do not

expect to convince and convert men by historical evidence or by philosophical arguments. They depend on the demonstration of the Spirit.

Proof from Analogy.

4. This doctrine, that the true and immediate ground of faith in the things of the Spirit is the testimony of the Spirit, producing spiritual discernment, is sustained by analogy. If a man cannot see the splendour of the sun, it is because he is blind. If he cannot perceive the beauties of nature and of art, it is because he has no taste. If he cannot apprehend "the concord of sweet sounds," it is because he has not a musical ear. If he cannot see the beauty of virtue, or the divine authority of the moral law, it is because his moral sense is blunted. If he cannot see the glory of God in his works and in his Word, it is because his religious nature is perverted. And in like manner, if he cannot see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, it is because the god of this world has blinded his eyes.

No one excuses the man who can see no excellence in virtue, and who repudiates the authority of the moral law. The Bible and the instinctive judgment of men, condemn the atheist. In like manner the Scriptures pronounce accursed all who do not believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God. This is the denial of supreme excellence; the rejection of the clearest manifestation of God ever made to man. The solemn judgment of God is, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha." (1 Cor. xvi. 22.) In this judgment the whole intelligent universe will ultimately acquiesce.

Faith in the Scriptures, therefore, is founded on the testimony of God. By testimony, as before stated, is meant attestation, anything which pledges the authority of the attester in support of the truth to be established. As this testimony is of different kinds, so the faith

which it produces, is also different. So far as the testimony is merely external, the faith it produces is simply historical or speculative. So far as the testimony is moral, consisting in the power which the Spirit gives to the truth over the natural conscience, the faith is temporary, depending on the state of mind which is its proximate cause. Besides these, there is the inward testimony of the Spirit, which is of such a nature and of such power as to produce a perfect revoluticn in the soul, compared in Scripture to that effected by opening the eyes of the blind to the reality, the wonders, and glories of creation. There is, therefore, all the difference between a faith resting on this inward testimony of the Spirit, and mere speculative faith, that there is between the conviction a blind man has of the beauties of nature, before and after the opening of his eyes. As this testimony is informing, enabling the soul to see the truth and excellence of the "things of the Spirit," so far as the consciousness of the believer is concerned, his faith is a form of knowledge. He sees to be true, what the Spirit reveals and authenticates.

---

§ 4. Faith and Knowledge.

The relation of faith to knowledge is a wide field. The discussions on the subject have been varied and endless. There is little probability that the points at issue will ever be settled to the satisfaction of all parties. The ground of faith is authority. The ground of knowledge is sense or reason. We are concerned here only with Christian faith, i.e., the faith which receives the Scriptures as the Word of God and all they teach as true on his authority.

Is a Supernatural Revelation needed?

The first question is, Whether there is any need of a supernatural revelation, whether human reason be not competent to discover and to

authenticate all needful truth. This question has already been considered under the head of Rationalism, where it was shown, (1.) That every man's consciousness tells him that there are questions concerning God and his own origin and destiny, which his reason cannot answer. (2.) That he knows à priori, that the reason of no other man can satisfactorily answer them. (3.) That he knows from experience that they never have been answered by the wisdom of men, and (4.) That the Scriptures declare that the world by wisdom knows not God, that the wisdom of the world is foolishness in his estimation, and that God has therefore himself made known truths undiscoverable by reason, for the salvation of man.

Must the Truths of Revelation be Demonstrable by Reason?

A second question is, Whether truths, supernaturally revealed, must be able to authenticate themselves at the bar of reason before they can be rationally received; so that they are received, not on the ground of authority, but of rational proof. This also has been previously discussed. It has been shown that the assumption that God can reveal nothing which human reason cannot, when known, demonstrate to be true, assumes that human reason is the measure of all truth; that there is no intelligence in the universe higher than that of man; and that God cannot have purposes and plans, the grounds or reasons of which we are competent to discover and appreciate. It emancipates the from the authority of God, refusing to believe anything except the authority of reason. Why may we not believe on the testimony of God that there is a spiritual world, as well as believe that there is such a nation as the Chinese on the testimony of men? No man acts on the principle of believing only what he can understand and prove, in any other department. There are multitudes of truths which every sane man receives on trust, without being able either to prove or comprehend

them. If we can believe only what we can prove at the bar of reason to be true, then the kingdom of heaven would be shut against all but the wise. There could be no Christian who was not also a philosopher. In point of fact no man acts on this principle. It is assumed in the pride of reason, or as an apology for rejecting unpalatable truths, but men believe in God, in sin, in freedom of the will, in responsibility, without the ability of comprehending or reconciling these truths with each other or with other facts of consciousness or experience.

May not Revealed Truths be Philosophically vindicated?

A third question is, Whether, admitting a supernatural revelation, and moreover admitting the obligation to receive on the authority of God the doctrines which revelation makes known, the revealed doctrines may not be philosophically vindicated, so as to commend them to the acceptance of those who deny revelation. May not the Scriptural doctrines concerning God, creation, providence, the trinity, the incarnation, sin, redemption, and the future state, be so stated and sustained philosophically. as to constrain acquiescence in them as truths of the reason. This was the ground taken in the early Church by the theologians of the Alexandrian School, who undertook to elevate the pistis of the people into a gnosis for the philosophers. Thus the sacred writers were made Platonists, and Christianity was transmuted into Platonism. A large part of the mental activity of the School-men, during the Middle Ages, was expended in the same way. They received the Bible as a supernatural revelation from God. They received the Church interpretation of its teachings. They admitted their obligation to believe its doctrines on the authority of God and of the Church. Nevertheless they held that all these doctrines could be philosophically proved. In later times Wolf undertook to demonstrate all the doctrines of Christianity on the principles of the Leibnitzian

philosophy. In our own day this principle and these attempts have been carried further than ever. Systems of theology, constructed on the philosophy of Hegel, of Schelling, and of Schleiermacher, have almost superseded the old Biblical systems. If any man of ordinary culture and intelligence should take up a volume of what is called "Speculative Theology," (that is, theology presented in the forms of the speculative philosophy,) he would not understand a page and would hardly understand a sentence. He could not tell whether the theology which it proposed to present was Christianity or Buddhism. Or, at best, he would find a few drops of Biblical truth so diluted by floods of human speculation that the most delicate of chemical tests would fail to detect the divine element.

Attempts to do this Futile.

All such attempts are futile. The empirical proof of this is, that no such attempt has ever succeeded. The experiment has been made hundreds of times, and always with the same result. Where are now the philosophical expositions and vindications of Scripture doctrines by the Platonizing fathers; by the Schoolmen; by the Cartesians; by the Leibnitzians? What power over the reason, the conscience, or the life, has any of the speculative systems of our day? Who, beyond the devotees of the systems which they represent, understand or adopt the theology of Daub, of Marheinecke, of Lange, and others? Strauss, therefore, is right when he repudiates all these vain attempts to reconcile Christianity with philosophy, or to give a form to Christian doctrine which satisfies the philosophical thinker. [103]

But apart from this argument from experience, the assumption is preposterous that the feeble intellect of man can explain, and from its own resources, vindicate and prove the deep things of God. An infant might as well undertake to expound Newton's "Principia." If there are

mysteries in nature, in every blade of grass, in the insect, in the body and in the soul of man, there must be mysteries in religion. The Bible and our consciousness teach us that God is incomprehensible, and his ways past finding out; that we cannot explain either his nature or his acts; we know not how he creates, upholds, and governs without interfering with the nature of his creatures; how there can be three persons in the Godhead; how in the one person of Christ there can be two intelligences and two wills; how the Spirit inspires, renews, sanctifies, or comforts. It belongs to the "self-deifying" class of philosophers to presume to know all that God knows, and to banish the incomprehensible from the religion which he has revealed. "To the school of Hegel," says Bretschneider, "there are mysteries in religion only for those who have not raised themselves to the Hegelian grade of knowledge. For the latter all is clear; all is knowledge; and Christianity is the solution, and therefore the revelation of all mysteries." [104] This may be consistent in those who hold that man is God in the highest form of his existence, and the philosopher the highest style of man. Such an assertion, however, by whomsoever it may be made, is the insanity of presumption.

May what is True in Religion be False in Philosophy?

A fourth question included in this general subject is, Whether there is or may be a real conflict between the truths of reason and those of revelation? Whether that which is true in religion may be false in philosophy? To this question different answers have been given.

The Fathers on this Question.

First, while the Greek fathers were disposed to bring religion and philosophy into harmony, by giving a philosophical form to Christian doctrines, the Latins were inclined to represent the two as irreconcilable. "What," asks Tertullian, "has Athens to do with

Jerusalem? The academy with the Church? What have heretics to do with Christians? Our instruction is from the porch of Solomon, who himself taught that the Lord was to be sought in the simplicity of the heart. . . . . We need no seeking for truth after Christ; no research after the Gospel. When we believe, we desire nothing beyond faith, because we believe that there is nothing else we should do. . . . . To know nothing beyond is to know all things." [105] He went so far as to say, "Prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; . . . . certum est, quia impossibile est." [106] Without going to this extreme, the theologians of the Latin Church, those of them at least most zealous for Church doctrines, were inclined to deny to reason even the prerogative of a judicium contradictionis. They were constrained to take this ground because they were called upon to defend doctrines whici contradicted not only reason but the senses. When it was objected to the doctrine that the consecrated wafer is the real body of Christ, that our senses pronounce it to be bread, and that it is impossible that a human body should be in heaven and in all parts of the earth at the same time, what could they say but that the senses and reason are not to be trusted in the sphere of faith? That what is false to the reason and the senses may be true in religion?

Lutheran Teaching on this Point.

The Lutherans were under the same necessity. Their doctrine of the person of Christ involves the denial of the primary truth, that attributes cannot be separated from the substance of which they are the manifestation. Their doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper involves the assumption of the ubiquity of Christ's body, which seems to be a contradiction in terms.

Luther's utterances on this subject are not very consistent. When arguing against the continued obligation of monastic vows, he did not

hesitate to say that what was contrary to reason was contrary to God. "Was nun der Vernunft entgegen ist, ist gewiss dass es Gott viehmehr entgegen ist. Denn wie sollte es nicht wider die göttliche Wahrheit seyn, das wider Vernunft und menschliche Wahrheit ist." [107] But in the sacramentarian controversy he will not allow reason to be heard. "In the things of God," he says, reason or nature is stock-star-and-stone blind. "It is, indeed," he adds, "audacious enough to plunge in and stumble as a blind horse; but all that it explains or concludes is as certainly false and wrong as that God lives." [108] In another place he says that reason, when she attempts to speculate about divine things, becomes a fool; which, indeed, is very much what Paul says. (Rom. i. 22, 1 Cor. i. 18-31.)

The Lutheran theologians made a distinction between reason in the abstract, or reason as it was in man before the fall, and reason as it now is. They admit that no truth of revelation can contradict reason as such; but it may contradict the reason of men all of whose faculties are clouded and deteriorated by sin. By this was not meant simply that the unrenewed man is opposed to the truth of God; that "the things of the Spirit" are foolishness to him, that it seems to him absurd that God should be found in fashion as a man; that He should demand a satisfaction for sin; or save one man and not another, according to his own good pleasure. This the Bible clearly teaches and all Christians believe. In all this there is no contradiction between reason and religion. The being of God is foolishness to the atheist; and personal immortality is foolishness to the pantheist. Yet who would admit that these doctrines are contrary to reason? The Lutheran theologians intended to teach, not only that the mysteries of the Bible are above reason, that they can neither be understood nor demonstrated; and not only that "the things of the Spirit" are foolishness to the natural

man, but that they are really in conflict with the human understanding; that by a correct process of reasoning they can be demonstrated to be false; so that in the strict sense of the terms what is true in religion is false in philosophy. "The Sorbonne," says Luther, "has pronounced a most abominable decision in saying that what is true in religion is also true in philosophy; and moreover condemning as heretics all who assert the contrary. By this horrible doctrine it has given it to be clearly understood that the doctrines of faith are to be subjected to the yoke of human reason." [109]

Sir William Hamilton.

Secondly, the ground taken by Sir William Hamilton on this subject is not precisely the same with that taken by the Lutherans. They agree, indeed, in this, that we are bound to believe what (at the bar of reason) we can prove to be false, but they differ entirely as to the cause and nature of this conflict between reason and faith. According to the Lutherans, it arises from the corruption and deterioration of our nature by the fall. It is removed in part in this world by regeneration, and entirely hereafter by the perfection of our sanctification. According to Hamilton, this conflict arises from the necessary limitation of human thought. God has so made us that reason, acting according to its own laws, of necessity arrives at conclusions directly opposed to the doctrines of religion both natural and revealed. We can prove demonstrably that the Absolute being cannot know, cannot be a cause, cannot be conscious. It may be proved with equal clearness that the Infinite cannot be a person, or possess moral attributes. Here, then, what is true in religion, what we are bound to believe, and what in point of fact all men, in virtue of the constitution of their nature do believe, can be proved to be false. There is thus an irreconcilable conflict between our intellectual and

moral nature. But as, according to the idealist, reason forces us to the conclusion that the external world does not exist, while, nevertheless, it is safe and proper to act on the assumption that it is, and is what it appears to be; so, according to Hamilton, it is not only safe, but obligatory on us to act on the assumption that God is a person, although infinite, while our reason demonstrates that an infinite person is a contradiction. The conflict between reason and faith is avowed, while the obligation of faith on the testimony of our moral and religious nature and of the Word of God is affirmed. This point has been already discussed.

The View of Speculative Philosophers.

Thirdly, we note the view taken by the speculative philosophers. They, too, maintain that reason demonstrates the doctrines of revelation and even of natural religion to be false. But they do not recognize their obligation to receive them as objects of faith. Being contrary to reason, those doctrines are false, and being false, they are, by enlightened men, to be rejected. If any cling to them as a matter of feeling, they are to be allowed to do so, but they must renounce all claim to philosophic insight.

May the Objects of Faith be above, and yet not against Reason?

A fifth question is, Whether the objects of faith may be above, and yet not contrary to reason? The answer to this question is to be in the affirmative, for the distinction implied is sound and almost universally admitted. What is above reason is simply incomprehensible. What is against reason is impossible. It is contrary to reason that contradictions should be true; that a part should be greater than the whole; that a thing should be and not be at the same time; that right should be wrong and wrong right. It is incomprehensible how matter attracts matter; how the mind acts on the body, and the body on the

mind. The distinction between the incomprehensible and the impossible, is therefore plain and admitted. And the distinction between what is above reason, and what is against reason, is equally obvious and just. The great body of Christian theologians have ever taken the ground that the doctrines of the Bible are not contrary to reason, although above it. That is, they are matters of faith to be received on the authority of God, and not because they can be either understood or proved. As it is incomprehensible how a soul and body can be united in one conscious life; so it is incomprehensible how a divine and human nature can be united in one person m Christ. Neither is impossible, and therefore neither is contrary to reason. We know the one fact from consciousness; we believe the other on the testimony of God. It is impossible, and therefore contrary to reason, that three should be one. But it is not impossible that the same numerical essence should subsist in three distinct persons. Realists tell us that humanity, as one numerical essence, subsists in all the millions of human individuals. Thomas Aquinas takes the true ground when he says: "Ea quæ sunt supra naturam, sola fide tenemus. Quod autem credimus, auctoritati debemus. Unde in omnibus asserendis sequi debemus naturam rerum, præter ea, quæ auctoritate divina traduntur, quæ sunt supra naturam." [110] "Quæ igitur fidei sunt, non sunt tentanda probare nisi per auctoritates his, qui auctoritates suscipiunt. Apud alios vero sufficit defendere non esse impossibile quod prædicat fides." [111] "Quidquid in aliis scientiis invenitur veritati hujus scientiæ [sacræ doctrinæ] repugnans, totum condemnatur ut falsum." [112]

The Objects of Faith are consistent with Reason.

While, therefore, the objects of faith as revealed in the Bible, are not truths of the reason, i.e., which the human reason can discover, or comprehend, or demonstrate, they are, nevertheless, perfectly

consistent with reason. They involve no contradictions or absurdities; nothing impossible, nothing inconsistent with the intuitions either of the intellect or of the conscience; nothing inconsistent with any well established truth, whether of the external world or of the world of mind. On the contrary, the contents of the Bible, so far as they relate to things within the legitimate domain of human knowledge, are found to be consistent, and must be consistent, with all we certainly know from other sources than a divine revelation. All that the Scriptures teach concerning the external world accords with the facts of experience. They do not teach that the earth is a plane; that it is stationary in space; that the sun revolves around it. On the other hand, they do teach that God made all plants and animals, each after its own kind; and, accordingly, all experience shows that species are immutable. All the anthropological doctrines of the Bible agree with what we know of man from consciousness and observation. The Bible teaches that God made of one blood all nations which dwell on the face of the earth. We accordingly find that all the varieties of our race have the same anatomical structure; the same physical nature; the same rational and moral faculties. The Bible teaches that man is a free, accountable agent; that all men are sinners; that all need redemption, and that no man can redeem himself or find a ransom for his brother. With these teachings the consciousness of all men agrees. All that the Scriptures reveal concerning the nature and attributes of Gods corresponds with our religious nature, satisfying, elevating, and sanctifying all our powers and meeting all our necessities. If the contents of the Bible did not correspond with the truths which God has revealed in his external works and the constitution of our nature, it could not be received as coming from Him, for God cannot contradict himself. Nothing, therefore, can be more derogatory to the Bible than the

assertion that its doctrines are contrary to reason.

Faith in the Irrational impossible.

The assumption that reason and faith are incompatible; that we must become irrational in order to become believers is, however it may be intended, the language of infidelity; for faith in the irrational is of necessity itself irrational. It is impossible to believe that to be true which the mind sees to be false. This would be to believe and disbelieve the same thing at the same time. If, therefore, as modern philosophers assert, it is impossible that an infinite being can be a person, then faith in the personality of God is impossible. Then there can be no religion, no sin, no accountability, no immortality. Faith is not a blind, irrational conviction. In order to believe, we must know what we believe, and the grounds on which our faith rests. And, therefore, the refuge which some would take in faith, from the universal scepticism to which they say reason necessarily leads, is insecure and worthless.

While admitting that the truths of revelation are to be received upon the authority of God; that human reason can neither comprehend nor prove them; that a man must be converted and become as a little child before he can truly receive the doctrines of the Bible; and admitting, moreover, that these doctrines are irreconcilable with every system of philosophy, ever framed by those who refuse to be taught of God, or who were ignorant of his Word, yet it is ever to be maintained that those doctrines are unassailable; that no created intellect can prove them to be impossible or irrational. Paul, while spurning the wisdom of the world, still claimed that he taught the highest wisdom, even the wisdom of God. (1 Cor. ii. 6, 7.) And who will venture to say that the wisdom of God is irrational?

Knowledge essential to Faith.

A sixth question, included under the head of the relation of faith to knowledge is, Whether knowledge is essential to faith? That is, whether a truth must be known in order to be believed? This Protestants affirm and Romanists deny.

Protestants of course admit that mysteries, or truths which we are unable to comprehend, may be, and are, proper objects of faith. They repudiate the rationalistic doctrine that we can believe only what we understand and what we can prove, or, at least, elucidate so that it appears to be true in its own light. What Protestants maintain is that knowledge, i.e., the cognition of the import of the proposition to be believed, is essential to faith; and, consequently, that faith is limited by knowledge. We can believe only what we know, i.e., what we intelligently apprehend. If a proposition be announced to us in an unknown language, we can affirm nothing about it. We can neither believe nor disbelieve it. Should the man who makes the declaration, assert that it is true, if we have confidence in his competency and integrity, we may believe that he is right, but the proposition itself is no part of our faith. The Apostle recognizes this obvious truth when he says, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood (eusemon logon), how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air. . . . . If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. . . . . When thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks? seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" (1 Cor. xiv. 9-16.) To say Amen, is to assent to, to make one's own. According to the Apostle, therefore, knowledge, or the intelligent apprehension of the meaning of what is proposed, is essential to faith. If the proposition "God is a Spirit," be announced to the unlearned in

Hebrew or Greek, it is impossible that they should assent to its truth. If they understand the language, if they know what the word "God" means, and what the word "Spirit" means, then they may receive or reject the truth which that proposition affirms. The declaration "Jesus is the Son of God," admits of different interpretations. Some say the term Son is an official title, and therefore the proposition "Jesus is the Son of God," means that Jesus is a ruler. Others say it is a term of affection, then the proposition means that Jesus was the special object of the love of God. Others say that it means that Jesus is of the same nature with God; that He is a divine person. If this be the meaning of the Spirit in declaring Jesus to be the Son of God, then those who do not attach that sense to the words, do not believe the truth intended to be taught. When it is said God set forth Christ to be a propitiation for our sins, if we do not understand what the word propitiation means, the proposition to us means nothing, and nothing cannot be an object of faith.

Knowledge the Measure of Faith.

It follows from what has been said, or rather is included in it, that knowledge being essential to faith, it must be the measure of it. What lies beyond the sphere of knowledge, lies beyond the sphere of faith. Of the unseen and eternal we can believe only what God has revealed; and of what God has revealed, we can believe only what we know. It has been said that he who believes the Bible to be the Word of God, may properly be said to believe all it teaches, although much of its instructions may be to him unknown. But this is not a correct representation. The man who believes the Bible, is prepared to believe on its authority whatever it declares to be true. But he cannot properly be said to believe any more of its contents than he knows. If asked if he believed that men bitten by poisonous serpents were ever

healed by merely looking at a brazen serpent, he might, if ignorant of the Pentateuch, honestly answer, No. But should he come to read and understand the record of the healing of the dying Israelites, as found in the Bible, he would rationally and sincerely, answer, Yes. This disposition to believe whatever the Bible teaches, as soon as we know what is taught, may be called an implicit faith, but it is no real faith. It has none of its characteristics and none of its power.

Proof that Knowledge is Essential to Faith.

That knowledge, in the sense above stated, is essential to faith is obvious, --

1. From the very nature of faith. It includes the conviction of the truth of its object. It is an affirmation of the mind that a thing is true or trustworthy, but the mind can affirm nothing of that of which it knows nothing.

2. The Bible everywhere teaches that without knowledge there can be no faith. This, as just stated, is the doctrine of the Apostle Paul. He condemned the speaking in an unknown tongue in a promiscuous assembly, because the hearers could not understand what was said; and if they did not know the meaning of the words uttered, they could neither assent to them, nor be profited by them. In another place (Rom. x. 14) he asks, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" "Faith," he says, "cometh by hearing." The command of Christ was to preach the Gospel to every creature; to teach all nations. Those who received the instructions thus given, should, He assured his disciples, be saved; those who rejected them, should be damned. This takes for granted that without the knowledge of the Gospel, there can be no faith. On this principle the Apostles acted everywhere. They went abroad preaching Christ, proving from the Scriptures that He was the Son of God and Saviour of the world. The communication of knowledge always preceded

the demand for faith.

3. Such is the intimate connection between faith and knowledge, that in the Scriptures the one term is often used for the other. To know Christ, is to believe upon Him. To know the truth, is intelligently and believingly to apprehend and appropriate it. Conversion is effected by knowledge. Paul says he was made a believer by the revelation of Christ within him. The Spirit is said to open the eyes of the understanding. Men are said to be renewed so as to know. We are translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light. Believers are children of the light. Men are said to perish for the lack of knowledge. Nothing is more characteristic of the Bible than the importance which it attaches to the knowledge of the truth. We are said to be begotten by the truth; to be sanctified by the truth; and the whole duty of ministers and teachers is said to be to hold forth the word of life. It is because Protestants believe that knowledge is essential to faith, that they insist so strenuously on the circulation of the Scriptures and the instruction of the people.

Romish Doctrine on this Subject.

Romanists make a distinction between explicit and implicit faith. By the former is meant, faith in a known truth; by the latter faith in truths not known. They teach that only a few primary truths of religion need be known, and that faith without knowledge, as to all other truths, is genuine and sufficient. On this subject Thomas Aquinas says, "Quantum ad prima credibilia, quæ sunt articuli fidei, tenetur homo explicite credere. Quantum autem ad alia credibilia non tenetur homo explicite credere, sed solum implicite, vel in præparatione animi, in quantum paratus est credere quidquid divina Scriptura continet." [113] Implicit faith is defined as, "Assensus, qui omnia, quamvis ignota, quæ ab ecclesia probantur, amplectitur." [114] Bellarmin [115] says, "In eo

qui credit, duo sunt, apprehensio et judicium, sive assensus: sed apprehensio non est fides, sed aliud fidem præcedens. Possunt enim infideles apprehendere mysteria fidei. Præterea, apprehensio non dicitur proprie notitia. . . . . Mysteria fidei, quæ rationem superant, credimus, non intelligimus, ac per hoc fides distingintur contra scientiam, et melius per ignorantiam, quam per notitiam definitur." The faith required of the people is simply, A general intention to believe whatever the Church believes." [116] The Church teaches that there are seven sacraments. A man who has no idea what the word sacrament means, or what rites are regarded by the Church as having a sacramental character, is held to believe that orders, penance, matrimony, and extreme unction, are sacraments. So, of all other doctrines of the Church. True faith is said to be consistent with absolute ignorance. According to this doctrine, a man may be a true Christian, if he submits to the Church, although in his internal convictions and modes of thought, he be a pantheist or pagan.

It is to this grave error as to the nature of faith, that much in the character and practice of the Romish Church is to be referred, --

1. This is the reason why the Scriptures are withheld from the people. If knowledge is not necessary to faith, there is no need that the people should know what the Bible teaches.

2. For the same reason the services of public worship are conducted in an unknown language.

3. Hence, too, the symbolism which characterizes their worship. The end to be accomplished is a blind reverence and awe. For this end there is no need that these symbols should be understood. It is enough that they affect the imagination.

4. To the same principle is to be referred the practice of reserve in preaching. The truth may be kept back or concealed. The cross is held

up before the people, but it is not necessary that the doctrine of the sacrifice for sin made thereon should be taught. It is enough if the people are impressed; it matters not whether they believe that the sign, or the material, or the doctrine symbolized, secures salvation. Nay, the darker the mind, the more vague and mysterious the feeling excited, and the more blind the submission rendered, the more genuine is the exercise of faith. "Religious light," says Mr. Newman, "is intellectual darkness." [117]

5. It is on the same principle the Roman Catholic missions have always been conducted. The people are converted not by the truth, not by a course of instruction, but by baptism. They are made Christians by thousands, not by the intelligent adoption of Christianity as a system of doctrine, of that they may be profoundly ignorant, but by simple submission to the Church and its prescribed rites. The consequence has been that the Catholic missions, although continued in some instances for more than a hundred years, take no hold on the people, but almost uniformly die out, as soon as the supply of foreign ministers is cut off.

---

[103] See above, p. 58.

[104] Systematische Entwickelung, § 29, 4th edit. Leipzig, 1841, p. 163.

[105] De Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos, cap. 7, 8, 14, Works, Paris, 1608, (t. iii.), p. 331: "Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid Academiæ et Ecelesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de portica Solomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat: Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum. Viderint qui Stoicum, et Platonicum, et Dialecticum, Christianissimum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post

Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debeamus. . . . . Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti. Certe aut non obstrepant, aut quiescant adversus regulam. Nihil ulta scire, omnia scire est."

[106] De Carne Christi, cap. 5, Works, (t. iii.), p. 555: "Natus est Dei filius: non pudet quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est Dei filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est. Et sepultus, resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile est."

[107] Works, edit. Walch, vol. xix. p. 1940.

[108] Ibid. vol. xii. pp. 399, 400.

[109] Works, edit. Walch, vol. x. p. 1399.

[110] Summa, I. quest. xcix. art 1, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 185, a.

[111] Ibid. quæst. xxxii. art. 1, p. 64, a.

[112] Ibid. quæst. i. art. 6, p. 2, b.

[113] Summa, II. ii. quæst. ii. art. 5, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 7, a, of third set.

[114] Hutterus Redivivius, § 108, 6th edit. Leipzig, 1845, p. 271.

[115] De Justificatione, lib. i. cap. 7, Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. 714, a, c.

[116] Strauss, Dogmatik, Die Christliche Glaubenslehre. Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1840, vol. i. p. 284.

[117] Sermons, vol. i. p. 124.

---

§ 5. Faith and Feeling.

It has already been seen, --

1. That faith, the act of believing, cannot properly be defined as the assent of the understanding determined by the will. There are, unquestionably, many cases in which a man believes against his will.

2. It has also been argued that it is not correct to say that faith is

assent founded on feeling. On this point it was admitted that a man's feelings have great influence upon his faith; that it is comparatively easy to believe what is agreeable, and difficult to believe what is disagreeable. It was also admitted that in saving faith, the gift of God, resting on the inward illuminating testimony of the Holy Spirit, there is a discernment not only of the truth but of the divine excellence of the things of the Spirit, which is inseparably connected with appropriate feeling. It was moreover conceded that, so far as the consciousness of the believer is concerned, he seems to receive the truth on its own evidence, on its excellence and power over his heart and conscience. This, however, is analogous to other facts in his experience. When a man repents and believes, he is conscious only of his own exercises and not of the supernatural influences of the Spirit, to which those exercises owe their origin and nature. Thus also in the exercise of faith, consciousness does not reach the inward testimony of the Spirit on which that faith is founded. Nevertheless, notwithstanding these admissions, it is still incorrect to say that faith is founded on feeling, because it is only of certain forms or exercises of faith that this can even be plausibly said; and because there are many exercises of even saving faith (that is, of faith in a true believer,) which are not attended by feeling. This is the case when the object of faith is some historical fact. Besides, the Scriptures clearly teach that the ground of faith is the testimony of God, or demonstration of the Spirit. He has revealed certain truths, and attends them with such an amount and kind of evidence, as produces conviction, and we receive them on his authority.

3. Faith is not necessarily connected with feeling. Sometimes it is, and sometimes it is not. Whether it is or not, depends, (a.) On the nature of the object. Belief in glad tidings is of necessity attended

by joy; of evil tidings with grief. Belief in moral excellence involves a feeling of approbation. Belief that a certain act is criminal, involves disapprobation. (b.) On the proximate ground of faith. If a man believes that a picture is beautiful on the testimony of competent judges, there is no æsthetic feeling connected with his faith. But if he personally perceives the beauty of the object, then delight is inseparable from the conviction that it is beautiful. In like manner if a man believes that Jesus is God manifest in the flesh, on the mere external testimony of the Bible, he experiences no due impression from that truth. But if his faith is founded on the inward testimony of the Spirit, by which the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ is revealed to him, then he is filled with adoring admiration and love.

Religious Faith more than Simple Assent.

4. Another question agitated on this subject is, Whether faith is a purely intellectual exercise; or Whether it is also an exercise of the affections. This is nearly allied to the preceding question, and must receive substantially the same answer. Bellarmin, [118] says, "Tribus in rebus ab hæreticis Catholici dissentiunt; Primum, in objecto fidei justificantis, quod hæretici restringunt ad solam promissionem misericordiæ specialis, Catholici tam late patere volunt, quam late patet verbam. . . . Deinde in facultate et potentia animi quæ sedes est fidei. Siquidem illi fidem collocant in voluntate [seu in corde] cum fiduciam esse definiunt; ac per hoc eam cum spe confundunt. Fiducia enim nihil est aliud, nisi spes roborata. . . . Catholici fidem in intellectu sedem habere docent. Denique, in ipso actu intellectus. Ipsi enim per notitiam fidem definiunt, nos per assensum. Assentimur enim Deo, quamvis ea nobis credenda proponat, quæ non intelligimus." Regarding faith as a mere intellectual or speculative act, they consistently deny that it is necessarily connected with salvation.

According to their doctrine, a man may have true faith, i.e., the faith which the Scriptures demand, and yet perish. On this point the Council of Trent says: "Si quis dixerit, amissa per peccatum gratia, simul et fidem semper amitti, aut fidem, quæ remanet, non esse veram fidem, licet non sit viva; aut eum, qui fidem sine caritate habet, non esse Christianum; anathema sit." [119]

Protestant Doctrine.

On the other hand Protestants with one voice maintain that the faith which is connected with salvation, is not a mere intellectual exercise. Calvin says: [120] "Verum observemus, fidei sedem non in cerebro esse, sed in corde: neque vero de eo contenderim, qua in parte corporis sita sit fides: sed quoniam cordis nomen pro serio et sincero affectu fere capitur, dico firmam esse et efficacem fiduciam, non nudam tantum notionem." He also says: [121] "Quodsi expenderent illud Pauli, Corde creditur ad justitiam (Rom. x. 10): fingere desinerent frigidam illam qualitatem. Si una hæc nobis suppeteret ratio, valere deberet ad litem finiendam: assensionem scilicet ipsam sicuti ex parte attigi, et fusius iterum repetam, cordis esse magis quam cerebri, et affectus magis quam intelligentiæ."

The answer in the Heidelberg Catechism, to the question, What is Faith? is, "It is not merely a certain knowledge, whereby I receive as true all that God has revealed to us in his Word, but also a cordial trust, which the Holy Ghost works in me by the Gospel, that not only to others, but to me also, the forgiveness of sin, and everlasting righteousness and life are given by God, out of pure grace, and only for the sake of Christ's merit." [122]

That saving faith is not a mere speculative assent of the understanding, is the uniform doctrine of the Protestant symbols. On this point, however, it may be remarked, in the first place, that, as

has often been stated before, the Scriptures do not make the sharp distinction between the understanding, the feelings, and the will, which is common in our day. A large class of our inward acts and states are so complex as to be acts of the whole soul, and not exclusively of any one of its faculties. In repentance there is of necessity an intellectual apprehension of ourselves as sinners, of the holiness of God, of his law to which we have failed to be conformed and of his mercy in Christ; there is a moral disapprobation of our character and conduct; a feeling of sorrow, shame, and remorse; and a purpose to forsake sin and lead a holy life. Scarcely less complex is the state of mind expressed by the word faith as it exists in a true believer. In the second place, there is a distinction to be made between faith in general and saving faith. If we take that element of faith which is common to every act of believing; if we understand by it the apprehension of a thing as true and worthy of confidence, whether a fact of history or of science, then it may be said that faith in its essential nature is intellectual, or intelligent assent. But if the question be, What is that act or state of mind which is required in the Gospel, when we are commanded to believe; the answer is very different. To believe that Christ is "God manifest in the flesh," is not the mere intellectual conviction that no one, not truly divine, could be and do what Christ was and did; for this conviction demoniacs avowed; but it is to receive Him as our God. This includes the apprehension and conviction of his divine glory, and the adoring reverence, love, confidence, and submission, which are due to God alone. When we are commanded to believe in Christ as the Saviour of men, we are not required merely to assent to the proposition that He does save sinners, but also to receive and rest upon Him alone for our own salvation. What, therefore, the Scriptures mean by faith, in this connection, the

faith which is required for salvation, is an act of the whole soul, of the understanding, of the heart, and of the will.

Proof of the Protestant Doctrine.

The Protestant doctrine that saving faith includes knowledge, assent, and trust, and is not, as Romanists teach, mere assent, in sustained by abundant proofs.

1. In the first place, it is proved from the nature of the object of saving faith. That object is not merely the general truth of Scripture, not the fact that the Gospel reveals God's plan of saving sinners; but it is Christ himself; his person and work, and the offer of salvation to us personally and individually. From the nature of the case we cannot, as just remarked, believe in Christ on the inward testimony of the Spirit which reveals his glory and his love, without the feelings of reverence, love, and trust mingling with the act and constituting its character. Nor is it possible that a soul oppressed with a sense of sin should receive the promise of deliverance from its guilt and power, without any feeling of gratitude and confidence. The act of faith in such a promise is in its nature an act of appropriation and confidence.

2. We accordingly find that in many cases in the Bible the word trust is used instead of faith. The same act or state of mind which in one place is expressed by the one word, is in others expressed by the other. The same promises are made to trust as are made to faith. The same effects are attributed to the one, that are attributed to the other.

3. The use of other words and forms of expression as explanatory of the act of faith, and substituted for that word, shows that it includes trust as an essential element of its nature. We are commanded to look to Christ, as the dying Israelites looked up to the brazen serpent. This looking involved trusting; and looking is declared to be

believing. Sinners are exhorted to flee to Christ as a refuge. The man-slayer fled to the city of refuge because he relied upon it as a place of safety. We are said to receive Christ, to rest upon Him, to lay hold of Him. All these, and other modes of expression which teach us what we are to do when we are commanded to believe, show that trust is an essential element in the act of saving faith.

4. The command to believe is expressed by the word pisteu,w not only when followed by the accusative, but also when followed by the dative and by the prepositions epi, eis, en. But the literal meaning of pisteuein eis, or epi, or en, is not simply to believe, but to believe upon, to confide in, to trust. Faith in a promise made to ourselves, from the nature of the case, is an act of confidence in him who makes the promise.

5. Unbelief is, therefore, expressed by doubt, fear, distrust and despair.

6 The believer knows from his own experience that when he believes he receives and rests on Jesus Christ for salvation, as He is freely offered to us in the Gospel.

The controversy between Romanists and Protestants on this subject turns on the view taken of the plan of salvation. If, as Protestants hold, every man in order to be saved, must receive the record which God has given of his Son; must believe that He is God manifest in the flesh, the propitiation for our sins, the prophet, priest, and king of his people, then it must be admitted that faith involves trust in Christ as to us the source of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. But if, as Romanists teach, the benefits of redemption are conveyed only through the sacraments, effective ex opere operato, then faith is the opposite of infidelity in its popular sense. If a man is not a believer, he is an infidel, i.e., a rejecter of Christianity. The

object of faith is divine revelation as contained in the Bible. It is a simple assent to the fact that the Scriptures are from God, and that the Church is a divinely constituted and supernaturally endowed institute for the salvation of men. Believing this, the sinner comes to the Church and receives through her ministrations, in his measure, all the benefits of redemption. According to this system the nature and office of faith are entirely different from what they are according to the Protestant theory of the Gospel.

---

[118] De Justificatione, lib. i. cap. 4, Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 706, d, e.

[119] Session vi., Canon 28; Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, vol. i. p. 37.

[120] On Romans x. 10; Commentaries, edit. Berlin, 1831, vol. v. p. 139.

[121] Institutio, III. ii. 8; edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. i. p. 358.

[122] Question 21.

---

§ 6. Faith and Love.

As to the relation between faith and love there are three different views: --

1. That love is the ground of faith; that men believe the truth because they love it. Faith is founded on feeling. This view has already been sufficiently discussed.

2. That love is the invariable and necessary attendant and consequent of saving faith. As no man can see and believe a thing to be morally good without the feeling of approbation; so no one can see and believe the glory of God as revealed in the Scriptures without adoring reverence being awakened in his soul; no one can believe unto salvation

that Christ is the Son of God and the Son of Man; that He loved us and gave Himself for us, and makes us kings and priests unto God, without love and devotion, in proportion to the clearness and strength of this faith, filling the heart and controlling the life. Hence faith is said to work by love and to purify the heart. Romanists, indeed, render pistis di' agapes energoumene in this passage (Gal. v. 6), "faith perfected or completed by love." But this is contrary to the constant usage of the word energeisthai in the New Testament, which is always used in a middle sense, "vim suam exserere." According to the Apostle's teaching in Rom. vii. 4-6, love without faith, or anterior to it, is impossible. Until we believe, we are under the condemnation of the law. While under condemnation, we are at enmity with God. While at enmity with God, we bring forth fruit unto death. It is only when reconciled to God and united to Christ, that we bring forth fruit unto God. Believing that God loves us we love Him. Believing that Christ gave Himself for us, we devote our lives to Him. Believing that the fashion of this world passes away, that the things unseen are eternal, those who have that faith which is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen, set their affections on things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. This necessary connection between faith and love, has already been sufficiently insisted upon.

Romanists make Love the Essence of Faith.

3. The third doctrinal view on this subject is that of the Romanists, who make love the essence of faith. In other words, love with them is the form (in the scholastic sense of the word) of faith; it is that which gives it being or character as a Christian virtue or grace. While on the one hand they teach, as we have seen with the Council of Trent, that faith is in itself mere intellectual assent, without any moral virtue, and which may be exercised by the unrenewed or by those in a

state of mortal sin; on the other hand, they hold that there is such a Christian grace as faith; but in that case, faith is only another name for love. This is not the distinction between a living and dead faith which the Scriptures and all Evangelical Christians recognize. With Romanists the fides informis is true faith, and the fides formata is love. On this point, Peter Lombard [123] says: "Fides qua dicitur [creditur?], si cum caritate sit, virtus est, quia caritas ut ait Ambrosius mater est omnium virtutum, quæ omnes informat, sine qua nulla vera virtus est." Thomas Aquinas [124] says: "Actus fidei ordinatur ad objectum voluntatis, quod est bonum, sicut ad finem. Hoc autem bonum quod est finis fidei, scilicet bonum divinum, est proprium objectum charitatis: et ideo charitas dicitur forma fidei, in quantum per charitatem actus fidei perficitur et formatur." Bellarmin [125] says: "Quod si charitas est forma fidei, et fides non justificat formaliter, nisi ab ipsa caritate formata certe multo magis charitas ipsa justificat. . . . . Fides quæ agitur, ac movetur, formatur, et quasi animatur per dilectionem. . . . . Apostolus Paulus . . . . explicat dilectionem formam esse extrinsecam fidei non intrinsecam, quæ det illi, non ut sit, sed ut moveatur." All this is intelligible and reasonable, provided we admit subjective justification, and the merit of good works. If justification is sanctification, then it may be admitted that love has more to do with making men holy, than faith considered as mere intellectual assent. And if it be conceded that we are accepted by God on the ground of our own virtue, then it may be granted that love is more valuable than any mere exercise of the intellect. Romanists argue, "Maxima virtus maxime justificat. Dilectio est maxima virtus. Ergo maxime justificat." It was because this distinction between a "formed and unformed faith" was made in the interest of justification on the ground of our own character and merit,

that Luther, with his usual vehement power, says: "Ipsi duplicem faciunt fidem, informem et formatam, hanc pestilentissimam et satanicam glossam non possum non vehementer detestari." It is only as connected with false views of justification that this question has any real importance. For it is admitted by all Protestants that saving faith and love are inseparably connected; that faith without love, i.e., that a faith which does not produce love and good works, is dead. But Protestants are strenuous in denying that we are justified on account of love, which is the real meaning of the Romanists when they say "fides non justificat formaliter, nisi ab ipsa caritate formata."

---

[123] Liber Sententiarum, III. xxiii. C. edit. 1472(?)

[124] Summa, II. ii. quæst. iv. art. 3, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 11, a, of third set.

[125] De Justificatione, lib. ii. cap. 4; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. pp. 789, a, b, 790, c.

---

§ 7. The Object of Saving Faith.

Fides Generalis.

It is conceded that all Christians are bound to believe, and that all do believe everything taught in the Word of God, so far as the contents of the Scriptures are known to them. It is correct, therefore, to say that the object of faith is the whole revelation of God as contained in his Word. As the Bible is with Protestants the only infallible rule of faith and practice, nothing not expressly taught in Scripture, or deduced therefrom by necessary inference, can be imposed on the people of God as an article of faith. This is "the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free," and in which we are bound to stand fast. This is our protection on the one hand, against the usurpations of the Church.

Romanists claim for the Church the prerogative of infallible and authoritative teaching. The people are bound to believe whatever the Church, i.e., its organs the bishops, declare to be a part of the revelation of God. They do not, indeed, assume the right "to make" new articles of faith. But they claim the authority to decide, in such a way as to bind the conscience of the people, what the Bible teaches; and what by tradition the Church knows to be included in the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. This gives them latitude enough to teach for doctrines the commandments of men. Bellarmin [126] says: "Omnium dogmatum firmitas pendet ab auctoritate præsentis ecclesiæ." On the other hand, however, it is not only against the usurpations of the Church, that the principle above mentioned is our security, but also against the tyranny of public opinion. Men are as impatient of contradiction now as they ever were. They manifest the same desire to have their own opinions enacted into laws, and enforced by divine authority. And they are as fierce in their denunciations of all who venture to oppose them. Hence they meet in conventions or other assemblies, ecclesiastical or voluntary, and decide what is true and what is false in doctrine, and what is right and what is wrong in morals. Against all undue assumptions of authority, true Protestants hold fast to the two great principles, -- the right of private judgment, and that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice. The object of faith, therefore, is all the truths revealed in the Word of God. All that God in the Bible declares to be true, we are bound to believe. This is what theologians call fides generalis.

Fides Specialis.

But, besides this, there is a fides specialis necessary to salvation. In the general contents of the Scriptures there are certain doctrines

concerning Christ and his work, and certain promises of salvation made through Him to sinful men, which we are bound to receive and on which we are required to trust. The special object of faith, therefore, is Christ, and the promise of salvation through Him. And the special definite act of faith which secures our salvation is the act of receiving and resting on Him as He is offered to us in the Gospel. This is so clearly and so variously taught in the Scriptures as hardly to admit of being questioned.

Christ's Testimony.

In the first place, our Lord repeatedly declares that what men are required to do, and what they are condemned because they do not do, is to believe on Him. He was lifted up, "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John iii. 15.) "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (v. 18.) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (v. 36.) "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 40.) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life. . . . . This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, ... any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." (vers. 47-51.) In another place our Lord says, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. (John vi. 29.) The passages, however, in which faith in Christ is expressly demanded as the condition of salvation, are too numerous to be cited.

We are said to be saved by receiving Christ.

That Christ is the immediate object of saving faith is also taught in all those passages in which we are said to receive Christ, or the testimony of God concerning Christ, and in which this act of receiving is said to secure our salvation. For example, in John i. 12, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not." (John v. 43.) "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God has made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." (1 John v. 9, 10.) "He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." (v. 12.) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." (v. 1.) It is, therefore, receiving Christ; receiving the record which God has given of his Son; believing that He is the Christ the Son of the living God, which is the specific act required of us in order to salvation. Christ, therefore, is the immediate object of those exercises of faith which secure salvation. And, therefore, faith is expressed by looking to Christ; coming to Christ; committing the soul to Him, etc.

Teaching of the Apostles

Accordingly the Apostle teaches we are justified "by the faith of Christ." It is not faith as a pious disposition of the mind not faith as general confidence in God; not faith in the truth of divine revelation; much less faith "in eternal verities," or the general principles of truth and duty, but that faith of which Christ is the object. Romans iii. 22: "The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Galatians ii. 16: "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." iii. 24: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." v. 26: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Galatians ii. 20: "I live by the faith of the Son of God," etc., etc.

Christ our Ransom.

Christ declares that He gave Himself as a ransom for many; He was set forth as a propitiation for sins; He offered Himself as a sacrifice unto God. It is through the merit of his righteousness and death that men are saved. All these representations which pervade the Scriptures necessarily assume that the faith which secures salvation must have special reference to Him. If He is our Redeemer, we must receive and trust Him as such. If He is a propitiation for sins, it is through faith in his blood that we are reconciled to God. The whole plan of salvation, as set forth in the Gospel, supposes that Christ in his person and work is the object of faith and the ground of confidence.

We live in Christ by Faith.

The same thing follows from the representations given of the relation of the believer to Christ. We are in Him by faith. He dwells in us. He is the head from whom we, as members of his body, derive our life. He is the vine, we are the branches. It is not we that live, but Christ, who liveth in us. These and other representations are utterly inconsistent with the doctrine that it is a vague general faith in God or in the Scriptures which secures our salvation. It is a faith which terminates directly on Christ, which takes Him to be our God and Saviour. God sent his Son into the world, clothed in our nature, to reveal his will, to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification. In Him dwells the fulness of the Godhead, from his fulness we are filled. He to us is wisdom, righteousness,

sanctification, and redemption. Those who receive this Saviour as being all He claimed to be, and commit their souls into his hands to be used in his service and saved to his glory, are, in the Scriptural sense of the term, believers. Christ is not only the object of their faith, but their whole inward, spiritual life terminates on Him. Nothing, therefore, can be more foreign to the Gospel than the Romish doctrine, substantially revived by the modern philosophy which turns the mind away from the historical, really existing, objective Christ, to the work within us; leaving us nothing to love and trust, but what is in our own miserable hearts.

Christ is not received in a Special Office alone.

Admitting that Christ is the immediate and special object of those acts of faith which secure salvation, it is asked, Whether it is Christ in all his offices, or Christ in his priestly office, especially, that is the object of justifying faith? This seems an unnecessary question. It is not raised in the Bible; nor does it suggest itself to the believer. He receives Christ. He does not ask himself for what special function of his saving work he thus accepts Him. He takes Him as a Saviour, as a deliverer from the guilt and power of sin, from the dominion of Satan, and from all the evils of his apostasy from God. He takes Him as his wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. He takes Him as his God and Saviour, as the full, complete, satisfying, life-giving portion of the soul. If this complex act of apprehension and surrender were analyzed it doubtless would be found to include submission to all his teaching, reliance on his righteousness and intercession, subjection to his will, confidence in his protection, and devotion to his service. As He is offered to us as a prophet, priest, and king, as such He is accepted. And as He is offered to us as a source of life, and glory, and blessedness, as the supreme object of adoration and

love, as such He is joyfully accepted.

Is the Sinner required to believe that God loves him?

Again, it is questioned, Whether the object of saving faith is that God is reconciled to us; that our sins are forgiven; that we are the objects of the saving love of God? This is not the question above considered, namely, Whether, as Romanists say, the object of faith is the whole revelation of God, or, as Protestants contend, Christ and the promise of redemption through Him, although many of the arguments of the Romanists are directed against the special form of the doctrine just stated. They argue that it is contradictory to say that we are pardoned because we believe; and, in the same breath, to say that the thing to be believed is that our sins are already pardoned. Again, they argue that the only proper object of faith is some revelation of God, but it is nowhere revealed that we individually are reconciled to God, or that our sins are pardoned, or that we are the objects of that special love which God has to his own people.

In answer to the first of these objections, the Reformed theologians were accustomed to say, that a distinction is to be made between the remission of sin de jure already obtained through the death of Christ, and remission de facto through the efficacious application of it to us. In the former sense, "remissio peccatorum jam impetrata" is the object of faith. In the latter sense, it is "remissio impetranda," because faith is the instrumental cause of justification, and must precede it. "Unde," says Turrettin, [127] "ad obtinendam remissionem peccatorum, non debeo credere peccata mihi jam remissa, ut perperam nobis impingunt; sed debeo credere peccata mihi credenti et poenitenti, juxta promissionem factam credentibus et poenitentibus, remissum iri certissime, quæ postea actu secundari et reflexo ex sensu fidei credo mihi esse remissa."

The second objection was answered by distinguishing between the direct and the reflex act of faith. By the direct act of faith we embrace Christ as our Saviour; by the reflex act, arising out of the consciousness of believing, we believe that He loved us and died for us, and that nothing can ever separate us from his love. These two acts are inseparable, not only as cause and effect, antecedent and consequent; but they are not separated in time, or in the consciousness of the believer. They are only different elements of the complex act of accepting Christ as He is offered in the Gospel. We cannot separate the joy and gratitude with which a great favour is accepted. Although a psychological analysis might resolve these emotions into the effects of the act of acceptance, they belong, as revealed in consciousness, to the very nature of the act. It is a cordial and grateful acceptance of a promise made to all who embrace it. If a general promise of pardon be made to criminals on the condition of the confession of guilt, every one of their number who makes the confession knows or believes that the promise is made to him. On this point the early Reformed and Lutheran theologians were agreed in teaching that when the sinner exercises saving faith. He believes that for Christ's sake he is pardoned and accepted of God. In other words, that Christ loved him and gave Himself for him. We have already seen that the "Heidelberg Catechism," [128] the symbolical book of so large a portion of the Reformed Church, declared saving faith to be "Certa fiducia, a Spiritu Sancto per evangelium in corde meo accensa, qua in Deo acquiesco, certo statuens, non solum aliis, sed mihi quoque remissionem peccatorum æternam, justitiam et vitam donatam esse idque gratis, ex Dei misericordia, propter unius Christi meritum." In the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession of the Lutheran Church" it is said, [129] "Nos præter illam fidem [fidem generalem] requirimus, ut credat sibi quisque remitti

peccata." Calvin says, [130] "Gratiæ promissione opus est, qua nobis testificetur se propitium esse Patrem: quando nec aliter ad eum appropinquare possumus, et in eam solam reclinare cor hominis potest. . . . . Nunc justa fidei definitio nobis constabit, si dicamus esse divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ firmam certamque cognitionem, quæ gratuitæ in Christo promissionis veritate fundata, per Spiritum Sanctum et revelatur mentibus nostris et cordibus obsignatur." "Hic præcipuus fidei cardo vertitur, ne quas Dominus offert misericordiæ promissiones, extra nos tantum veras esse arbitremur, in nobis minime: sed ut potius eas intus complectendo nostras faciamus. . . . . In summa, vere fidelis non est nisi qui solida persuasione Deum sibi propitium benevolumque patrem esse persuasus, de ejus benignitate omnia sibi pollicetur: nisi qui divinæ erga se benevolentiæ promissionibus fretus, indubitatam salutis expectationem præsumit."

This is strong language. The doctrine, however, is not that faith implies assurance. The question concerns the nature of the object seen, not the clearness of the vision; what it is that the soul believes, not the strength of its faith. This Calvin himself elsewhere beautifully expresses, saying, "When the least drop of faith is instilled into our minds, we begin to see the serene and placid face of our reconciled Father; far off and on high, it may be, but still it is seen." A man in a dungeon may see only a ray of light streaming through a crevice. This is very different from broad daylight. Nevertheless, what he sees is light. So what the penitent sinner believes is, that God for Christ's sake is reconciled to him. It may be with a very dim and doubtful vision, he apprehends that truth; but that is the truth on which his trust is stayed.

Proof of this Doctrine.

This is involved in the appropriation of the general promise of the

Gospel. The Scriptures declare that God is love; that He set forth his Son to be a propitiation for sin; that in Him He is reconciled; that He will receive all who come to Him through Christ. To appropriate these general declarations, is to believe that they are true, not only in relation to others, but to ourselves that God is reconciled to us. We have no right to exclude ourselves. This self-exclusion is unbelief. It is refusing to take of the waters of life, freely offered to all.

Galatians ii. 20.

Accordingly the Apostle in Galatians ii. 20, says, "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." The object of the Apostle's faith, therefore, the truths which he believed, and faith in which gave life to his soul, were, (1.) That Christ is the Son of God; (2.) That He loved him; (3.) That He gave Himself for him. The faith by which a believer lives, is not specifically different in its nature or object from the faith required of every man in order to his salvation. The life of faith is only the continued repetition, it may be with ever increasing strength and clearness, of those exercises by which we first receive Christ, in all his fuiness and in all his offices, as our God and Saviour. "Qui fit ut vivamus Christi fide? quia nos dilexit, et se ipsum tradidit pro nobis. Amor, inquam, quo nos complexus est Christus, fecit ut se nobis coadunaret. Id implevit morte sua nam se ipsum tradendo pro nobis, non secus atque in persona nostra passus est. . . . . Neque parum energiæ habet pro me: quia non satis fuerit Christum pro mundi salute mortuum reputare, nisi sibi quisque effectum ac possessionem hujus gratiæ privatim vindicet." [131]

It is objected to this view of the case that by the "love of God," or "of Christ," in the above statement, is not meant the general benevolence or philanthropy of God, but his special, electing, and

saving love. When Paul said he lived by the faith of Christ who loved him, and gave Himself for him, he meant something more than that Christ loved all men and therefore him among the rest. He evidently believed himself to be a special object of the Saviour's love. It was this conviction which gave power to his faith. And a like conviction enters into the faith of every true believer. But to this it is objected that faith must have a divine revelation for its object. But there is no revelation of God's special love to individuals, and, therefore, no individual has any Scriptural ground to believe that Christ loved him, and gave Himself for him. Whatever force there may be in this objection, it bears against Paul's declaration and experience. He certainly did believe that Christ loved him and died for him. It will not do to say that this was a conclusion drawn from his own experience; or to assume that the Apostle argued himself into the conviction that Christ loved him. Christ specially loves all who believe upon Him. I believe upon Him. Therefore Christ specially loves me. But a conclusion reached by argument is not an object of faith. Faith must rest on the testimony of God. It must be, therefore, that God in some way testifies to the soul that it is the object of his love. This he does in two ways. First, by the general invitations and promises of the Gospel. The act of appropriating, or of accepting these promises, is to believe that they belong to us as well as to others. Secondly, by the inward witness of the Spirit. Paul says (Rom. v. 5), "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." That is, the Holy Ghost convinces us that we are the objects of God's love. This is done, not only by the various manifestations of his love in providence and redemption, but by his inward dealings with the soul. "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." (John xiv. 21). This manifestation is

not outward through the word. It is inward. God has fellowship or intercourse with the souls of his people. The Spirit calls forth our love to God, and reveals his love to us. Again, in Romans viii. 16, the Apostle says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." This does not mean that the Spirit excites in us filial feelings toward God, from whence we infer that we are his children. The Apostle refers to two distinct sources of evidence of our adoption. The one is that we can call God Father; the other, the testimony of the Spirit. The latter is joined with the former. The word is summarturei, unites in testifying. Hence we are said to be sealed, not only marked and secured, but assured by the Spirit; and the Spirit is a pledge, an assurance, that we are, and ever shall be, the objects of God's saving love. (Eph. i. 13, 14; iv. 30. 2 Cor. i. 22.)

This is not saying that a man must believe that he is one of the elect. Election is a secret purpose of God. The election of any particular person is not revealed, and, therefore, is not an object of faith. It is a thing to be proved, or made sure, as the Apostle Peter says, by the fruits of the Spirit. All that the doctrine of the Reformers on this subject includes is, that the soul in committing itself to Christ does so as to one who loved it and died for its salvation. The woman healed by touching our Saviour's garment, believed that she was an object of his compassionate love, because all who touched Him with faith were included in that number. Her faith included that conviction.

---

[126] De Sacram. lib. ii. c. 2. (?)

[127] Institutio, XV. xii. 6; Works, edit. Edinburgh, 1847, vol. ii. p. 508.

[128] XXI.; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 434.

[129] V. 60; Hase, Libri Symbolici, Leipzig, 1846, p. 172.

[130] Institutio, lib. III. ii. 7, 16; edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. i. pp. 357, 364.

[131] Calvin in loco.

---

§ 8. Effects of Faith.

Union with Christ.

The first effect of faith, according to the Scriptures, is union with Christ. We are in Him by faith. There is indeed a federal union between Christ and his people, founded on the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son in the counsels of eternity. We are, therefore, said to be in Him before the foundation of the world. It is one of the promises of that covenant, that all whom the Father had given the Son should come to Him; that his people should be made willing in the day of his power. Christ has, therefore, been exalted to the right hand of God, to give repentance and the remission of sins. But it was also, as we learn from the Scriptures, included in the stipulations of that covenant, that his people, so far as adults are concerned, should not receive the saving benefits of that covenant until they were united to Him by a voluntary act of faith. They are "by nature the children of wrath, even as others." (Eph. ii. 8.) They remain in this state of condemnation until they believe. Their union is consummated by faith. To be in Christ, and to believe in Christ, are, therefore, in the Scriptures convertible forms of expression. They mean substantially the same thing and, therefore, the same effects are attributed to faith as are attributed to union with Christ.

Justification an Effect of Faith.

The proximate effect of this union, and, consequently, the see. ond effect of faith, is justification. We are "justified by the faith of Christ." (Gal. ii. 16.) "There is therefore now no condemnation to them

which are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. vii. 1.) "He that believeth on him is not condemned." (John iii. 18.) Faith is the condition on which God promises in the covenant of redemption, to impute unto men the righteousness of Christ. As soon, therefore, as they believe, they cannot be condemned. They are clothed with a righteousness which answers all the demands of justice. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." (Rom. viii. 33, 34.)

Participation of Christ's Life an Effect of Faith.

The third effect of faith, or of union with Christ, is a participation of his life. Those united with Christ, the Apostle teaches (Rom. vi. 4-10), so as to be partakers of his death, are partakers also of his life. "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John xiv. 19.) Christ dwells in our hearts by faith. (Eph. iii. 17.) Christ is in us. (Rom. viii. 10.) It is not we that live, but Christ liveth in us. (Gal. ii. 20.) Our Lord's illustration of this vital union is derived from a vine and its branches. (John xv. 1-6.) As the life of the vine is diffused through the branches, and as they live only as connected with the vine, so the life of Christ is diffused through his people, and they are partakers of spiritual and eternal life, only in virtue of their union with Him. Another familiar illustration of this subject is derived from the human body. The members derive their life from the head, and perish if separated from it. (Eph. i. 22; 1 Cor. xii. 12-27, and often). In Ephesians iv. 15, 16, the Apostle carries out this illustration in detail. "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." As the principle of animal life located in the head, through the complicated yet ordered system of nerves extending to every member, diffuses life and energy through the whole body; so the Holy Spirit, given without measure to Christ the head of the Church, which is his body, diffuses life and strength to every member. Hence, according to Scripture, Christ's dwelling in us is explained as the Spirit's dwelling in us. The indwelling of the Spirit is the indwelling of Christ. If God be in you; if Christ be in you; if the Spirit be in you, -- all mean the same thing. See Romans viii. 9-11.

To explain this vital and mystical union between Christ and his people as a mere union of thought and feeling, is utterly inadmissible. (1.) In the first place, it is contrary to the plain meaning of his words. No one ever speaks of Plato's dwelling in men; of his being their life, so that without him they can do nothing; and much less, so that holiness, happiness, and eternal life depend upon that union. (2.) Such interpretation supposes that our relation to Christ is analogous to the relation of one man to another. Whereas it is a relation between men and a divine person, who has life in Himself, and gives life to as many as He wills. (3.) It ignores all that the Scriptures teach of the work of the Holy Spirit and of his dwelling in the hearts of men. (4.) It overlooks the supernatural character of Christianity, and would reduce it to a mere philosophical and ethical system.

Peace as the Fruit of Faith.

The fourth effect of faith is peace. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) Peace arises from a sense of reconciliation. God promises to pardon, to receive into his favour, and finally to save all who believe the record which He has given of his Son. To believe, is therefore to believe this

promise; and to appropriate this promise to ourselves is to believe that God is reconciled to us. This faith may be weak or strong. And the peace which flows from it may be tremulous and intermitting, or it may be constant and assured.

Assurance.

To make assurance of personal salvation essential to faith, is contrary to Scripture and to the experience of God's people. The Bible speaks of a weak faith. It abounds with consolations intended for the doubting and the desponding. God accepts those who can only say, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." Those who make assurance the essence of faith, generally reduce faith to a mere intellectual assent. They are often censorious, refusing to recognize as brethren those who do not agree with them, and sometimes they are antinomian.

At the same time, Scripture and experience teach that assurance is not only attainable, but a privilege and a duty. There may indeed be assurance, where there is no true faith at all; but where there is true faith, the want of assurance is to be referred either to the weakness of faith, or to erroneous views of the plan of salvation. Many sincere believers are too introspective. They look too exclusively within, so that their hope is graduated by the degree of evidence of regeneration which they find in their own experience. This, except in rare cases, can never lead to the assurance of hope. We may examine our hearts with all the microscopic care prescribed by President Edwards in his work on "The Religious Affections," and never be satisfied that we have eliminated every ground of misgiving and doubt. The grounds of assurance are not so much within, as without us. They are, according to Scripture, (1.) The universal and unconditional promise of God that those who come to Him in Christ, He will in no wise cast out; that whosoever will, may take of the water of life without money and without

price. We are bound to be assured that God is faithful and will certainly save those who believes (2.) The infinite, immutable, and gratuitous love of God. In the first ten verses of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in the eighth chapter of that epistle from the thirty-first verse to the end, the Apostle dwells on these characteristics of the love of God, as affording an immovable foundation of the believer's hope. (3.) The infinite merit of the satisfaction of Christ, and the prevalence of his continued intercession. Paul, in Romans viii. 34, especially emphasizes these points. (4.) The covenant of redemption in which it is promised that all given by the Father to the Son, shall come to Him, and that none of them shall be lost. (5.) From the witness of the Spirit, Paul says, "We . . . . rejoice in hope of the glory of God," because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost given unto us. That is, the Holy Ghost assures us that we are the objects of that love which he goes on to describe as infinite, immutable, and gratuitous. (Rom. v. 3-5.) And again, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." If, therefore, any true believer lacks the assurance of faith, the fault is in himself and not in the plan of salvation, or in the promises of God.

Sanctification a Fruit of Faith.

The fifth effect of faith is sanctification. "Which are sanctified," says our Lord "by faith that is in me." Although in this verse (Acts xxvi. 18), the words "by faith" do not qualify the preceding clause, "are sanctified," alone, but are to be referred to all the preceding particulars, illumination, deliverance from Satan, forgiveness of sins, and the eternal inheritance, yet the immediate antecedent is not to be omitted. We are sanctified by faith as is elsewhere clearly taught. "Faith which worketh by love and purifies the heart." (Gal. v. 6, and

Acts xv. 9.)

The relation of faith to sanctification is thus set forth in the Scriptures, --

1. We are justified by faith. So long as we are under the law, we are under the curse, and bring forth fruit unto death. There is, and can be no love to God, and no holy living until we are delivered from his wrath due to us for sin. We are freed from the law, delivered from its condemnation, by the body or death of Christ. It is by faith in Him as the end of the law for righteousness, that we personally are freed from condemnation and restored to the favour of God. See all this clearly taught in Romans vi., and in the first six verses of the seventh chapter. It is thus by faith we pass from judicial death to judicial life, or justification. This is the first and indispensable step of sanctification so far as it reveals itself in the consciousness of the believer.

2. It is by faith that we receive the indwelling of the Spirit. Christ (or the Spirit of Christ) dwells in our hearts by faith. Faith is the indispensable condition (so far as adults are concerned) of this indwelling of the Spirit. And the indwelling of the Spirit is the source of all spiritual life. Faith is indeed the fruit of the Spirit, and therefore the gift of the Spirit must precede the exercise of faith. It is nevertheless true that faith is the condition of the indwelling of the Spirit, and consequently of spiritual life. Life must precede breathing, and yet breathing is the necessary condition of living.

3. Faith is not only the condition of the Spirit's dwelling in us as the source of spiritual life, but we live by faith. That is, the continuance and exercise of spiritual life involve and suppose the constant exercise of faith. We live by exercising faith in God, in his

attributes, in his providence, in his promises, and in all the truths which He has revealed. Especially is this life sustained by those exercises of faith of which Christ is the object; his divine and mysteriously constituted person, as God manifest in the flesh his finished work for our redemption; his constant intercession; his intimate relation to us not only as our prophet, priest, and king, but as our living head in whom our life is hid in God, and from whom it flows into our souls. We are thus sanctified by faith, because it is through faith that all the religious affections and all the activities of spiritual life are called into exercise.

4. We are sanctified by faith, as it is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen. "The things of God," the truths which He has revealed concerning the spiritual and eternal world exist for us while in this world, only as the objects of faith. But faith is to the soul what the eye is to the body. It enables us to see the things unseen and eternal. It gives them substance, reality, and therefore power, -- power in some little measure in proportion to their value. Thus the things seen and temporal lose their dominant power over the soul. They are not worthy to be compared with the things which God has prepared for them that love Him. The believer, -- the ideal, and at times the actual believer, as we learn from Scripture and from history, is raised above the things of time and sense, overcomes the world, and becomes heavenly minded. He lives in heaven, breathes its atmosphere, is pervaded by its spirit, and has a prelibation of its joys. This renders him pure, spiritual, humble, self-denying, laborious, meek, gentle, forgiving, as well as firm and courageous. The whole of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is devoted to the illustration of the power of faith especially in this aspect. The Apostle shows that in times past, even under the dim light of the

former dispensation, it enabled Noah to stand alone against the world, Abraham to offer up his only son, Moses to prefer the reproach of Christ to the treasures of Egypt; that others through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire; that others were by faith made strong out of weakness, waxed valiant in fight; that others submitted to the trial of cruel mockings and scourgings that others by faith endured to be stoned, sawn asunder, or slain with the sword; and that yet others through faith consented to wander about in sheepskins and goatskins, destitute, afflicted, and tormented. All these, we are told, through faith obtained a good report.

5. Faith sanctifies because it is the necessary condition of the efficacy of the means of grace. It is through the Word, sacraments, and prayer, that God communicates constant supplies of grace. They are the means of calling the activities of spiritual life into exercise. But these means of grace are inoperative unless they are received and used by faith. Faith does not, indeed, give them their power, but it is the condition on which the Spirit of God renders them efficacious.

That good works are the certain effects of faith is included in the doctrine that we are sanctified by faith. For it is impossible that there should be inward holiness, love, spirituality, brotherly kindness, and zeal, without an external manifestation of these graces in the whole outward life. Faith, therefore, without works, is dead. We are saved by faith. But salvation includes deliverance from sin. If, therefore, our faith does not deliver us from sin, it does not save us. Antinomianism involves a contradiction in terms.

Certainty of Salvation.

A sixth effect attributed to faith in the Scriptures is security, or, certainty of salvation. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only

begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.) "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." (John vi. 51.) "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. . . . . And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 37, 40.) "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them. and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." (John x. 27, 28.)

The Eighth Chapter of Romans.

The whole of the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is designed to prove the certain salvation of all who believe. The proposition to be established is, that there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." That is, they can never perish; they can never be so separated from Christ as to come into condemnation. The Apostle's first argument to establish that proposition, is, that believers are delivered from the law by the sacrifice of Christ. The believer, therefore, is not under the law which condemns, as Paul had before said (Rom. vi. 14), "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." But if not under the law he cannot be condemned. The law has had its course, and found full satisfaction in the work of Christ, who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. He renders every one righteous, in the sight of the law, who believes on Him. This is the first reason which the Apostle gives why those who are in Christ shall never be condemned.

His second argnment is that they have already within them the principle of eternal life. That principle is the Spirit of God; "the life-giving" as He was designated by the ancient Church. To be carnally minded is death. To be spiritually minded is life and peace. Sin is death; holiness is life. It is a contradiction to say that those in whom the Spirit of life dwells, should die. And, therefore, the Apostle says, Although the body dies, the soul lives. And if the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken even your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. The indwelling of the Spirit, therefore, secures not only the life of the soul, but also the ultimate and glorious life of the body.

The third argument for the security of believers, is, that they are the sons of God. As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. That is, they are partakers of his nature, the special objects of his love, and entitled to the inheritance which He gives. If sons then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. According to the Apostle's mode of thinking, that any of the sons of God should perish, is impossible. If sons they shall certainly be saved.

The fourth argument is from the purpose of God. Those whom He has predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, them He calls to the exercise of faith and repentance; and whom He thus calls He justifies, He provides for them and imputes to them a righteousness which satisfies the demands of the law, and which entitles them in Christ and for his sake to eternal life; and those whom He justifies He glorifies. There is no flaw in this chain. If men were predestinated to eternal life on the ground of their repenting and believing through their own strength, or through a cooperation with the grace of God which others fail to exercise, then their continuance in a state of

grace might be dependent on themselves. But if faith and repentance are the gifts of God, the results of his effectual vocation, then bestowing those gifts is a revelation of the purpose of God to save those to whom they are given. It is an evidence that God has predestinated them to be conformed to the image of his Son, i.e., to be like Him in character, destiny, and glory, and that He will infallibly carry out his purpose. No one can pluck them out of his hands.

Paul's fifth argument is from the love of God. As stated above, [132] the Apostle argues from the greatness, the freeness, and the immutability of that love that its objects never can be lost. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things." If He has done the greater, will He not do the less? If he gave even his own Son, will He not give us faith to receive and constancy to persevere even unto the end? A love so great as the love of God to his people cannot fail of its object. This love is also gratuitous. It is not founded on the attractiveness of its objects. He loved us "while we were yet sinners;" "when we were enemies." "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." God's love in this aspect is compared to parental love. A mother does not love her child because it is lovely. Her love leads her to do all she can to render it attractive and to keep it so. So the love of God, being in like manner mysterious, unaccountable by anything in its objects, secures his adorning his children with the graces of his Spirit, and arraying them in all the beauty of holiness. It is only the lamentable mistake that God loves us for our goodness, that can lead any one to suppose that his love is dependent on our self-sustained attractiveness, when we

should look to his fatherly love as the source of all goodness, and the ground of the assurance that He will not allow Satan or our own evil hearts to destroy the lineaments of his likeness which He has impressed upon our souls. Having loved his own, He loves them to the end. And Christ prays for them that their faith may not fail.

It must be remembered that what the Apostle argues to prove is not merely the certainty of the salvation of those that believe but their certain perseverance in holiness. Salvation in sin, according to Paul's system, is a contradiction in terms. This perseverance in holiness is secured partly by the inward secret influence of the Spirit, and partly by all the means adapted to secure that end -- instructions, admonitions, exhortations, warnings, the means of grace, and the dispensations of his providence. Having, through love, determined on the end, He has determined on the means for its accomplishment.

The sixth argument of the Apostle is that, as the love of God is infinitely great and altogether gratuitous, it is also immutable, and, therefore, believers shall certainly be saved. Hence the conclusion, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

It will be seen that the Apostle does not rest the perseverance of the saints on the indestructible nature of faith, or on the imperishable nature of the principle of grace in the heart, or on the constancy of the believer's will, but solely on what is out of ourselves. Perseverance, he teaches us, is due to the purpose of God, to the work of Christ, to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and to the primal source of all, the infinite, mysterious, and immutable love of God. We do not keep ourselves; we are kept by the power of God, through faith

unto salvation. (1 Peter i. 5.)

---

[132] Page 107.

CHAPTER XVII: JUSTIFICATION

JUSTIFICATION

---

§ 1. Symbolical Statement of the Doctrine.

Justification is defined in the Westminster Catechism, "An act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone."

The Heidelberg Catechism in answer to the question, "How dost thou become righteous before God?" answers, "Sola fide in Jesum Christum, adeo ut licet mea me conscientia accuset, quod adversus omnia mandata Dei graviter peccaverim, nec ullum eorum servaverim, adhæc etiamnum ad omne malum propensus sim, nihilominus tamen (modo hæc beneficia vera animi fiducia amplectar), sine ullo meo merito, ex mera Dei misericordia, mihi perfecta satisfactio, justitia, et sanctitas Christi, imputetur ac donetur; perinde ac si nec ullum ipse peccatum admisissem, nec ulla mihi labes inhæreret; imo vero quasi eam obedientiam, quam pro me Christus præstitit, ipse perfecte præstitissem." And in answer to the question, Why faith alone justifies? it says. "Non quod dignitate meæ fidei Deo placeam, sed quod sola satisfactio, justitia ac sanctitas Christi, mea justitia sit coram Deo. Ego vero eam non alia ratione, quam fide amplecti, et mihi applicare queam."

The Second Helvetic Confession, [133] says "Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et poena absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare. Etenim ad Romanos dicit apostolus, Deus est, qui justificat, quis ille, qui

condemnet?' opponuntur justificare et condemnare. . . . . Etenim Christus peccata mundi in se recepit et sustulit, divinæque justitiæ satisfecit. Deus ergo propter solum Christum passum et resuscitatum, propitius est peccatis nostris, nec illa nobis imputat, imputat autem justitiam Christi pro nostra: ita ut jam simus non solum mundati a peccatis et purgati, vel sancti, sed etiam donati justitia Christi, adeoque absoluti a peccatis, morte vel condemnatione, justi denique ac hæredes vitæ æternæ. Proprie ergo loquendo, Deus solus nos justificat, et duntaxat propter Christum justificat, non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans ejus nobis justitiam." [134]

These are the most generally received and authoritative standards of the Reformed Churches, with which all other Reformed symbols agree. The Lutheran confessions teach precisely the same doctrine on this subject. [135] "Unanimi consensu, docemus et confitemur. . . . . quod homo peccator coram Deo justificetur, hoc est, absolvatur ab omnibus suis peccatis et a judicio justissimæ condemnationis, et adoptetur in numerum filiorum Dei atque hæres æternæ vitæ scribatur, sine ullis nostris meritis, aut dignitate, et absque ullis præcedentibus, præsentibus, aut sequentibus nostris operibus, ex mera gratia, tantummodo propter unicum meritum, perfectissimam obedientiam, passionem acerbissimam, mortem et resurrectionem Domini nostri, Jesu Christi, cujus obedientia nobis ad justitiam imputatur." [136]

Again, "Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, hoc ipsum nostram esse coram Deo justitiam, quod Dominus nobis peccata remittit, ex mera gratia, absque ullo respectu præcedentium, præsentium, aut consequentium nostrorum operum, dignitatis, aut meriti. Ille enim donat atque imputat nobis justitiam obedientiæ Christi; propter eam justitiam a Deo in gratiam recipimur et justi reputamur." [137] "Justificari significat hic non ex impio justum effici, sed usu forensi justum pronuntiari."

And "Justificare hoc loco (Rom. v. 1.) forensi cousuetudine significat reum absolvere et pronuntiare justum, sed propter alienam justitiam, videlicet Christi, quæ aliena justitia communicatur nobis per fidem." [138] So also "Vocabulum justificationis in hoc negotio significat justum pronuntiare, a peccatis et æternis peccatorum suppliciis absolvere, propter justitiam Christi, quæ a Deo fidei imputatur." [139] Hase, [140] concisely states the Lutheran doctrine on this subject in these words: "Justificatio est actus forensis, quo Deus, sola gratia ductus, peccatori, propter Christi meritum fide apprehensum, justitiam Christi imputat, peccata remittit, eumque sibi reconciliat."

The" Form of Concord" says, "Hic articulus, de justitia fidei, præcipuus est (ut Apologia loquitur) in tota doctrina Christiana, sine quo conscientiæ perturbatæ nullam veram et firmam consolationem habere, aut divitias gratiæ Christi recte agnoscere possunt. Id D. Lutherus suo etiam testimonio confirmavit, cum inquit: Si unicus his articulus sincerus permanserit, etiam Christiana Ecclesia sincera, concors et sine omnibus sectis permanet: sin vero corrumpitur, impossibile est, ut uni errori aut fanatico spiritui recte obviam iri possit." [141] The Lutheran theologians, therefore, speak of it as the "akropolis totius Christianæ religionis, ac nexus, quo omnia corporis doctrinæ Christianæ membra continentur, quoque rupto solvuntur." [142]

President Edwards.

This statement of the doctrine of justification has retained symbolical authority in the Lutheran and Reformed churches, to the present day. President Edwards, who is regarded as having initiated certain departures from some points of the Reformed faith, was firm in his adherence to this view of justification, which he held to be of vital importance. In his discourse on "Justification by Faith alone," he thus defines justification: "A person is said to be justified when he is

approved of God as free from the guilt of sin and its deserved punishment; and as having that righteousness belonging to him that entitles to the reward of life. That we should take the word in such a sense and understand it as the judge's accepting a person as having both a negative and positive righteousness belonging to him, and looking on him therefore as not only quit or free from any obligation to punishment, but also as just and righteous, and so entitled to a positive reward, is not only most agreeable to the etymology and natural import of the word, which signifies to make righteous, or to pass one for righteous in judgment, but also manifestly agreeable to the force of the word as used in Scripture." He then shows how it is, or why faith alone justifies. It is not on account of any virtue or goodness in faith, but as it unites us to Christ, and involves the acceptance of Him as our righteousness. Thus it is we are justified "by faith alone, without any manner of virtue or goodness of our own." The ground of justification is the righteousness of Christ imputed to the believer. "By that righteousness being imputed to us," says Edwards, "is meant no other than this, that that righteousness of Christ is accepted for us, and admitted instead of that perfect inherent righteousness that ought to be in ourselves: Christ's perfect obedience shall be reckoned to our account, so that we shall have the benefit of it, as though we had performed it ourselves: and so we suppose that a title to eternal life is given us as the reward of this righteousness. . . . The opposers of this doctrine suppose that there is an absurdity in it: they say that to suppose that God imputes Christ's obedience to us, is to suppose that God is mistaken, and thinks that we performed that obedience that Christ performed. But why cannot that righteousness be reckoned to our account, and be accepted for us, without any such absurdity? Why is there any more absurdity in

it, than in a merchant's transferring debt or credit from one man's account to another, when one man pays a price for another, so that it shall be accepted, as if that other had paid it? Why is there any more absurdity in supposing that Christ's obedience is imputed to us, than that his satisfaction is imputed? If Christ has suffered the penalty of the law for us, and in our stead, then it will follow, that his suffering that penalty is imputed to us, i.e., that it is accepted for us, and in our stead, and is reckoned to our account, as though we had suffered it. But why may not his obeying the law of God be as rationally reckoned to our account, as his suffering the penalty of the law?" [143]

Points included in the above Statement of the Doctrine.

According to the above statements, justification is, --

1. An act, and not, as sanctification, a continued and progressive work.

2. It is an act of grace to the sinner. In himself he deserves condemnation when God justifies him.

3. As to the nature of the act, it is, in the first place, not an efficient act, or an act of power. It does not produce any subjective change in the person justified. It does not effect a change of character, making those good who were bad, those holy who were unholy. That is done in regeneration and sanctification. In the second place, it is not a mere executive act, as when a sovereign pardons a criminal, and thereby restores him to his civil rights, or to his former status in the commonwealth. In the third place, it is a forensic, or judicial act, the act of a judge, not of a sovereign. That is, in the case of the sinner, or, in foro Dei, it is an act of God not in his character of sovereign, but in his character of judge. It is a declarative act in which God pronounces the sinner just or righteous, that is, declares

that the claims of justice, so far as he is concerned, are satisfied, so that he cannot be justly condemned, but is in justice entitled to the reward promised or due to perfect righteousness.

4. The meritorious ground of justification is not faith; we are not justified on account of our faith, considered as a virtuous ot holy act or state of mind. Nor are our works of any kind the ground of justification. Nothing done by us or wrought in us satisfies the demands of justice, or can be the ground or reason of the declaration that justice as far as it concerns us is satisfied. The ground of justification is the righteousness of Christ, active and passive, i.e., including his perfect obedience to the law as a covenant, and his enduring the penalty of the law in our stead and on our behalf.

5. The righteousness of Christ is in justification imputed to the believer. That is, is set to his account, so that he is entitled to plead it at the bar of God, as though it were personally and inherently his own.

6. Faith is the condition of justification. That is, so far an adults are concerned, God does not impute the righteousness of Christ to the sinner, until and unless, he (through grace) receives and rests on Christ alone for his salvation.

That such is the doctrine of the Reformed and Lutheran churches on this important doctrine, cannot be disputed. The statements of the standards of those churches are so numerous, explicit, and discriminating as to preclude all reasonable doubt on this subject. That such is the doctrine of the Word of God appears from the following considerations. It will not be necessary to discuss all the points above specified separately, as some of them are necessarily included in others. The following propositions include all the essential points of the doctrine.

[133] Chapter XV.

[134] See Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840.

[135] The main passages are Augsburg Confession, part i., article iv.; the Apology for that Confession, article iii.; and the Form of Concord, article iii.

[136] Form of Concord, III. 9.

[137] Ibid. Epitome, III. 4.

[138] Apology for the Augsburg Confession, Art. III. 131, 184.

[139] Form of Concord, III. 17. See Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit., Leipzig, 1836.

[140] Hutterus Redivivus, § 109, 6th edit. Leipzig, 1845, p. 274.

[141] III. 6.

[142] Quenstedt.

[143] Works of President Edwards, New York, 1868, vol. iv. pp. 66, 91, 92.

---

§ 2. Justification is a Forensic Act.

By this the Reformers intended, in the first place, to deny the Romish doctrine of subjective justification. That is, that justification consists in an act or agency of God making the sinner subjectively holy. Romanists confound or unite justification and sanctification. They define justification as "the remission of sin and infusion of new habits of grace." By remission of sin they mean not simply pardon, but the removal of everything of the nature of sin from the soul. Justification, therefore, with them, is purely subjective, consisting in the destruction of sin and the infusion of holiness. In opposition to this doctrine, the Reformers maintained that by justification the Scriptures mean something different from sanctification. That the two

gifts, although inseparable, are distinct, and that justification, instead of being an efficient act changing the inward character of the sinner, is a declarative act, announcing and determining his relation to the law and justice of God.

In the second place, the Symbols of the Reformation no less explicitly teach that justification is not simply pardon and restoration. It includes pardon, but it also includes a declaration that the believer is just or righteous in the sight of the law. He has a right to plead a righteousness which completely satisfies its demands.

And, therefore, in the third place, affirmatively, those Symbols teach that justification is a judicial or forensic act, i.e., an act of God as judge proceeding according to law, declaring that the sinner is just, i.e., that the law no longer condemns him, but acquits and pronounces him to be entitled to eternal life.

Here, as so often in other cases, the ambiguity of words is apt to create embarrassment. The Greek word dikaios and the English word righteous, have two distinct senses. They sometimes express moral character. When we say that God is righteous, we mean that He is right. He is free from any moral imperfection. So when we say that a man is righteous, we generally mean that he is upright and honest; that he is and does what he ought to be and do. In this sense the word expresses the relation which a man sustains to the rule of moral conduct. At other times, however, these words express, not moral character, but the relation which a man sustains to justice. In this sense a man is just with regard to whom justice is satisfied; or, against whom justice has no demands. The lexicons, therefore, tell us that dikaios sometimes means, leges observans; at others insons, culpa vacans (free from guilt or obligation to punishment) -- judicio Dei insons. Pilate (Matt. xxvii. 24) said, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person;"

i.e., of this person who is tree from guilt; free from anything which justifies his condemnation to death. "Christ, also," says the Apostle, "hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust;" the innocent for the guilty. See Romans ii. 18; v. 19. "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." "As the predicate of judicandus in his relation to the judge, righteousness' expresses, not a positive virtue, but a judicial negative freedom from reatus. In the presence of his judge, he is tsryq who stands free from guilt and desert of punishment (straflos), either because he has contracted no guilt (as, e.g., Christ), or, because in the way demanded by the Judge (under the Old Testament by expiatory sacrifice) he has expiated the guilt contracted." [144] If, therefore, we take the word righteous in the former of the two senses above mentioned, when it expresses moral character, it would be a contradiction to say that God pronounces the sinner righteous. This would be equivalent to saying that God pronounces the sinner to be not a sinner, the wicked to be good, the unholy to be holy. But if we take the word in the sense in which the Scriptures so often use it, as expressing relation to justice, then when God pronounces the sinner righteous or just, He simply declares that his guilt is expiated, that justice is satisfied, that He has the righteousness which justice demands. This is precisely what Paul says, when he says that God "justifieth the ungodly." (Rom. iv. 5.) God does not pronounce the ungodly to be godly; He declares that notwithstanding his personal sinfulness and unworthiness, he is accepted as righteous on the ground of what Christ has done for him.

Proof of the Doctrine just stated.

That to justify means neither simply to pardon, nor to make inherently righteous or good is proved, --

From the Usage of Scripture.

1. By the uniform usage of the word to justify in Scripture it is never used in either of those senses, but always to declare or pronounce just. It is unnecessary to cite passages in proof of a usage which is uniform. The few following examples are enough. Deuteronomy xxv. 1, "If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked." Exodus xxiii. 7, "I will not justify the wicked." Isaiah v. 23, "Which justify the wicked for reward." Proverbs xvii. 15, "He that justifieth the wicked" is "abomination to the Lord." Luke x. 29, "He willing to justify himself." Luke xvi. 15, "Ye are they which justify yourselves before men." Matthew xi. 19, "Wisdom is justified of her children." Galatians ii. 16, "A man is not justified by the works of the law," v. 6, "Whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Thus men are said to justify God. Job xxxii. 2, "Because he justified himself, rather than God." Psalms li. 4, "That thou mightest be justified when thou speakest." Luke vii. 29, "All the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God." The only passage in the New Testament where the word dikaioo is used in a different sense is Revelation xxii. 11, 6, ho dikaios, dikaiotheto eti, "He that is righteous, let him be righteous still." Here the first aorist passive appears to be used in a middle sense, Let him show himself righteous, or continue righteous.' Even if the reading in this passage were undoubted, this single case would have no force against the established usage of the word. The reading, however, is not merely doubtful, but it is, in the judgment of the majority of the critical editors, Tischendorf among the rest, incorrect. They give, as the true text, dikaiosunen poiesato eti. Even if this latter reading be, as De Wette thinks, a gloss, it shows that ho dikaios dikaiotheto eti was as

intolerable to a Greek ear as the expression, He that is righteous, let him justify himself still,' would be to us.

The usage of common life as to this word is just as uniform as that of the Bible. It would be a perfect solecism to say of a criminal whom the executive had pardoned, that he was justified, or that a reformed drunkard or thief was justified. The word always expresses a judgment, whether of the mind, as when one man justifies another for his conduct, or officially of a judge. If such be the established meaning of the word, it ought to settle all controversy as to the nature of justification. We are bound to take the words of Scripture in their true established sense. And, therefore, when the Bible says, "God justifies the believer," we are not at liberty to say that it means that He pardons, or that He sanctifies him. It means, and can mean only that He pronounces him just.

Justification the Opposite of Condemnation.

2. This is still further evident from the antithesis between condemnation and justification. Condemnation is not the opposite either of pardon or of reformation. To condemn is to pronounce guilty; or worthy of punishment. To justify is to declare not guilty; or that justice does not demand punishment; or that the person concerned cannot justly be condemned. When, therefore, the Apostle says (Rom. vii. 1), "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," he declares that they are absolved from guilt; that the penalty of the law cannot justly be inflicted upon them. "Who," he asks, "shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? God who justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? Christ who died?" (vers. 33, 34.) Against the elect in Christ no ground of condemnation can be presented. God pronounces them just, and therefore no one can pronounce them guilty.

This passage is certainly decisive against the doctrine of subjective

justification in any form. This opposition between condemnation and justification is familiar both in Scripture and in common life. Job ix. 20, "If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me." xxxiv. 17, "And wilt thou condemn him that is most just." If to condemn does not mean to make wicked, to justify does not mean to make good. And if condemnation is a judicial, as opposed to an executive act, so is justification. In condemnation it is a judge who pronounces sentence on the guilty. In justification it is a judge who pronounces or who declares the person arraigned free from guilt and entitled to be treated as righteous.

Argument from Equivalent Forms of Expression.

3. The forms of expression which are used as equivalents of the word "justify" clearly determine the nature of the act. Thus Paul speaks of "the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." (Rom. iv. 6.) To impute righteousness is not to pardon; neither is it to sanctify. It means to justify, i.e., to attribute righteousness. The negative form in which justification is described is equally significant. "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." (Rom. iv. 7, 8.) As "to impute sin" never means and cannot mean to make wicked; so the negative statement "not to impute sin cannot mean to sanctify. And as "to impute sin" does mean to lay sin to one's account and to treat him accordingly; so to justify means to lay righteousness to one's account and treat him accordingly. "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already." (John iii. 17, 18.)

For "as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came

upon all men unto justification of life." (Rom. v. 18.) It was krima, a judicial sentence, which came on men for the offence of Adam, and it is a judicial sentence (justification, a dikaiosis) which comes for the righteousness of Christ, or, as is said in ver. 16 of the same chapter, it was a krima eis katakrima, a condemnatory sentence that came for one offence; and charisma eis dikaioma, a sentence of gratuitous justification from many offences. Language cannot be plainer. If a sentence of condemnation is a judicial act, then justification is a judicial act.

Argument from the Statement of the Doctrine.

4. The judicial character of justification is involved in the mode in which the doctrine is presented in the Bible. The Scriptures speak of law, of its demands, of its penalty, of sinner. as arraigned at the bar of God, of the day of judgment. The question is, How shall man be just with God? The answer to this question determines the whole method of salvation. The question is not, How a man can become holy? but, How can he become just? How can he satisfy the claims which justice has against him? It is obvious that if there is no such attribute as justice in God; if what we call justice is only benevolence, then there is no pertinency in this question. Man is not required to be just in order to be saved. There are no claims of justice to be satisfied. Repentance is all that need be rendered as the condition of restoration to the favour of God. Or, any didactic declaration or exhibition of God's disapprobation of sin, would open the way for the safe pardon of sinners. Or, if the demands of justice were easily satisfied; if partial, imperfect obedience and fatherly chastisements, or self-inflicted penances, would suffice to satisfy its claims, then the sinner need not be just with God in order to be saved. But the human soul knows intuitively that these are refugee of lies. It knows that

there is such an attribute as justice. It knows that the demands thereof are inexorable because they are righteous. It knows that it cannot be saved unless it be justified, and it knows that it cannot be declared just unless the demands of justice are fully satisfied. Low views of the evil of sin and of the justice of God lie at the foundation of all false views of this great doctrine.

The Apostle's Argument in the Epistle to the Romans.

The Apostle begins the discussion of this subject by assuming that the justice of God, his purpose to punish all sin, to demand perfect conformity to his law, is revealed from heaven, i.e., so revealed that no man, whether Jew or Gentile, can deny it. (Rom. i. 18.) Men, even the most degraded pagans, know the righteous judgment of God that those who sin are worthy of death, (ver. 32.) He next proves that all men are sinners, and, being sinners are under condemnation. The whole world is "guilty before God." (iii. 19.) From this he infers, as intuitively certain (because plainly included in the premises), that no flesh living can be justified before God "by the deeds of the law," i.e., on the ground of his own character and conduct. If guilty he cannot be pronounced not guilty, or just. In Paul's argument, to justify is to pronounce just. Dikaios is the opposite of hupodikos (i.e., "reus, satisfactionem alteri debens"). That is, righteous is the opposite of guilty. To pronounce guilty is to condemn. To pronounce righteous, i.e., not guilty, is to justify. If a man denies the authority of Scripture; or if he feels at liberty, while holding what he considers the substance of Scripture doctrines, to reject the form, it is conceivable that he may deny that justification is a judicial act; but it seems impossible that any one should deny that it is so represented in the Bible. Some men professing to believe the Bible, deny that there is anything supernatural in the work of regeneration and

sanctification. Being born of the Spirit;' quickened by the mighty power of God;' created anew in Christ Jesus,' are only, they say, strong oriental expressions for a self-wrought reformation. By a similar process it is easy to get rid, not only of the doctrine of justification as a judicial act, but of all other distinguishing doctrines of the Scriptures. This, however, is not to interpret, but to pervert.

The Apostle, having taught that God is just, i.e., that He demands the satisfaction of justice, and that men are sinners and can render no such satisfaction themselves, announces that such a righteousness has been provided, and is revealed in the Gospel. It is not our own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness of Christ, and, therefore, the righteousness of God, in virtue of which, and on the ground of which, God can be just and yet justify the sinner who believes in Christ. As long as the Bible stands this must stand as a simple statement of what Paul teaches as to the method of salvation. Men may dispute as to what he means, but this is surely what he says.

Argument from the Ground of Justification.

5. The nature of justification is determined by its ground. This indeed is an anticipation of another part of the subject, but it is in point here. If the Bible teaches that the ground of justification, the reason why God remits to us the penalty of the law and accepts us as righteous in his sight, is something out of ourselves, something done for us, and not what we do or experience, then it of necessity follows that justification is not subjective. It does not consist in the infusion of righteousness, or in making the person justified personally holy. If the "formal cause" of our justification be our goodness; then we are justified for what we are. The Bible, however, teaches that no man living can be justified for what he is. He is condemned for what he is

and for what he does. He is justified for what Christ has done for him.

Justification not mere Pardon.

For the same reason justification cannot be mere pardon. Pardon does not proceed on the ground of a satisfaction. A prisoner delivered by a ransom is not pardoned. A debtor whose obligations have been cancelled by a friend, becomes entitled to freedom from the claims of his creditor. When a sovereign pardons a criminal, it is not an act of justice. It is not on the ground of satisfaction to the law. The Bible, therefore, is reaching that justification is on the ground of an atonement or satisfaction; that the sinner's guilt is expiated; that he is redeemed by the precious blood of Christ; and that judgment is pronounced upon him as righteous, does thereby teach that justification is neither pardon nor infusion of righteousness.

Argument from the Immutability of the Law.

6. The doctrine that justification consists simply in pardon, and consequent restoration, assumes that the divine law is imperfect and mutable. In human governments it is often expedient and right that men justly condemned to suffer the penalty of the law should be pardoned. Human laws must be general. They cannot take in all the circumstances of each particular case. Their execution would often work hardship or injustice. Human judgments may therefore often be set aside. It is not so with the divine law. The law of the Lord is perfect. And being perfect it cannot be disregarded. It demands nothing which ought not to be demanded. It threatens nothing which ought not to be inflicted. It is in fact its own executioner. Sin is death. (Rom. vii. 6.) The justice of God makes punishment as inseparable from sin, as life is from holiness. The penalty of the law is immutable, and as little capable of being set aside as the precept. Accordingly the Scriptures everywhere teach that in the justification of the sinner there is no

relaxation of the penalty. There is no setting aside, or disregarding the demands of the law. We are delivered from the law, not by its abrogation, but by its execution. (Gal. ii. 19.) We are freed from the law by the body of Christ. (Rom. vii. 4.) Christ having taken our places bore our sins in his own body on the tree. (1 Pet. ii. 24.) The handwriting which was against us, he took out of the way, nailing it to his cross. (Col. ii. 14.) We are therefore not under the law, but under grace. (Rom. vi. 14.) Such representations are inconsistent with the theory which supposes that the law may be dispensed with; that the restoration of sinners to the favour and fellowship of God, requires no satisfaction to its demands; that the believer is pardoned and restored to fellowship with God, just as a thief or forger is pardoned and restored to his civil rights by the executive in human governments. This is against the Scriptures. God is just in justifying the sinner. He acts according to justice.

It will be seen that everything in this discussion turns on the question, Whether there is such an attribute in God as justice? If justice be only "benevolence guided by wisdom," then there is no justification. What evangelical Christians so regard, is only pardon or sanctification. But if God, as the Scriptures and conscience teach, be a just God, as immutable in his justice as in his goodness and truth, then there can be no remission of the penalty of sin except on the ground of expiation, and no justification except on the ground of the satisfaction of justice, and therefore justification must be a judicial act, and neither simply pardon nor the infusion of righteousness. These doctrines sustain each other. What the Bible teaches of the justice of God, proves that justification is a judicial declaration that justice is satisfied. And what the Bible teaches of the nature of justification, proves that justice in God is something more than

benevolence. It is thus that all the great doctrines of the Bible are concatenated.

Argument from the Nature of our Union with Christ.

7. The theory which reduces justification to pardon and its consequences, is inconsistent with what is revealed concerning our union with Christ. That union is mystical, supernatural, representative, and vital. We were in Him before the foundation of the world (Eph. i. 4); we are in Him as we were in Adam (Rom. v. 12, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 22); we are in Him as the members of the body are in the head (Eph. i. 23, iv. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27, and often); we are in Him as the branches are in the vine (John xv. 1-12). We are in Him in such a sense that his death is our death, we were crucified with Him (Gal. ii. 20; Rom. vi. 1-8) ; we are so united with Him that we rose with Him, and sit with Him in heavenly places. (Eph. ii. 1-6.) In virtue of this union we are (in our measure) what He is. We are the sons of God in Him. And what He did, we did. His righteousness is our righteousness. His life is our life. His exaltation is our exaltation. Such is the pervading representation of the Scriptures. All this is overlooked by the advocates of the opposite theory. According to that view, Christ is no more united to his people, except in sentiment, than to other men. He has simply done what renders it consistent with the character of God and the interests of his kingdom, to pardon any and every man who repents and believes. His relation is purely external. He is not so united to his people that his merit becomes their merit and his life their life. Christ is not in them the hope of glory. (Col. i. 27.) He is not of God made unto them wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. (1 Cor. i. 30.) They are not so in Him that, in virtue of that union, they are filled with all the fulness of God. (Col. ii. 10; and Eph. iii. 19.) On the other hand, the Protestant doctrine of

justification harmonizes with all these representations. If we are so united to Christ as to be made partakers of his life, we are also partakers of his righteousness. What He did in obeying and suffering He did for his people. One essential element of his redeeming work was to satisfy the demands of justice in their behalf, so that in Him and for his sake they are entitled to pardon and eternal life.

Arguments from the Effects ascribed to Justification.

8. The consequences attributed to justification are inconsistent with the assumption that it consists either in pardon or in the infusion of righteousness. Those consequences are peace, reconciliation, and a title to eternal life. "Being justified by faith," says the Apostle, "we have peace with God." (Rom. v. 1.) But pardon does not produce peace. It leaves the conscience unsatisfied. A pardoned criminal is not only just as much a criminal as he was before, but his sense of guilt and remorse of conscience are in no degree lessened. Pardon can remove only the outward and arbitrary penalty. The sting of sin remains. There can be no satisfaction to the mind until there is satisfaction of justice. Justification secures peace, not merely because it includes pardon, but because that pardon is dispensed on the ground of a full satisfaction of justice. What satisfies the justice of God, satisfies the conscience of the sinner. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin (1 John i. 7) by removing guilt, and thus producing a peace which passes all understanding. When the soul sees that Christ bore his sins upon the cross, and endured the penalty which he had incurred; that all the demands of the law are fully satisfied; that God is more honoured in his pardon than in his condemnation; that all the ends of punishment are accomplished by the work of Christ, in a far higher degree than they could be by the death of the sinner; and that he has a right to plead the infinite merit of the Son of God at the bar of

divine justice, then he is satisfied. Then he has peace. He is humble; he does not lose his sense of personal demerit, but the conscience ceases to demand satisfaction. Criminals have often been known to give themselves up to justice. They could not rest until they were punished. The infliction of the penalty incurred gave them peace. This is an element in Christian experience. The convinced sinner never finds peace until he lays his burden of sin on the Lamb of God; until he apprehends that his sins have been punished, as the Apostle says (Rom. viii. 3), in Christ.

Again, we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. (Rom. v. 10.) But pardon does not produce reconciliation. A pardoned criminal may be restored to his civil rights, so far as the penalty remitted involved their forfeiture, but he is not reconciled to society. He is not restored to its favour. Justification, however, does secure a restoration to the favour and fellowship of God. We become the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ. (Gal. iii. 26.) No one can read the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans without being convinced that in Paul's apprehension a justified believer is something more than a pardoned criminal. He is a man whose salvation is secure because he is free from the law and all its demands; because the righteousness of the law (i.e., all its righteous requirements) has been fulfilled him; because thereby he is so united to Christ as to become a partaker of his life; because no one can lay anything to the charge of those for whom Christ died and whom God has justified; and because such believers being justified are revealed as the objects of the mysterious, immutable, and infinite love of God.

Again, justification includes or conveys a title to eternal life. Pardon is purely negative. It simply removes a penalty. It confers no title to benefits not previously enjoyed. Eternal life, however, is

suspended on the positive condition of perfect obedience. The merely pardoned sinner has no such obedience. He is destitute of what, by the immutable principles of the divine government, is the indispensable condition of eternal life. He has no title to the inheritance promised to the righteous. This is not the condition of the believer. The merit of Christ is entitled to the reward. And the believer, being partaker of that merit, shares in that title. This is constantly recognized in the Scriptures. By faith in Christ we become the sons of God. But sonship involves heirship, and heirship involves a title to the inheritance. "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (Rom. viii. 17.) This is the doctrine taught in Romans v. 12-21. For the offence of one, judgment passed on all men to condemnation. For the righteousness of one, the sentence of justification of life has passed on all; that is, of a justification which entitles to life. As the sin of Adam was the judicial ground of our condemnation (i.e., was the ground on which justice demanded condemnation), so the righteousness of Christ is the judicial ground of justification. That is, it is the ground on which the life promised to the righteous should in justice be granted to the believer. The Church in all ages has recognized this truth. Believers have always felt that they had a title to eternal life. For this they have praised God in the loftiest strains. They have ever regarded it as intuitively true that heaven must be merited The only question was, Whether that merit was in them or in Christ. Being in Christ, it was a free gift to them; and thus righteousness and peace kissed each other. Grace and justice unite in placing the crown of righteousness on the believer's head.

It is no less certain that the consequences attributed to justification do not flow from the infusion of righteousness. The amount of holiness possessed by the believer does not give him peace. Even perfect

holiness would not remove guilt. Repentance does not atone for the crime of murder. It does not still the murderer's conscience; nor does it satisfy the sense of justice iu the public mind. It is the proton pseudos of Romanism, and of every theory of subjective justification, that they make nothing of guilt, or reduce it to a minimum. If there were no guilt, then infusion of righteousness would be all that is necessary for salvation. But if there be justice in God then no amount of holiness can atone for sin, and justification cannot consist in making the sinner holy. Besides this, even admitting that the past could be ignored, that the guilt which burdens the soul could be overlooked or so easily removed, subjective righteousness, or holiness, is so imperfect that it could never give the believer peace. Let the holiest of men look within himself and say whether what he sees there satisfies his own conscience. If not, how can it satisfy God. He is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things. No man, therefore, can have peace with God founded on what he is or on what he does. Romanists admit that nothing short of perfect holiness justifies or gives peace to the soul. In answer to the Protestant argument founded on that admission, Bellarmin says: [145] "Hoc argumentum, si quid probat, probat justitiam actualem non esse perfectam: non autem probat, justitiam habitualem, qua formaliter justi sumus, ... non esse ita perfectam, ut absolute, simpliciter, et proprie justi nominemur, et simus. Non enim formaliter justi sumus opere nostro, sed opere Dei, qui simul maculas peccatorum tergit, et habitum fidei, spei, et caritatis infundit. Dei autem perfecta sunt opera. . . . . Unde parvuli baptizati, vere justi sunt, quamvis nihil operis fecerint." Again, "Justitia enim actualis, quamvis aliquo modo sit imperfecta, propter admixtionem venalium delictorum, et egeat quotidiana remissione peccati, tamen non propterea desinit esse vera justitia, et suo etiam

quodam modo perfecta." No provision is made in this system for guilt. If the soul is made holy by the infusion of habits, or principles, of grace, it is just in the sight of God. No guilt or desert of punishment remains. "Reatus," says Bellarmin, [146] . . . . . "est relatio," but if the thing of which it is a relation be taken away, where is the relation. It is impossible that such a view of justification can give peace. It makes no provision for the satisfaction of justice, and places all our hopes upon what is within, which our conscience testifies cannot meet the just requirements of God.

Neither can the theory of subjective justification account for reconciliation with God, and for the same reasons. What is infused, the degree of holiness imparted, does not render us the objects of divine complacency and love. His love to us is of the nature of grace; love for the unlovely. We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son. That removes the obstacle arising from justice to the outflow toward us of the mysterious, unmerited love of God. We are accepted in the beloved. We are not in ourselves fit for fellowship with God. And if driven to depend on what is within, on our subjective righteousness, instead of peace we should have despair.

Again, justification according to the Scriptures gives a title to eternal life. For this our own righteousness is utterly inadequate. So far from anything in us being meritorious, or entitled to reward, the inward state and the exercises of the holiest of men, come so far short of perfection as to merit condemnation. In us there is no good thing. When we would do good, evil is present with us. There is ever a law in our members warring against the law of the mind. Indwelling sin remains. It forced even Paul to cry out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death." (Rom. vii. 24.) "Nullum unquam exstitisse pii hominis opus, quod, si severo Dei judicio

examinaretur, non esset damnabile." [147] Ignoring this plain truth of Scripture and of Christian experience expressing itself in daily and hourly confession, humiliation, and prayers for forgiveness, the doctrine of subjective justification assumes that there is no sin in the believer, or no sin which merits the condemnation of God, but on the contrary that there is in him what merits eternal life. The Romanists make a distinction between a first and second justification. The first they admit to be gratuitous, and to be founded on the merit of Christ, or rather, to be gratuitously bestowed for Christ's sake. This consists in the infusion of habitual grace (i.e., regeneration). This justifies in rendering the soul subjectively just or holy. The second justification is not a matter of grace. It is founded on the merit of good works, the fruits of regeneration. But if these fruits are, as our consciousness testifies, deified by sin, how can they merit eternal life? How can they cancel the handwriting which is against us? How can they be the ground of Paul's confident challenge, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" It is not what is within us, but what is without us; not what we are or do, but what Christ is and has done, that is the ground of confidence and of our title to eternal life. This is the admitted doctrine of the Protestant Reformation. "Apud theologos Augustanæ confessionis extra controversiam positum est," says the "Form of Concord," [148] "totam justitiam nostram extra nos, et extra omnium hominum merita, opera, virtutes atque dignitatem quærendam, eamque in solo Domino nostro, Jesu Christo consistere." As high as the heavens are above the earth, so high is a hope founded on the work of Christ for us, above a hope founded on the merit of anything wrought in us. Calvin teaches the same doctrine as Luther. [149] He quotes Lombard as saying that our justification in Christ may be interpreted in two ways: "Primum, mors Christi nos

justificat, dum per eam excitatur caritas in cordibus nostris, qua justi efficimur: deinde quod per eandem exstinctum est peccatum; quo nos captivos distinebat diabolus, ut jam non habeat unde nos damnet." To which Calvin replies, "Scriptura autem, quem de fidei justitia loquitur, longe alio nos ducit: nempe ut ab intuitu operum nostrorum aversi, in Dei misericordiam ac Christi perfectionem, tantum respiciamus. . . . . Hic est fidei sensus, per quem peccator in possessionem venit suæ salutis, dum ex Evangeli doctrina agnoscit Deo se reconciliatum: quod intercedente Christi justitia, impetrata peccatorum remissione, justificatus sit: et quanquam Spiritu Dei regeneratus, non in bonis operibus, quibus incumbit, sed sola Christi justitia repositam sibi perpetuam justitiam cogitat."

That justification is not merely pardon, and that it is not the infusion of righteousness whereby the sinner is made inherently just or holy, but a judgment on the part of God that the demands of the law in regard to the believer are satisfied, and that he has a right to a righteousness which entitles him to eternal life, has been argued, (1.) From the uniform usage of Scripture both in the Old and New Testament. (2.) From the constant opposition between justification and condemnation. (3.) From equivalent forms of expression. (4.) From the whole design and drift of the Apostle's argument in his Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians. (5.) From the ground of justification, namely, the righteousness of Christ. (6.) From the immutability of the law and the justice of God. (7.) From the nature of our union with Christ. (8.) From the fact that peace, reconciliation with God, and a title to eternal life which according to Scripture, are the consequences of justification, do not flow either from mere pardon or from subjective righteousness, or from sanctification. That this is the doctrine of Protestants, both Lutheran and Reformed, cannot with any

show of reason be disputed.

Calvin's Doctrine.

It is true, indeed, that by the earlier Reformers, and especially by Calvin, justification is often said to consist in the pardon of sin. But that that was not intended as a denial of the judicial character of justification, or as excluding the imputation of the righteousness of Christ by which the believer is counted just in the sight of the law, is obvious, --

1. From the nature of the controversy in which those Reformers were engaged. The question between them and the Romanists was, Does justification consist in the act of God making the sinner inherently just or holy? or, Does it express the judgment of God by which the believer is pronounced just. What Calvin denied was that justification is a making holy. What he affirmed was that it was delivering the believer from the condemnation of the law and introducing him into a state of favour with God. The Romanists expressed their doctrine by saying that justification consists in the remission of sin and the infusion of charity or righteousness. But by the remission of sin they meant the removal of sin; the putting off the old man. In other words, justification with them consisted (to use the scholastic language then in vogue) in the removal of the habits of sin and the infusion of habits of grace. In those justified, therefore, there was no sin, and, therefore, nothing to punish. Pardon, therefore, followed as a necessary consequence. It was a mere accessary. This view of the matter makes nothing of guilt; nothing of the demands of justice. Calvin therefore, insisted that besides the subjective renovation connected with the sinner's conversion, his justdication concerned the removal of guilt, the satisfaction of justice, which in the order of nature, although not of time, must precede the communication of the life of God

to the soul. That Calvin did not differ from the other Reformers and the whole body of the Reformed Church on this subject appears from his own explicit declarations, and from the perfectly unambiguous statements of the Confessions to which he gave his assent. Thus he says, [150] "Porro ne impingamus in ipso limine (quod fieret si de re incognita disputationem ingrediremur) primum explicemus quid sibi velint istæ loquutiones, Hominem coram Deo justificari, Fide justificari, vel operibus. Justificari coram Deo dicitur qui judicio Dei et censetur justus, et acceptus est ob suam justitiam: siqui dem ut Deo abominabilis est iniquitas, ita nec peccator in ejus oculis potest invenire gratiam, quatenus est peccator, et quamdiu talis censetur. Proinde ubicunque peccatum est, illic etiam se profert ira et ultio Dei. Justificatur autem qui non loco peccatoris, sed justi habetur, eoque nomine consistit coram Dei tribunali, ubi peccatores omnes corruunt. Quemadmodum si reus innocens ad tribunal æqui judicis adducatur, ubi secundum innocentiam ejus judicatum fuerit, justificatus apud judicem dicitur: sic apud Deum justificatur, qui numero peccatorum exemptus, Deum habet suæ justitiæ testem et assertorem. Justificari, ergo, operibus ea ratione dicetur, in cujus vita reperietur ea puritas ac sanctitas quæ testimonium justitiæ apud Dei thronum mereatur: seu qui operum suorum integritate respondere et satisfacere illius judicio queat. Contra, justificabitur ille fide, qui operum justitia exclusus, Christi justitiam per fidem apprehendit, qua vestitus in Dei conspectu non ut peccator, sed tanquam justus apparet. Ita nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem, qua nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro justos habet. Eamque in peccatorum remissione ac justitiæ Christi imputatione positam ease dicimus."

This passage is decisive as to the views of Calvin; for it is professedly a formal statement of the "Status Questionis" given with

the utmost clearness and precision. Justification consists "in the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ." "He is justified in the sight of God, who is taken from the class of sinners, and has God for the witness and assertor of his righteousness."

---

[144] Christliche Dogmatik, von Johannes Heinrich August Ebrard, § 402, edit. Königsberg, 1852, vol. ii. p. 163.

[145] De Justificatione, ii. 14; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 819, a, b.

[146] De Amissione Gratiæ et Statu Peccati, v. 7; Ibid. p. 287.

[147] Calvin, Institutio, III. xiv. 11; edit. Berlin, 1834, part ii. p. 38.

[148] Solida Declaratio, III. 55; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 695.

[149] Institutio, III. xi. 15, 16; ut supra, p. 17.

[150] Institutio, III. x. 2; ut supra, p. 6.

---

§ 3. Works not the Ground of Justification.

In reference to men since the fall the assertion is so explicit and so often repeated, that justification is not of works, that that proposition has never been called in question by any one professing to receive the Scriptures as the word of God. It being expressly asserted that the whole world is guilty before God, that by the works of the law no flesh living can be justified, the only question open for discussion is, What is meant by works of the law?

To this question the following answers have been given, First, that by works of the law are meant works prescribed in the Jewish law. It is assumed that as Paul's controversy was with those who taught that

unless men were circumcised and kept the law af Moses, they could not be saved (Acts xv. 1, 24), all he intended to teach was the reverse of that proposition. He is to be understood as saying that the observance of Jewish rites and ceremonies is not essential to salvation; that men are not made righteous or good by external ceremonial works, but by works morally good. This is the ground taken by Pelagians and by most of the modern Rationalists. It is only a modification of this view that men are not justified, that is, that their character before God is not determined so much by their particular acts or works, as by their general disposition and controlling principles. To be justified by faith, therefore, is to be justified on the ground of our trust, or pious confidence in God and truth. Thus Wegscheider [151] says, "Homines non singulis quibusdam recte factis operibusque operatis, nec propter meritum quoddam iis attribuendum, sed sola vera fide, i.e., animo ad Christi exemplum ejusdemque præcepta composito et ad Deum et sanctissimum et benignissimum converso, ita, ut omnia cogitata et facta ad Deum ejusque voluntatem sanctissimam pie referant, Deo vere probantur et benevolentiæ Dei confisi spe beatitatis futuræ pro dignitate ipsorum morali iis concedendæ certissima imbuuntur." Steudlin, [152] expresses the same view. "All true reformation, every good act," he says, "must spring from faith, provided we understand by faith the conviction that something is right, a conviction of general moral and religious principles." Kant says that Christ in a religious aspect is the ideal of humanity. When a man so regards him and endeavours to conform his heart and life to that ideal, he is justified by faith. [153] According to all these views, mere ceremonial works are excluded, and the ground of justification is made to be our own natural moral character and conduct.

Romish Doctrine.

Secondly. The doctrine of Romanists on this subject is much higher. Romanism retains the supernatural element of Christianity throughout. Indeed it is a matter of devout thankfulness to God that underneath the numerous grievous and destructive errors of the Romish Church, the great truths of the Gospel are preserved. The Trinity, the true divinity of Christ, the true doctrine concerning his person as God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever; salvation through his blood, regeneration and sanctification through the almighty power of the Spirit, the resurrection of the body, and eternal life, are doctrines on which the people of God in that communion live, and which have produced such saintly men as St. Bernard, Fénélon, and doubtless thousands of others who are of the number of God's elect. Every true worshipper of Christ must in his heart recognize as a Christian brother, wherever he may be found, any one who loves, worships, and trusts the Lord Jesus Christ as God manifest in the flesh and the only Saviour of men. On the matter of justification the Romish theologians have marred and defaced the truth as they have almost all other doctrines pertaining to the mode in which the merits of Christ are made available to our salvation. They admit, indeed, that there is no good in fallen man; that he can merit nothing and claim nothing on the ground of anything he is or can do of himself. He is by nature dead in sin; and until made partaker of a new life by the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, he can do nothing but sin. For Christ's sake, and only through his merits, as a matter of grace, this new life is imparted to the soul in regeneration (i.e., as Romanists teach, in baptism). As life expels death; as light banishes darkness, so the entrance of this new divine life into the soul expels sin (i.e., sinful habits), and brings forth the fruits of righteousness. Works done after regeneration have real merit, "meritum condigni," and are the ground of the second

justification the first justification consisting in making the soul inherently just by the infusion of righteousness. According to this view, we are not justified by works done before regeneration, but we are justified for gracious works, i.e., for works which spring from the principle of divine life infused into the heart. The whole ground of our acceptance with God is thus made to be what we are and what we do.

Remonstrant Doctrine.

Thirdly. According to the Remonstrants or Arminians the works which are excluded from our justification are works of the law as distinguished from works of the Gospel. In the covenant made with Adam God demanded perfect obedience as the condition of life. For Christ's sake, God in the Gospel has entered into a new covenant with men, promising them salvation on the condition of evangelical obedience. This is expressed in different forms. Sometimes it is said that we are justified on account of faith. Faith is accepted in place of that perfect righteousness demanded by the Adamic law. But by faith is not meant the act of receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation. It is regarded as a permanent and controlling state of mind. And therefore it is often said that we are justified by a "fides obsequiosa," an obedient faith; a faith which includes obedience. At other times, it is said that we are justified by evangelical obedience, i.e., that kind and measure of obedience which the Gospel requires, and which men since the fall, in the proper use of "sufficient grace" granted to all men, are able to render. Limborch says, "Sciendum, quando dicimus, nos fide justificari, nos non excludere opera, quæ fides exigit et tanquam foecunda mater producit; sed ea includere." And again, "Est itaque [fides] 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 peccatoram et vitæ æternæ premium conferre vult." Again, [154] God, he says, demands, "obedientiam fidei, hoc est, non rigidam et ab omnibus æqualem, prout exigebat lex; sed tantam, quantam fides, id est, certa de divinis promissionibus persuasio, in unoquoque efficere potest." Therefore justification, he says, [155] "Est gratiosa æstimatio, seu potius acceptatio justitiæ nostræ imperfectæ pro perfecta, propter Jesum Christum."

Protestant Doctrine.

Fourthly. According to the doctrine of the Lutherans and Reformed, the works excluded from the ground of our justification are not only ritual or ceremonial works, nor merely works done before regeneration, nor the perfect obedience required by the law given to Adam, but works of all kinds, everything done by us or wrought in us. That this is the doctrine of the Bible is plain, --

1. Because the language of Scripture is unlimited. The declaration is, that we are not justified "by works." No specific kind of works is designated to the exclusion of all others. But it is "works;" what we do; anything and everything we do. It is, therefore, without authority that any man limits these general declarations to any particular class of works.

2. The word law is used in a comprehensive sense. It includes all revelations of the will of God as the rule of man's obedience and, therefore, by "works of the law" must be intended all kinds of works. As nomos means that which binds, it is used for the law of nature, or the law written on the heart (Rom. ii. 14), for the Decalogne, for the law of Moses, for the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures. (Rom. iii. 19.) Sometimes one, and sometimes another of these aspects of the law is specially referred to. Paul assures the Jews that they could not be justified by the works of the law, which was especially binding on

them. He assures the Gentiles that they could not be justified by the law written on their hearts. He assures believers under the Gospel that they cannot be justified by works of the law binding on them. The reason given includes all possible works That reason is, that all human obedience is imperfect; all men are sinners: and the law demands perfect obedience. (Gal. iii. 10.) Therefore, it is that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." (Rom. iii. 20.)

3. The law of which Paul speaks is the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet" (Rom. vii. 7); the law which is spiritual (ver. 14); which is "holy, and just, and good" (ver. 12); the law of which the great command is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself. Besides, what are called works of the law are in Titus iii. 5 called "works of righteousness." Higher works than these there cannot be. The Apostle repudiates any ground of confidence in his "own righteousness" (Phil. iii. 9), i.e., own excellence, whether habitual or actual. He censures the Jews because they went about to establish their own righteousness, and would not submit to the righteousness of God. (Rom. x. 3.) From these and many similar passages it is clear that it is not any one or more specific kinds of work which are excluded from the ground of justification, but all works, all personal excellence of every kind.

4. This is still further evident from the contrast constantly presented between faith and works. We are not justified by works, but by faith in Jesus Christ. (Gal. ii. 16, and often elsewhere.) It is not one kind of works as opposed to another; legal as opposed to evangelical; natural as opposed to gracious; moral as opposed to ritual; but works of every kind as opposed to faith.

5 The same is evident from what is taught of the gratuitous nature of our justification. Grace and works are antithetical. "To him that

worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." (Rom. iv. 4.) "If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace." (Rom. xi. 6.) Grace of necessity excludes works of every kind, and more especially those of the highest kind, which might have some show of merit. But merit of any degree is of necessity excluded, if our salvation be by grace.

6. When the positive ground of justification is stated, it is always declared to be not anything done by us or wrought in us, but what was done for us. It is ever represented as something external to ourselves. We are justified by the blood of Christ (Rom. v. 9); by his obedience (Rom. v. 19); by his righteousness (ver. 18). This is involved in the whole method of salvation. Christ saves us as a priest; but a priest does not save by making those who come to him good. He does not work in them, but for them. Christ saves us by a sacrifice; but a sacrifice is effectual, not because of its subjective effect upon the offerer, but as an expiation, or satisfaction to justice. Christ is our Redeemer; he gave himself as a ransom for many. But a ransom does not infuse righteousness. It is the payment of a price. It is the satisfaction of the claims of the captor upon the captive. The whole plan of salvation, therefore, as presented in the Bible and as it is the life of the Church, is changed, if the ground of our acceptance with God be transferred from what Christ has done for us, to what is wrought in us or done by us. The Romish theologians do not agree exactly as to whether habitual or actual righteousness is the ground of justification. Bellarmin says it is the former. [156] He says, "Solam esse habitualem justitiam, per quam formaliter justi nominamur, et sumus: justitiam vero actualem, id est, opera vere justa justificare quidem, ut sanctus Jacobus loquitur, cum ait cap. 2 ex operibus hominem justificari, sed meritorie, non formaliter." This he says is clearly

the doctrine of the Council of Trent, which teaches, [157] "Causam formalem justificationis esse justitiam, sive caritatem, quam Deus unicuique propriam infundit, secundum mensuram dispositionum, et quæ in cordibus justificatorum innæret." This follows also, he argues, from the fact that the sacraments justify, [158] "per modum instrumenti ad infusionem justitiæ habitualis." This, however, only amounts to the distinction, already referred to, between the first and second justification. The infusion of righteousness renders the soul inherently righteous; then good works merit salvation. The one is the formal, the other the meritorious cause of the sinner's justification. But according to the Scriptures, both habitual and actual righteousness, both inherent grace and its fruits are excluded from any share in the ground of our justification.

7. This still further and most decisively appears from the grand objection to his doctrine which Paul was constantly called upon to answer. That objection was, that if our personal goodness or moral excellence is not the ground of our acceptance with God, then all necessity of being good is denied, and all motive to good works is removed. We may continue in sin that grace may abound. This objection has been reiterated a thousand times since it was urged against the Apostles. It seems so unreasonable and so demoralizing to say as Paul says, Romans iii. 22, that so far as justification is concerned there is no difference between Jew and Gentile; between a worshipper of the true God and a worshipper of demons; between the greatest sinner and the most moral man in the world, that men have ever felt that they were doing God service in denouncing this doctrine as a soul-destroying heresy. Had Paul taught that men are justified for their good moral works as the Pelagians and Rationalists say; or for their evangelical obedience as the Remonstrants say; or for their inherent righteousness

and subsequent good works as the Romanists say, there would have been no room for this formidable objection. Or, if through any misapprehension of his teaching, the objection had been urged, how easy had it been for the Apostle to set it aside. How obvious would have been the answer, I do not deny that really good works are the ground of our acceptance with God. I only say that ritual works have no worth in his sight, that He looks on the heart; or, that works done before regeneration have no real excellence or merit; or, that God is more lenient now than in his dealing with Adam; that He does not demand perfect obedience, but accepts our imperfect, well-meant endeavours to keep his holy commandments.' How reasonable and satisfactory would such an answer have been. Paul, however, does not make it. He adheres to his doctrine, that our own personal moral excellence has nothing to do with our justification; that God justifies the ungodly, that He receives the chief of sinners. He answers the objection in deed, and answers it effectually; but his answer supposes him to teach just what Protestants teach, that we are justified without works, not for our own righteousness, but gratuitously, without money and without price, solely on the ground of what Christ has done for us. His answer is, that so far from its being true that we must be good before we can be justified, we must be justified before we can be good; that so long as we are under the curse of the law we bring forth fruit unto death; that it is not until reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, that we bring forth fruit unto righteousness; that when justified by the righteousness of Christ, we are made partakers of his Spirit; being justified we are sanctified; that union with Christ by faith secures not only the imputation of his righteousness to our justification, but the participation of his life unto our sanctification, so that as surely as He lives and lives unto God, so they that believe on Him

shall live unto God; and that none are partakers of the merit of his death who do not become partakers of the power of his life. We do not, therefore, he says, make void the law of God. Yea, we establish the law. We teach the only true way to become holy; although that way appears foolishness unto the wise of this world, whose wisdom is folly in the sight of God.

---

[151] Institiones Theologiæ, III. iii. § 155, 5th edit. Halle, 1826, p. 476.

[152] Dogmatik, 2ter Th. § 134, 13, g, h; Göttingen, 1800, pp. 783, 784.

[153] See Strauss, Dogmatik, Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1841, vol. ii. pp. 493, 494.

[154] Theologia Christiana, VI. iv. 32, 31, 37; edit. Amsterdam, 1725, pp. 705, b, a, 706 a.

[155] Limborch, VI. iv. 18; ut supra, p. 703, a.

[156] De Justificatione, II. 15; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 820, a.

[157] See Session vi. cap. 7.

[158] Bellarmin, ut supra, p. 820, b.

---

§ 4. The Righteousness of Christ the Ground of Justification.

The imperative question remains, How shall a man be just with God? If our moral excellence be not the ground on which God pronounces us just, what is that ground? The grand reason why such different answers are given to this question is, that it is understood in different senses.

The Scriptural and Protestant answer is absurd, if the question means what Romanists and others understand it to mean. If "just" means good, i.e., it the word be taken in its moral, and not in its judicial sense,

then it is absurd to say that a man can be good with the goodness of another; or to say that God can pronounce a man to be good who is not good. Bellarmin says an Ethiopian clothed in a white garment is not white. Curcellæus, the Remonstrant, says, "A man can no more be just with the justice of another, than he can be white with the whiteness of another." Moehler [159] says, it is impossible that anything should appear to God other than it really is; that an unjust man should appear to him, or be pronounced by him just. All this is true in the sense intended by these writers, "The judgment of God is according to truth." (Rom. ii. 2.) Every man is truly just whom He justifies or dodares to be just. It is in vain to dispute until the "status quæstionis" be clearly determined. The word dikaios, "righteous," or "just," has two distinct senses, its above stated. It has a moral, and also a legal, forensic, or judicial sense. It sometimes expresses moral character, sometimes simply a relation to law and justice. In one sense to pronounce a man just, is to declare that he is morally good. In another sense, it is to declare that the claims of justice against him are satisfied, and that he is entitled to the reward promised to the righteous. When God justifies the ungodly, he does not declare that he is godly, but that his sins are expiated, and that he has a title founded in justice to eternal life. In this there is no contradiction and no absurdity. If a man under attainder appear before the proper tribunal, and show cause why the attainder should in justice be reversed, and he be declared entitled to his rank, titles, and estates, a decision in his favour would be a justification. It would declare him just in the eye of the law, but it would declare nothing and effect nothing as to his moral character. In the like manner, when the sinner stands at the bar of God, he can show good reason why he cannot be justly condemned, and why he should be declared entitled to eternal

life. Now the question is, "On what ground can God pronounce a sinner just in this legal or forensic sense?" It has been shown that to justify, according to uniform Scriptural usage, is to pronounce just in the sense stated, that it is not merely to pardon, and that it is not to render inherently righteous or holy. It has also been shown to be the doctrine of Scripture, what indeed is intuitively true to the conscience, that our moral excellence, habitual or actual, is not and cannot be the ground of any such judicial declaration. What then is the ground? The Bible and the people of God, with one voice answer, "The righteousness of Christ." The ambiguity of words, the speculations of theologians, and misapprehensions, may cause many of the people of God to deny in words that such is the proper answer, but it is nevertheless the answer rendered by every believer's heart. He relies for his acceptance with God, not on himself but on Christ, not on what he is or has done, but on what Christ is and has done for him.

Meaning of the Terms.

By the righteousness of Christ is meant all he became, did, and suffered to satisfy the demands of divine justice, and merit for his people the forgiveness of sin and the gift of eternal life. The righteousness of Christ is commonly represented as including his active and passive obedience. This distinction is, as to the idea, Scriptural. The Bible does teach that Christ obeyed the law in all its precepts, and that he endured its penalty, and that this was done in such sense for his people that they are said to have done it. They died in Him. They were crucified with Him. They were delivered from the curse of the law by his being made a curse for them. He was made under the law that he might redeem those who were under the law. We are freed from the law by the body of Christ. He was made sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He is the end of the law for righteousness

to all them that believe. It is by his obedience that many are made righteous. (Rom. v. 19.) We obeyed in Him, according to the teaching of the Apostle, in Romans v. 12-21, in the same sense in which we sinned in Adam. The active and passive obedience of Christ, however, are only different phases or aspects of the same thing. He obeyed in suffering. His highest acts of obedience were rendered in the garden, and upon the cross. Hence this distinction is not so presented in Scripture as though the obedience of Christ answered one purpose, and his sufferings another and a distinct purpose. We are justified by his blood. We are reconciled unto God by his death. We are freed from all the demands of the law by his body (Rom. vii. 4), and we are freed from the law by his being made under it and obeying it in our stead. (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) Thus the same effect is ascribed to the death or sufferings of Christ, and to his obedience, because both are forms or parts of his obedience or righteousness by which we are justified. In other words the obedience of Christ includes all He did in satisfying the demands of the law.

The Righteousness of Christ is the Righteousness of God.

The righteousness of Christ on the ground of which the believer's justified is the righteousness of God. It is so designated in Scripture not only because it was provided and is accepted by Him; it is not only the righteousness which avails before God, but it is the righteousness of a divine person; of God manifest in the flesh. God purchased the Church with his own blood. (Acts xx. 28.) It was the Lord of glory who was crucified. (1 Cor. ii. 8.) He who was in the form of God and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 6-8.) He who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, who upholds all things by the word of his power; whom angels worship; who is called God; who in the beginning laid the foundations of the

earth, and of whose hands the heavens are the workmanship; who is eternal and immutable, has, the Apostle teaches, by death destroyed him who has the power of death and delivered those who through fear of death (i.e., of the wrath of God) were all their lifetime subject to bondage. (Heb. i., ii.) He whom Thomas recognized and avowed to be his Lord and God was the person into whose wounded side he thrust his hand. He whom John says he saw, looked upon, and handled, he declares to be the true God and eternal life. The soul, in which personality resides, does not die when the man dies, yet it is the soul that gives dignity to the man, and which renders his life of unspeakably greater value in the sight of God and man, than the life of any irrational creature. So it was not the divine nature in Christ in which his personality resides, the eternal Logos, that died when Christ died. Nevertheless the hypostatic union between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, makes it true that the righteousness of Christ (his obedience and sufferings) was the righteousness of God. This is the reason why it can avail before God for the salvation of the whole world. This is the reason why the believer, when arrayed in this righteousness, need fear neither death nor hell. This is the reason why Paul challenges the universe to lay anything to the charge of God's elect.

---

[159] Symbolik, § 14, 6th edit. Mainz, 1843, p. 139.

---

§ 5. Imputation of Righteousness.

The righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer for his justification. The word impute is familiar and unambiguous. To impute is to ascribe to, to reckon to, to lay to one's charge. When we say we impute a good or bad motive to a man, or that a good or evil action is imputed to him, no one misunderstands our meaning. Philemon had no

doubt what Paul meant when he told him to impute to him the debt of Onesimus. "Let not the king impute anything unto his servant." (1 Sam. xxii. 15.) "Let not my lord impute iniquity unto me." (2 Sam. xix. 19.) "Neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it." (Lev. vii. 18.) "Blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood." (Lev. xvii. 4.) "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." (Ps. xxxii. 2.) "Unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." (Rom. iv. 6.) God is "in Christ not imputing their trespasses unto them." (2 Cor. v. 19.)

The meaning of these and similar passages of Scripture has never been disputed. Everyone understands them. We use the word impute in its simple admitted sense, when we say that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer for his justification.

It seems unnecessary to remark that this does not, and cannot mean that the righteousness of Christ is infused into the believer or in any way so imparted to him as to change, or constitute His moral character. Imputation never changes the inward, subjective state of the person to whom the imputation is made. When sin is imputed to a man he is not made sinful; when the zeal of Phinehas was imputed to him, he was not made zealous. When you impute theft to a man, you do not make him a thief. When you impute goodness to a man, you do not make him good. So when righteousness is imputed to the believer, he does not thereby become subjectively righteous. If the righteousness be adequate, and if the imputation be made on adequate grounds and by competent authority, the person to whom the imputation is made has the right to be treated as righteous. And, therefore, in the forensic, although not in the moral or subjective sense, the imputation of the righteousness of Christ does make the sinner righteous. That is, it gives him a right to the full pardon of all his sins and a claim in justice to eternal life.

That this is the simple and universally accepted view of the doctrine as held by all Protestants at the Reformation, and by them regarded as the corner-stone of the Gospel, has already been sufficiently proved by extracts from the Lutheran and Reformed Symbols, and has never been disputed by any candid or competent authority. This has continued to be the doctrine of both the great branches of the Protestant Church, so far as they pretend to adhere to their standards. Schmid [160] proves this by a whole catena of quotations so far as the Lutheran Church is concerned. Schweizer [161] does the same for the Reformed Church. A few citations, therefore, from authors of a recognized representative character will suffice as to this point. Turrettin with his characteristic precision says: "Cum dicimus Christi justitiam ad justificationem nobis imputari, et nos per justitiam illam imputatam justos esse coram Deo, et non per justitiam ullam quæ nobis inhæreat; Nihil aliud volumus, quam obedientiam Christi Deo Patri nomine nostro præstitam, ita nobis a Deo donari, ut vere nostra censeatur, eamque esse unicam et solam illam justitiam propter quam, et cujus merito, absolvamur a reatu peccatorum nostrum, et jus ad vitam obtinemus; nec ullam in nobis esse justitiam, aut ulla bona opera, quibus beneficia tanta promereamur, quæ ferre possint severum judicii divini examen, si Deus juxta legis suæ rigorem nobiscum agere vellet nihil nos illi posse opponere, nisi Christi meritum et satisfactionem, in qua sola, peccatorum conscientia territi, tutum adversus iram divinam perfugium, et animarum nostrarum pacem invenire possumus." [162]

On the following page he refers to Bellarmin, [163] who says, "Si [Protestantes hoc] solum vellent, nobis imputari Christi merita, quia [a Deo] nobis donata sunt, et possumus ea [Deo] Patri offere pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi, recta esset eorum

sententia." On this Turrettin remarks, "Atqui nihil aliud volumus; Nam quod addit, nos velle ita imputari nobis Christi justitiam, ut per eam formaliter justi nominemur et simus,' hoc gratis et falso supponit, ex perversa et præpostera sua hypothesi de justificatione morali. Sed quæritur, Ad quid imputatio ista fiat? An ad justificationem et vitam, ut nos pertendimus, An vero tantum ad gratiæ internæ et justitiæ inhærentis infusionem, ut illi volunt; Id est, an ita imputentur et communicentur nobis merita Christi, ut sint causa meritoria sola nostræ justificationis, nec ulla alia detur justitia propter quam absolvamur in conspectu Dei; quod volumus; An vero ita imputentur, ut sint conditiones causæ formalis, id. justitiæ inhærentis, ut ea homo donari possit, vel causæ extrinsecæ, quæ mereantur infusionem justitiæ, per quam justificatur homo; ut ita non meritum Christi proprie, sed justitia inhærens per meritum Christi acquisita, sic causa propria et vera, propter quam homo justificatur; quod illi statuunt." It may be remarked in passing that according to the Protestant doctrine there is properly no "formal cause" of justification. The righteousness of Christ is the meritorious, but not the formal cause of the sinner's being pronounced righteous. A formal cause is that which constitutes the inherent, subjective nature of a person or thing. The formal cause of a man's being good, is goodness, of his being holy, holiness; of his being wicked, wickedness. The formal cause of a rose's being red, is redness; and of a wall's being white, is whiteness. As we are not rendered inherently righteous by the righteousness of Christ, it is hardly correct to say that his righteousness is the formal cause of our being righteous. Owen, and other eminent writers do indeed often use the expression referred to, but they take the word "formal" out of its ordinary scholastic sense.

Campegius Vitringa [164] says: "Tenendum est certissimum hoc

fundamentum, quod justificare sit vocabulum forense, notetque in Scriptura actum judicis, quo causam alicujus in judicio justam esse declarat; sive eum a crimine, cujus postulatus est, absolvat (quæ est genuina, et maxime propria vocis significatio), sive etiam jus ad hanc, vel illam rem ei sententia addicat, et adjudicet."

"17. Per justificationem peccatoris intelligimus actum Dei Patris, ut judicis, quo peccatorem credentem, natura filium iræ, neque ullum jus ex se habentem bona coelestia petendi, declarat immunem esse ab omni reatu, et condemnatione, adoptat in filium, et in eum ex gratia confert jus ad suam communionem, cum salute æterna, bonisque omnibus cum ea conjunctis, postulandi."

"27. Teneamus nullam carnem in se posse reperire et ex se producere causam, et fundamentum justificationis. 29. Quærendum igitur id, propter quod peccator justificatur, extra peccatorem in obedientia Filli Dei, quam præstitit Patri in humana natura ad mortem, imo ad mortem crucis, et ad quam præstandam se obstrinxerat in sponsione. (Rom. v. 19.)" "32. Hæc [obedientia] imputatur peccatori a Deo judice ex gratia juxta jus sponsionis, de quo ante dictum."

Owen in his elaborate work on justification, [165] proves that the word to justify, "whether the act of God towards men, or of men towards God, or of men among themselves, or of one towards another, be expressed thereby, is always used in a forensic' sense, and does not denote a physical operation, transfusion, or transmutation." He thus winds up the discussion: "Wherefore as condemnation is not the infusing of a habit of wickedness into him that is condemned, nor the making of him to be inherently wicked, who was before righteous, but the passing a sentence upon a man with respect to his wickedness; no more is justification the change of a person from inherent unrighteousness to righteousness, by the infusion of a principle of grace, but a

sentential declaration of him to be righteous." [166]

The ground of this justification in the case of the believing inner is the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. This is set forth at length. [167] "The judgment of the Reformed Churches herein," he says, "is known to all and must be confessed, unless we intend by vain cavils to increase and perpetuate contentions. Especially the Church of England is in her doctrine express as to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, both active and passive, as it is usually distinguished. This has been of late so fully manifested out of her authentic writings, that is, the Articles of Religion' and Books of Homilies,' and other writings publicly authorized, that it is altogether needless to give any further demonstration of it."

President Edwards in his sermon on justification [168] sets forth the Protestant doctrine in all its fulness. "To suppose," he says, "that a man is justified by his own virtue or obedience, derogates from the honour of the Mediator, and ascribes that to man's virtue that belongs only to the righteousness of Christ. It puts man in Christ's stead, and makes him his own saviour, in a respect in which Christ only is the Saviour: and so it is a doctrine contrary to the nature and design of the Gospel, which is to abase man, and to ascribe all the glory of our salvation to Christ the Redeemer. It is inconsistent with the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which is a gospel doctrine. Here I would (1.) Explain what we mean by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. (2.) Prove the thing intended by it to be true. (3.) Show that this doctrine is utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of our being justified by our own virtue or sincere obedience.

"First. I would explain what we mean by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Sometimes the expression is taken by our divines in a larger sense, for the imputation of all that Christ did and suffered

for our redemption, whereby we are free from guilt, and stand righteous in the sight of God; and so implies the imputation both of Christ's satisfaction and obedience. But here I intend it in a stricter sense, for the imputation of that righteousness or moral goodness that consists in the obedience of Christ. And by that righteousness being imputed to us, is meant no other than this, that that righteousness of Christ is accepted for us, and admitted instead of that perfect inherent righteousness that ought to be in ourselves: Christ's perfect obedience shall be reckoned to our account so that we shall have the benefit of it, as though we had performed it ourselves: and so we suppose that a title to eternal life is given us as the reward of this righteousness." In the same connection, he asks, "Why is there any more absurdity in supposing that Christ's obedience is imputed to us, than that his satisfaction is imputed? If Christ has suffered the penalty of the law for us, and in our stead, then it will follow that his suffering that penalty is imputed to us, i.e., that it is accepted for us, and in our stead, and is reckoned to our account, as though we had suffered it. But why may not his obeying the law of God be as rationally reckoned to our account as his suffering the penalty of the law." He then goes on to argue that there is the same necessity for the one as for the other.

Dr. Shedd says, "A second difference between the Anselmic and the Protestant soteriology is seen in the formal distinction of Christ's work into his active and his passive righteousness. By his passive righteousness is meant his expiatory sufferings, by which He satisfied the claims of justice, and by hie active righteousness is meant his obedience to the law as a rule of life and conduct. It was contended by those who made this distinction, that the purpose of Christ as the vicarious substitute was to meet the entire demands of the law for the

sinner. But the law requires present and perfect obedience, as well as satisfaction for past disobedience. The law is not completely fulfilled by the endurance of penalty only. It must also be obeyed Christ both endured the penalty due to man for disobedience, and perfectly obeyed the law for him; so that He was a vicarious substitute in reference to both the precept and the penalty of the law. By his active obedience He obeyed the law, and by his passive obedience He endured the penalty. In this way his vicarious work is complete." [169]

The earlier Symbols of the Reformation do not make this distinction. So far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, it first appears in the "Form of Concord" (A.D. 1576). Its statement is as follows: "That righteousness which is imputed to faith, or to believers, of mere grace, is the obedience, suffering, and resurrection of Christ, by which He satisfied the law for us, and expiated our sins. For since Christ was not only man, but truly God and man in one undivided person, He was no more subject to the law than He was to suffering and death (if his person, merely, be taken into account), because He was the Lord of the law Hence, not only that obedience to God his Father which He exhibited in his passion and death, but also that obedience which He exhibited in voluntarily subjecting Himself to the law and fulfilling it for our sakes, is imputed to us for righteousness, so that God on account of the total obedience which Christ accomplished (præstitit) for our sake before his heavenly Father, both in acting and in suffering, in life and in death, may remit our sins to us, regard us as good and righteous, and give us eternal salvation." [170] In this point the Reformed or Calvinistic standards agree.

It has already been remarked that the distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ is, in one view, unimportant. As Christ obeyed in suffering, his sufferings were as much a part of his

obedience as his observance of the precepts of the law. The Scriptures do not expressly make this distinction, as they include everything that Christ did for our redemption under the term righteousness or obedience. The distinction becomes important only when it is denied that his moral obedience is any part of the righteousness for which the believer is justified, or that his whole work in making satisfaction consisted in expiation or bearing the penalty of the law. This is contrary to Scripture, and vitiates the doctrine of justification as presented in the Bible.

---

[160] Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt, 3d edit. Frankfort and Erlangen, 1853.

[161] Die Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt, Zurich, 1844, 1847.

[162] Institutio, loc. XVI. iii. 9, edit. Edinburgh, 1847, vol. ii. p. 570.

[163] De Justificatione, ii. 7; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, p. 801, b.

[164] Doctrina Christianæ Religionis, III. xvi. 2; Leyden, 1764, vol. iii. p. 254, ff.

[165] Justification, chap. 4, edit. Philadelphia, 1841, p. 144.

[166] Ibid. p. 154.

[167] Ibid. chap. 7, p. 187.

[168] Serm. IV. Works, edit. N. Y. 1868, vol. iv. pp. 91, 92.

[169] History of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1863, vol. ii. p. 341.

[170] Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit., Leipzig, 1846, pp. 684, 685.

---

§ 6. Proof of the Doctrine.

That the Protestant doctrine as above stated is the doctrine of the word of God appears from the following considerations: --

1. The word dikaioo, as has been shown, means to declare dikaios. No one can be truthfully pronounced dikaios to whom dikaiosune cannot rightfully be ascribed. The sinner (ex vi verbi) has no righteousness of his own. God, therefore, imputes to him a righteousness which is not his own. The righteousness thus imputed is declared to be the righteousness of God, of Christ, the righteousness which is by faith. This is almost in so many words the declaration of the Bible on the subject. As the question, What is the method of justification? is a Biblical question, it must be decided exegetically, and not by arguments drawn from assumed principles of reason. We are not at liberty to say that the righteousness of one man cannot be imputed to another; that this would involve a mistake or absurdity; that God's justice does not demand a righteousness such as the law prescribes, as the condition of justification; that He may pardon and save as a father without any consideration, unless it be that of repentance; that it is inconsistent with his grace that the demands of justice should be met before justification is granted; that this view of justification makes it a sham, a calling a man just, when he is not just etc. All this amounts to nothing. It all pertains to that wisdom which is foolishness with God. All we have to do is to determine, (1.) What is the meaning of the word to justify as used in Scripture? (2.) On what ground does the Bible affirm that God pronounces the ungodly to be just? If the answer to these questions be what the Church in all ages, and especially the Church of the Reformation has given, then we should rest satisfied. The Apostle in express terms says that God imputes righteousness to the sinner. (Rom. iv. 6, 24.) By righteousness every one admits is meant that which makes a man righteous, that which the law demands. It does not consist in the sinner's own obedience, or moral excellence, for it is said to be "without works;" and it is

declared that no man can be justified on the ground of his own character or conduct. Neither does this righteousness consist in faith; for it is "of faith," "through faith," "by faith." We are never said to be justified on account of faith. Neither is it a righteousness, or form of moral excellence springing from faith, or of which faith is the source or proximate cause; because it is declared to be the righteousness of God; a righteousness which is revealed; which is offered; which must be accepted as a gift. (Rom. v. 17.) It is declared to be the righteousness of Christ; his obedience. (Rom. v. 19.) It is, therefore, the righteousness of Christ, his perfect obedience in doing and suffering the will of God, which is imputed to the believer, and on the ground of which the believer, although in himself ungodly, is pronounced righteous, and therefore free from the curse of the law and entitled to eternal life.

The Apostle's Argument.

2. All the points above stated are not only clearly affirmed by the Apostle but they are also set forth in logical order, and elaborately sustained and vindicated in the Epistle to the Romans. The Apostle begins with the declaration that the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation." It is not thus divinely efficacious because of the purity of its moral precepts; nor because it brings immortality to light; nor because it sets before us the perfect example of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor because it assures us of the love of God; nor because of the elevating, sanctifying, life-giving influence by which it is attended. There is something preliminary to all this. The first and indispensable requisite to salvation is that men should be righteous before God. They are under his wrath and curse. Until justice is satisfied, until God is reconciled, there is no possibility of any moral influence being of any avail. Therefore the Apostle says that the power of the Gospel is due

to the fact that "therein is the righteousness of God revealed." This cannot mean the goodness of God, for such is not the meaning of the word. It cannot in this connection mean his justice, because it is a righteousness which is "of faith;" because the justice of God is revealed from heaven and to all men; because the revelation of justice terrifies and drives away from God; because what is here called the righteousness of God, is elsewhere contrasted with our "own righteousness" (Rom. x. 8; Phil. iii. 9); and because it is declared to be the righteousness of Christ (Rom. v. 18), which is (Rom. v. 19) explained by his "obedience," and in Romans v. 9 and elsewhere declared to be "his blood." This righteousness of Christ is the righteousness of God, because Christ is God; because God has provided, revealed, and offers it; and because it avails before God as a sufficient ground on which He can declare the believing sinner righteous. Herein lies the saving power of the Gospel. The question, How shall man be just with God? had been sounding in the ears of men from the beginning. It never had been answered. Yet it must be answered or there can be no hope of salvation. It is answered in the Gospel, and therefore the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; i.e., to every one, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, good or bad, who, instead of going about to establish his own righteousness, submits himself in joyful confidence to the righteousness which his God and Saviour Jesus Christ has wrought out for sinners, and which is freely offered to them in the Gospel without money and without price.

This is Paul's theme, which he proceeds to unfold and establish, as has been already stated under a previous head. He begins by asserting, as indisputably true from the revelation of God in the constitution of our nature, that God is just, that He will punish sin; that He cannot pronounce him righteous who is not righteous. He then shows from

experience and from Scripture, first as regards the Gentiles, then as regards the Jews, that there is none righteous, no not one; that the whole world is guilty before God. There is therefore no difference, since all have sinned.

Since the righteousness which the law requires cannot be found in the sinner nor be rendered by him, God has revealed another righteousness (Rom. iii. 21); "the righteousness of God," granted to every one who believes. Men are not justified for what they are or for what they do, but for what Christ has done for them. God has set Him forth as a propitiation for sin, in order that He might be just and yet the justifier of them that believe.

The Apostle teaches that such has been the method of justification from the beginning. It was witnessed by the law and the prophets. There had never, since the fall, been any other way of justification possible for men. As God justified Abraham because he believed in the promise of redemption through the Messiah; so He justifies those now who believe in the fulfilment of that promise. (Rom. iv. 3, 9, 24.) It was not Abraham's believing state of mind that was taken for righteousness. It is not faith in the believer now; not faith as a virtue, or as a source of a new life, which renders us righteous. It is faith in a specific promise. Righteousness, says the Apostle, is imputed to us, "if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." (Rom. iv. 24.) Or, as he expresses it in Romans x. 9, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The promise which Abraham believed, is the promise which we believe (Gal. iii. 14); and the relation of faith to justification, in his case, is precisely what it is in ours. He and we are justified simply because we trust in the Messiah for our salvation. Hence, as the Apostle says, the Scriptures

are full of thanksgiving to God for gratuitous pardon, for free justification, for the imputation of righteousness to those who have no righteousness of their own. This method of justification, he goes on to show, is adapted to all mankind. God is not the God of the Jews only but also of the Gentiles. It secures peace and reconciliation with God. (Rom. v. 1-3.) It renders salvation certam, for if we are saved not by what we are in ourselves, but for what Christ has done for us, we may be sure that if we are "justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." (Rom. v. 9.) This method of justification, he further shows, and this only, secures sanctification, namely, holiness of heart and life. it is only those who are reconciled to God by the death of his Son, that are "saved by his life." (v. 10.) This idea he expands and vindicates in the sixth and seventh chapters of this Epistle.

The Parallel between Adam and Christ.

3. Not content with this clear and formal statement of the truth that sinners can be justified only through the imputation of a righteousness not their own; and that the righteousness thus imputed is the righteousness (active and passive if that distinction be insisted upon) of the Lord Jesus Christ; he proceeds to illustrate this doctrine by drawing a parallel between Adam and Christ. The former, he says, was a type of the latter. There is an analogy between our relation to Adam and our relation to Christ. We are so united to Adam that his first transgression was the ground of the sentence of condemnation being passed on all mankind, and on account of that condemnation we derive from him a corrupt nature so that all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, come into the world in a state of spiritual death.

In like manner we are so united to Christ, when we believe, that his obedience is the ground on which a sentence of justification passes

upon all thus in Him, and in consequence of that sentence they derive from Him a new, holy, divine, and imperishable principle of spiritual life. These truths are expressed in explicit terms. "The judgment was by one (offence) to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification." (Rom. v. 16.) "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (v. 18, 19.) These two great truths, namely, the imputation of Adam's sin and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, have graven themselves on the consciousness of the Church universal. They have been reviled, misrepresented, and denounced by theologians, but they have stood their ground in the faith of God's people, just as the primary truths of reason have ever retained control over the mass of men, in spite of all the speculations of philosophers. It is not meant that the truths just mentioned have always been expressed in the terms just given; but the truths themselves have been, and still are held by the people of God, wherever found, among the Greeks, Latins, or Protestants. The fact that the race fell in Adam; that the evils which come upon us on account of his transgression are penal; and that men are born in a state of sin and condemnation, are outstanding facts of Scripture and experience, and are avowed every time the sacrament of baptism is administered to an infant. No less universal is the conviction of the other great truth. It is implied in every act of saving faith which includes trust in what Christ has done for us as the ground of our acceptance with God, as opposed to anything done by us or wrought in us. As a single proof of the hold which this conviction has on the Christian consciousness, reference may be made to the ancient direction for the

visitation of the sick, attributed to Anselm, but of doubtful authorship: "Dost thou believe that thou canst not be saved, but by the death of Christ? The sick man answereth, Yes. Then let it be said unto him, Go to, then, and whilst thy soul abideth in thee, put all thy confidence in this death alone, place thy trust in no other thing, commit thyself wholly to this death, cover thyself wholly with this alone, cast thyself wholly on this death, wrap thyself wholly in this death. And if God would judge them, say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thy judgment, and otherwise I will not contend, or enter into judgment with thee. And if He shall say unto thee, that thou art a sinner, say, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and my sins. If He shall say unto thee, that thou hast deserved damnation, say, Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between thee and all my sins; and I offer his merits for my own, which I should have, and have not. If He say that He is angry with thee: say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thy anger." [171]

Such being the real and only foundation of a sinner's hope towards God, it is of the last importance that it should not only be practically held by the people, but that it should also be clearly presented and maintained by the clergy. It is not what we do or are, but solely what Christ is and has done that can avail for our justification before the bar of God.

Other Passages teaching the same Doctrine.

4. This doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; or, in other words, that his righteousness is the judicial ground of the believer's justification, is not only formally and argumentatively presented as in the passages cited, but it is constantly asserted or implied in the word of God. The Apostle argues, in the fourth chapter

of his Epistle to the Romans, that every assertion or promise of gratuitous forgiveness of sin to be found in the Scriptures involves this doctrine. He proceeds on the assumption that God is just; that He demands a righteousness of those whom He justifies. If they have no righteousness of their own, one on just grounds must be imputed to them. If, therefore, He forgives sin, it must be that sin is covered, that justice has been satisfied. "David, also," he says, "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." (Rom. iv. 6-8.) Not to impute sin implies the imputation of righteousness.

In Romans v. 9, we are said to be "justified by his blood." In Romans iii. 25, God is said to have set Him forth as a propitiation for sin, that He might be just in justifying the ungodly. As to justify does not mean to pardon, but judicially to pronounce righteous, this passage distinctly asserts that the work of Christ is the ground on which the sentence of justification is passed. In Romans x. 3, 4, he says of the Jews, "They being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." It can hardly be questioned that the word (dikaiosune) righteousness must have the same meaning in both members of the first of these verses. If a man's "own righteousness" is that which would render him righteous, then "the righteousness of God," in this connection, must be a justifying righteousness. It is called the righteousness of God, because, as said before, He is its author. It is the righteousness of Christ. It is provided, offered, and accepted of God. Here then are two

righteousnesses; the one human, the other divine; the one valueless, the other infinitely meritorious. The folly of the Jews, and of thousands since their day, consists in refusing the latter and trusting to the former. This folly the Apostle makes apparent in the fourth verse. The Jews acted under the assumption that the law as a covenant, that is, as prescribing the conditions of salvation, was still in force, that men were still bound to satisfy its demands by their personal obedience in order to be saved, whereas Christ had made an end of the law. He had abolished it as a covenant, in order that men might be justified by faith. Christ, however, has thus made an end of the law, not by merely setting it aside, but by satisfying its demands. He delivers us from its curse, not by mere pardon, but by being made a curse for us. (Gal. iii. 13.) He redeems us from the law by being made under it (Gal. iv. 4, 5), and fulfilling all righteousness.

In Philippians iii. 8, 9, the Apostle says, he "suffered the loss of all things," that he might be found in Christ, not having his "own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Here again one's own righteousness is contrasted with that which is of God. The word must have the same sense in both members. What Paul trusted to, was not his own righteousness, not his own subjective goodness, but a righteousness provided for him and received by faith. De Wette (no Augustinian) on this passage says, the righteousness of God here means," a righteousness received from God (graciously imputed) on condition of faith" ("die von Gott empfangene (aus Gnaden zugerechnete) Gerechtigkeit um des Glaubenswillen.")

The Apostle says (1 Cor. i. 30), Christ of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." In this enumeration sanctification and righteousness are distinguished. The one

renders us holy; the other renders us just, i.e., satisfies the demands of justice. As Christ is to us the source of inward spiritual life, so He is the giver of that righteousness which secures our justification. Justification is not referred to sanctification as its proximate cause and ground. On the contrary, the gift of righteousness precedes that of sanctification. We are justified in order that we may be sanctified. The point here, however, is that righteousness is distinguished from anything and everything in us which can recommend us to the favour of God. We are accepted, justified, and saved, not for what we are, but for what He has done in our behalf. God "made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) As Christ was not made sin in a moral sense; so we are not (in justification) made righteousness in a moral sense. As He was made sin in that He "bare our sins;" so we are made righteousness in that we bear his righteousness. Our sins were the judicial ground of his humiliation under the law and of all his sufferings; so his righteousness is the judicial ground of our justification. In other words, as our sins were imputed to Him; so his righteousness is imputed to us. If imputation of sin did not render Him morally corrupt; the imputation of righteousness does not make us holy or morally good.

Argument from the General Teachings of the Bible.

5. It is unnecessary to dwell upon particular passages in support of a doctrine which pervades the whole Scriptures. The question is, What is the ground of the pardon of sin and of the acceptance of the believe as righteous (in the forensic or judicial sense of the word), in the sight of God? Is it anything we do, anything experienced by us, or wrought in us; or, is it what Christ has done for us? The whole revelation of God concerning the method of salvation shows that it is the latter and not the former. In the first place, this is plain from what the Scriptures

teach of the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son. That there was such covenant cannot be denied if the meaning of the words be once agreed upon. It is plain from Scripture that Christ came into the world to do a certain work, on a certain condition. The promise made to Him was that a multitude whom no man can number, of the fallen race of man, should be saved. This included the promise that they should be justified, sanctified, and made partakers of eternal life. The very nature of this transaction involves the idea of vicarious substitution. It assumes that what He was to do was to be the ground of the justification, sanctification, and salvation of his people.

In the second place this is involved in the nature of the work which He came to perform. He was to assume our nature, to be born of a woman, to take part of flesh and blood with all their infirmities, yet without sin. He was to take his place among sinners; be made subject to the law which they are bound to obey, and to endure the curse which they had incurred. If this be so, then what He did is the ground of our salvation from first to last; of our pardon, of our reconciliation with God, of the acceptance of our persons, of the indwelling of the Spirit, of our being transformed into His image, and of our admission into heaven. "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory," has, therefore, been the spontaneous language of every believer from the beginning until now.

In the third place, the manner in which Christ was to execute the work assigned as described in the prophets, and the way in which it was actually accomplished as described by Himself and by his Apostles, prove that what He did and suffered is the ground of our salvation. He says that He came "to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx. 28.) "There is one God," says the Apostle, "and one mediator between God and

men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all." (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) The deliverance effected by a ransom has no reference to the character or conduct of the redeemed. Its effects are due exclusively to the ransom paid. It is, therefore, to deny that Christ was a ransom, that we are redeemed by his blood, to affirm that the proximate ground of our deliverance from the curse of the law and of our introduction into the liberty of the sons of God, is anything wrought in us or done by us. Again, from the beginning to the end of the Bible, Christ is represented as a sacrifice. From the first institution of sacrifices in the family of Adam; during the patriarchal period; in all the varied and costly ritual of the Mosaic law; in the predictions of the prophets; in the clear didactic statements of the New Testament, it is taught with a constancy, a solemnity, and an amplitude, which proves it to be a fundamental and vital element of the divine plan of redemption, that the Redeemer was to save his people by offering himself as a sacrifice unto God in their behalf. There is no one characteristic of the plan of salvation more deeply engraven on the hearts of Christians, which more effectually determines their inward spiritual life, which so much pervades their prayers and praises, or which is so directly the foundation of their hopes, as the sacrificial nature of the death of Christ. Strike from the Bible the doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ, and what have we left? But if Christ saves us as a sacrifice, then it is what He does for us, his objective work, and nothing subjective, nothing in us, which is the ground of our salvation, and of all that salvation includes. For even our sanctification is due to his death. His blood cleanses from all sin. (1 John i. 7.) It cleanses from the guilt of sin by expiation; and secures inward sanctification by securing the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Again, the whole Bible is full of the idea of substitution. Christ took

our place. He undertook to do for us what we could not do for ourselves. This is taught in every possible way. He bore our sins. He died for us and in our place. He was made under the law for us. He was made a curse for us. He was made sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. The chastisement of our peace was laid on Him. Everything, therefore, which the Bible teaches of the method of salvation, is irreconcilable with the doctrine of subjective justification in all its forms. We are always and everywhere referred to something out of ourselves as the ground of our confidence toward God.

In the fourth place, the effects ascribed to the work of Christ, as before remarked, are such as do not flow from anything in the believer himself, but must be referred to what has been done for him. These effects are expiation of sin, propitiation, the gift and indwelling of the life-giving Spirit of God; redemption, or deliverance from all forms of evil; and a title to eternal life and actual participation in the exaltation, glory, and blessedness of the Son of God. It is out of all question that these wonderful effects should be referred to what we personally are; to our merit, to our holiness, to our participation of the life of Christ. In whatever sense these last words may be understood, they refer to what we personally are or become. His life in us is after all a form of our life. It constitutes our character. And it is self-evident to the conscience that our character is not, and cannot be the ground of our pardon, of God's peculiar love, or of our eternal glory and blessedness in heaven.

In the fifth place, the condition on which our participation of the benefits of redemption is suspended, is inconsistent with any form of the doctrine of subjective justification. We are never said to be justified on account of faith, considered either as an act or as a

principle, as an exercise or as a permanent state of the mind. Faith is never said to be the ground of justification Nor are we saved by faith as the source of holiness or of spiritual life in the soul, or as the organ of receiving the infused life of God. We are saved simply "by" faith, by receiving and resting upon Christ alone for salvation. The thing received is something out of ourselves. It is Christ, his righteousness, his obedience, the merit of his blood or death. We look to Him. We flee to Him. We lay hold on Him. We hide ourselves in Him. We are clothed in his righteousness. The Romanist indeed says, that an Ethiopian in a white robe does not become white. True, but a suit of armor gives security from the sword or spear, and that is what we need before attending to the state of our complexion. We need protection from the wrath of God in the first instance. The inward transformation of the soul into his likeness is provided for by other means.

In the sixth place and finally, the fact that we are saved by grace proves that the ground of salvation is not in ourselves. The grace of God, his love for the unlovely, for the guilty and polluted, is represented in the Bible as the most mysterious of the divine perfections. It was hidden in God. It could not be discovered by reason, neither was it revealed prior to the redemption of man. The specific object of the plan of salvation is the manifestation of this most wonderful, most attractive, and most glorious attribute of the divine nature. Everything connected with our salvation, says the Apostle, is intended for the "praise of the glory of his grace" (Eph. i. 6.) God hath quickened us, he says, and raised us up, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, in order "that in the ages to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us, through Christ Jesus."

From their nature, grace and works are antithetical. The one excludes

the other. What is of grace, is not of works. And by works in Scripture, in relation to this subject, is meant not individual acts only, but states of mind, anything and everything internal of which moral character can be predicated. When, therefore, it is said that salvation is of grace and not of works, it is thereby said that it is not founded upon anything in the believer himself. It was not any moral excellence in man, that determined God to interpose for his redemption, while He left the apostate angels to their fate. This was a matter of grace. To deny this, and to make the provision of a plan of salvation for man a matter of justice, is in such direct contradiction to everything in the Bible, that it hardly ever has been openly asserted. The gift of his Son for the redemption of man is ever represented as the most wonderful display of unmerited love. That some and not all men are actually saved, is expressly declared to be not of works, not on account of anything distinguishing favourably the one class from the other, but a matter of pure grace. When a sinner is pardoned and restored to the favour of God, this again is declared to be of grace. If of grace it is not founded upon anything in the sinner himself. Now as the Scriptures not only teach that the plan of salvation is thus gratuitous in its inception, execution, and application, but also insist upon this characteristic of the plan as of vital importance, and even go so far as to teach that unless we consent to be saved by grace, we cannot be saved at all, it of necessity follows that the doctrine of subjective justification is contrary to the whole spirit of the Bible. That doctrine in all its forms teaches that that which secures our acceptance with God, is something in ourselves, something which constitutes character. If so, then salvation is not of grace; and if not of grace, it is unattainable by sinners.

[171] See "The General Considerations," prefixed by Owen to his work on Justification.

---

§ 7. The Consequences of the Imputation of Righteousness.

It is frequently said that justification consists in the pardon of sin and in the imputation of righteousness. This mode of statement is commonly adopted by Lutheran theologians. This exhibition of the doctrine is founded upon the sharp distinction made in the "Form of Concord" between the passive and active obedience of Christ. To the former is referred the remission of the penalty due to us for sin; to the latter our title to eternal life. The Scriptures, however, do not make this distinction so prominent. Our justification as a whole is sometimes referred to the blood of Christ, and sometimes to his obedience. This is intelligible because the crowning act of his obedience, and that without which all else had been unavailing, was his laying down his life for us. It is, perhaps, more correct to say that the righteousness of Christ, including all He did and suffered in our stead, is imputed to the believer as the ground of his justification, and that the consequences of this imputation are, first, the remission of sin, and secondly, the acceptance of the believer as righteous. And if righteous, then he is entitled to be so regarded and treated.

By the remission of sin Romanists understand the removal of the pollution of sin. So that their definition of justification as consisting in the remission of sin and infusion of righteousness, is only a statement of the negative and positive aspects of sanctification, i.e., putting off the old man and putting on the new man. The effect of remission is constantly declared to be that nothing of the nature of sin remains in the soul. The Council of Trent says, "Justificatio . . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et

sanctificatio, et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum. . . . . Quanquam nemo possit esse justus, nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicantur: id tamen in hac impii justificatione fit, dum ejusdem sanctissimæ passionis merito per Spiritum Sanctum caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus eorum, qui justificantur, atque ipsis inhæret." "Quibus verbis justificationis impii descriptio insinuatur, ut sit translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adæ, in statum gratiæ et adoptionis filiorum Dei, per secundum Adam Jesum Christum, salvatorem nostrum: quæ quidem translatio post evangelium promulgatum sine lavacro regenerationis, aut ejus voto fieri non potest." [172] By "status gratiæ" in this definition is not meant a state of favour, but a state of subjective grace or holiness; because in other places and most commonly justification is said to consist in the infusion of grace. In this definition, therefore, the pardon of sin in the proper sense of the words is not included. Bellarmin [173] says this translation into a state of adoption as sons of God, "non potest . . . . fieri, nisi homo per remissionem peccati desinat esse impius; et per infusionem justitiæ incipiat esse pius. Sed sicut aër cum illustratur a sole per idem lumen, quod recipit, desinit esse tenebrosus et incipit esse lucidus: sic etiam homo per eandem justitiam sibi a sole justitiæ donatam atque infusam desinit esse injustus, delente videlicet lumine gratiæ tenebras peccatorum." The remission of sin is therefore defined to be the removal of sin. Bellarmin argues in support of this view that guilt is removed by holiness, that guilt is a relation; the relation of sin to justice. When the thing itself is taken away, the relation itself of course ceases. [174] Hence remission of sin, even in the sense of pardon, is effected by the infusion of righteousness, as darkness is banished by the introduction of light. It

is thus, as remarked above, that guilt is either ignored, or reduced to a minimum by the Romish theory of justification. There is really no satisfaction of justice in the case. The merits of Christ avail to secure for man the gift of the Holy Ghost, by whose power as exercised in the sacrament of baptism, the soul is made holy, and by the introduction of holiness everything of the nature of sin is banished, and all ground for the infliction of punishment is removed. A scheme so opposed to Scripture, and so inconsistent with even the natural conscience, cannot be practically adopted by the mass of the people. The conviction is too intimate that the desert of punishment is not removed by the reformation, or even by the regeneration of the sinner, to allow the conscience to be satisfied with any scheme of salvation which does not provide for the expiation of the guilt of sin by what really satisfies the justice of God.

In the Bible, therefore, as well as in common life, pardon is not a mere consequence of sanctification. It is exemption from the infliction of the deserved penalty of the law. Whether this exemption is a mere matter of caprice, or unworthy partiality for the offender, or for considerations of expediency, or at the promptings of compassion, or upon the ground of an adequate satisfaction to the demands of justice, makes no difference so far as the nature of pardon is concerned. It is in all cases the remission of a penalty adjudged to be deserved. It is in this sense, therefore, that justification is declared to include the pardon of sins, founded on the imputation to the believing sinner of the perfect righteousness of Christ. It is this that gives the believer peace. He sees that he is delivered from "the wrath and curse of God" due to him, not by any arbitrary exercise of executive authority, but because God, as a righteous judge, can, in virtue of the propitiation of Christ, be just and yet justify the ungodly.

The sins which are pardoned in justification include all sins, past, present, and future. It does indeed seem to be a solecism that sins should be forgiven before they are committed. Forgiveness involves remission of penalty. But how can a penalty be remitted before it is incurred? This is only an apparent difficulty arising out of the inadequacy of human language. The righteousness of Christ is a perpetual donation. It is a robe which hides, or as the Bible expresses it, covers from the eye of justice the sins of the believer. They are sins; they deserve the wrath and curse of God, but the necessity for the infliction of that curse no longer exists. The believer feels the constant necessity for confession and prayer for pardon, but the ground of pardon is ever present for him to offer and plead. So that it would perhaps be a more correct statement to say that in justification the believer receives the promise that God will not deal with him according to his transgressions, rather than to say that sins are forgiven before they are committed.

This subject is thus presented by the Apostle: believers "are not under the law but under grace." (Rom. vi. 14.) They are not under a legal system administered according to the principles of retributive justice, a system which requires perfect obedience as the condition of acceptance with God, and which says, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." They are under grace, that is, under a system in which believers are not dealt with on the principles of justice, but on the principles of undeserved mercy, in which God does not impute "their trespasses unto them." (2 Cor. v. 19.) There is therefore to them no condemnation. They are not condemned for their sins, not because they are not sins and do not deserve condemnation, but because Christ has already made expiation for their guilt and makes continual intercession

for them.

The second consequence attributed to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, is a title to eternal life. This in the older writers is often expressed by the words "adoption and heirship." Being made the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii. 26), they are heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ of a heavenly inheritance. (Rom. viii. 17.) The mere expiation of guilt confers no title to eternal life. The condition of the covenant under which man was placed was perfect obedience. This, from all that appears in Scripture, the perfection of God requires. As He never pardons sins unless the demands of justice be satisfied, so He never grants eternal life unless perfect obedience be rendered. Heaven is always represented as a purchased possession. In the covenant between the Father and the Son the salvation of his people was promised as the reward of his humiliation, obedience, and death. Having performed the stipulated conditions. He has a claim to the promised recompense. And this claim inures to the benefit of his people. But besides this, as the work of Christ consisted in his doing all that the law of God, or covenant of works requires for the salvation of men, and as that righteousness is freely offered to every one that believes, every such believer has as valid a claim to eternal life as he would have had, had he personally done all that the law demands. Thus broad and firm is the foundation which God has laid for the hopes of his people. It is the rock of ages; Jehovah our righteousness.

---

[172] Sess. VI. cap. 7, 4; Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, pp. 24, 25, 22.

[173] De Justificatione, II. ii.; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. pp. 780, e, 781, a.

[174] De Amissione Gratiæ et Statu Peccati, V. vii., Ibid. p. 287, a, b.

---

§ 8. Relation of Faith to Justification.

All who profess to be Christians admit the doctrine of justification by faith. There are different views, however, as to the relation between faith and justification, as has been already intimated.

1. Pelagians and rationalists teach that faith in God's being and perfection, or in the great principles of moral and religious truth, is the source of that moral excellence on account of which we are accepted of God. It is perhaps only a different way of expressing the same idea, to say that God, in the case of Abraham, and, therefore, of other men, accepts the pious state of mind involved in the exercise of faith or confidence in God, in lieu of perfect righteousness.

2. Romanists make faith mere assent. It does not justify as a virtue, or as apprehending the offered righteousness of Christ. It is neither the formal nor the instrumental cause of justification, it is merely the predisposing or occasional cause. A man assents to the truth of Christianity, and to the more special truth that the Church is a divine institution for saving men. He therefore comes to the Church and receives the sacrament of baptism, by which, "ex opere operato," a habit of grace, or spiritual life is infused into the soul, which is the formal cause of justification; i.e., it renders the soul inherently just or holy. In this sense the sinner may be said to be justified by faith. This is the first justification. After the man is thus rendered holy or regenerated, then the exercises of faith have real merit, and enter into the ground of his second justification, by which he becomes entitled to eternal life. But here faith stands on a level with other Christian graces. It is not the only, nor the most important ground of

justification. It is in this view inferior to love, from which faith indeed derives all its virtue as a Christian grace. It is then "fides formata," i.e., faith of which love s the essence, the principle which gives it character.

The Romish Doctrine.

According to the Romish scheme (1.) God is the efficient cause of justification, as it is by his power or supernatural grace that the soul is made just. (2.) Christ is the meritorious cause, as it is for his sake God grants this saving grace, or influence of the Spirit to the children of men. (3.) Inherent righteousness is the formal cause, since thereby the soul is made really just or holy. (4.) Faith is the occasional and predisposing cause, as it leads the sinner to seek justification (regeneration), and disposes God to grant the blessing. In this aspect it has the merit of congruity only, not that of condignity. (5.) Baptism is the essential instrumental cause, as it is only through or by baptism that inherent righteousness is infused or justification is effected. So much for the first justification. After this justification, which makes the sinner holy, then, (6.) Good works, all the fruits and exercises of the new life, have real merit and constitute the ground of the Christian's title to eternal life.

The language of the Council of Trent on this subject is as follows: "Hujus justificationis causæ sunt, finalis quidem, gloria Dei et Christi, ac vita æterna: efficiens vero, misericors Deus, qui gratuito abluit et sanctificat, signans et ungens Spiritu promissionis sancto, ... meritoria autem dilectissimus unigenitus suus, Dominus noster, Jesus Christus, qui, cum essemus inimici, propter nimiam caritatem, qua dilexit nos, sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem [i.e., regeneration] meruit et pro nobis Deo Patri satisfecit: instrumentalis item, sacramentum baptismi, quod est

sacramentum fidei, sine qua nulli unquam contigit justificatio: demum unica formalis causa est justitia Dei, non qua ipse justus est, sed qua nos justos facit: qua videlicet ab eo donati, renovamur spiritu mentis nostræ, et non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur, et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes, unusquisque suam secundum mensuram, quam Spiritus Sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, et secundum propriam cujusque dispositionem et cooperationem." Again, it is said: "Quæ enim justitia nostra dicitur, quia per eam nobis inhærentem justificamur; illa eadem Dei est, quia a Deo nobis infunditur per Christi meritum." [175] All this relates to the first justifications or regeneration, in which the soul passes from spiritual death to spiritual Life. Of the second justification, which gives a title to eternal life, Bellarmin says, [176] "Habet communis catholicorum omnium sententia, opera bona justorum vere, ac proprie esse merita, et merita non cujuscunque præmii, sed ipsius vitæ æternæ." The thirty-second canon of the Tridentine Council at this sixth session anathematizes any one who teaches a different doctrine. "Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus, quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam et Jesu Christi meritum, cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum; anathema sit." It appears from all this that, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, faith has no special or direct connection with justification, and that "justification by faith" in that Church means something entirely different from what is intended by those words in the lips of evangelical Christians.

Remonstrant View.

3. According to the Remonstrants or Arminians, faith is the ground of

justification. Under the Gospel God accepts our imperfect obedience including faith and springing from it, in place of the perfect obedience demanded by the law originally given to Adam. There is one passage in the Bible, or rather one form of expression, which occurs in several places, which seems to favour this view of the subject. In Romans iv. 3, it is said, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness;" and again in ver. 22 of that chapter, and in Galatians iii. 6. If this phrase be interpreted according to the analogy of such passages as Romans ii. 26, "Shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" it does mean that faith is taken or accepted for righteousness. The Bible, however, is the word of God and therefore self-consistent. Consequently if a passage admits of one interpretation inconsistent with the teaching of the Bible in other places, and of another interpretation consistent with that teaching, we are bound to accept the latter. This rule, simple and obvious as it is, is frequently violated, not only by those who deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, but even by men professing to recognize their infallible authority. They seem to regard it as a proof of independence to make each passage mean simply what its grammatical structure and logical connection indicate, without the least regard to the analogy of Scripture. This is unreasonable. In Genesis xv. we are told that Abraham lamented before the Lord that he was childless, and that one born in his house was to be his heir. And God said unto him, "This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels, shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them. And he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord: and He counted it to him for righteousness." Taking this passage by itself, it is inferred that the object of Abraham's faith

was the promise of a numerous posterity. Supposing this to be true, which it certainly is not, what right has any one to assume that Abraham's faith's being imputed to him for righteousness, means anything more than when it is said that the zeal of Phinehas was imputed for righteousness (Ps. cvi. 31); or when in Deuteronomy xxiv. 13, it is said that to return a poor man's pledge "shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God." No one supposes that one manifestation of zeal, or one act of benevolence, is taken for complete obedience to the law. All that the phrase "to impute for righteousness" by itself means, according to Old Testament usage, is, to esteem as right, to approve. The zeal of Phinehas was right. Returning a poor man's pledge was right. These were acts which God approved. And so He approved of Abraham's faith. He gained the favour of God by believing. Now while this is true, far more, as the Apostle teaches, is true. He teaches, first, that the great promise made to Abraham, and faith in which secured his justification, was not that his natural descendants should be as numerous as the stars of heaven, but that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed; secondly, that the seed intended was not a multitude, but one person, and that that one person was Christ (Gal. iii. 16); and, thirdly, that the blessing which the seed of Abraham was to secure for the world was redemption. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: . . . . that the blessing ol Abraham (i.e., the promise made to Abraham) might come on" us. The promise made to Abraham, therefore, was redemption through Christ. Hence those who are Christ's, the Apostle teaches, are Abraham's seed and heirs of his promise. What, therefore, Abraham believed, was that the seed of the woman, the Shiloh, the promised Redeemer of the world, was to be born of him. He believed in Christ, as his Saviour, as his righteousness,

and deliverer, and therefore it was that he was accepted as righteous, not for the merit of his faith, and not on the ground of faith, or by taking faith in lieu of righteousness, but because he received and rested on Christ alone for his salvation.

Unless such be the meaning of the Apostle, it is hard to see how there is any coherence or force in his arguments. His object is to prove that men are justified, not by works, but gratuitously; not for what they are or do, but for what is done for them. They are saved by a ransom; by a sacrifice. But it is absurd to say that trust in a ransom redeems, or is taken in place of the ransom; or that faith in a sacrifice, and not the sacrifice itself, is the ground of acceptance. To prove that such is the Scriptural method of justification, Paul appeals to the case of Abraham. He was not justified for his works, but by faith in a Redeemer. He expected to be justified as ungodly. (Rom. iv. 5.) This, he tells us, is what we must do. We have no righteousness of our own. We must take Christ for our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. In the immediately preceding chapter the Apostle had said we are justified by faith in the blood of Christ, as a propitiation for sin; and for him to prove this from the fact that Abraham was justified on account of his confiding, trusting state of mind, which led him to believe that, although a hundred years old, he should be the father of a numerous posterity, would be a contradiction.

Besides, it is to be remembered, not only that the Scriptures never say that we are justified "on account" of faith (dia pistin), but always "by," or "through" faith (dia or ek pisteos or pistei); but also that it is not by faith as such; not by faith in God, nor in the Scriptures; and not by faith in a specific divine promise such as that made to Abraham of a numerous posterity, or of the possession of the land of Canaan; but only by faith in one particular promise, namely, that of

salvation through Christ. It is, therefore, not on account of the state of mind, of which faith is the evidence, nor of the good works which are its fruits, but only by faith as an act of trust in Christ, that we are justified. This of necessity supposes that He, and not our faith, is the ground of our justification. He, and not our faith, is the ground of our confidence. How can any Christian wish it to be otherwise? What comparison is there between the absolutely perfect and the infinitely meritorious righteousness of Christ, and our own imperfect evangelical obedience as a ground of confidence and peace! This doctrine is moreover dishonouring to the Gospel. It supposes the Gospel to be less holy than the law. The law required perfect obedience; the Gospel is satisfied with imperfect obedience. And how imperfect and insufficient our best obedience is the conscience of every believer certifies. If it does not satisfy us, how can it satisfy God?

The grand objection, however, to this Remonstrant doctrine is to the relation between faith and justification, is that it is in direct contradiction to the plain and pervading teachings of the Word of God. The Bible teaches that we are not justified by works. This doctrine affirms that we are justified by works. The Bible teaches that we are justified by the blood of Christ; that it is for his obedience that the sentence of justification is passed on men. This doctrine affirms that God pronounces us righteous because of our own righteousness. The Bible from first to last teaches that the whole ground of our salvation or of our justification is objective, what Christ as our Redeemer, our ransom, our sacrifice, our surety, has done for us. This doctrine teaches us to look within, to what we are and to what we do, as the ground of our acceptance with God. It may safely be said that this is altogether unsatisfactory to the awakened conscience. The sinner cannot

rely on anything in himself. He instinctively looks to Christ, to his work done for us as the ground of confidence and peace. This in the last resort is the hope of all believers, whatever their theory of justification may be. Whether Papist, Remonstrant, or Augustinian, they all cast their dying eyes on Christ. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

Protestant Doctrine.

4. The common doctrine of Protestants on this subject is that faith is merely the instrumental cause of justification. It is the act of receiving and resting upon Christ, and has no other relation to the end than any other act by which a proffered good is accepted. This is clearly the doctrine of Scripture, (1.) Because we are constantly said to be justified by, or through faith. (2.) Because the faith which justifies is described as a looking, as a receiving, as a coming, as a fleeing for refuge, as a laying hold of, and as a calling upon. (3.) Because the ground to which our justification is referred, and that on which the sinner's trust is placed, is declared to be the blood, the death, the righteousness, the obedience of Christ. (4.) Because the fact that Christ is a ransom, a sacrifice, and as such effects our salvation, of necessity supposes that the faith which interests us in the merit of his work is a simple act of trust. (5.) Because any other view of the case is inconsistent with the gratuitous nature of justification, with the honour of Christ, and with the comfort and confidence of the believer.

---

[175] Sess. VI. cap. 7, 16; Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, vol. i. pp. 24, 25, 32.

[176] De Justificatione, v. 1; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, p. 949, a.

§ 9. Objections to the Protestant Doctrine of Justification.

It is said to lead to Licentiousness.

1. The first, most obvious, and most persistently urged objection against the doctrine of gratuitous justification through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, has already been incidentally considered. That objection is that the doctrine leads to license; that if good works are not necessary to justification, they are not necessary at all; that if God accepts the chief of sinners as readily as the most moral of men, on the simple condition of faith in Christ, then what profit is there in circumcision? in Judaism? in being in the Church? in being good in any form? Why not live in sin that grace may abound? This objection having been urged against the Apostle, it needs no other answer than that which he himself gave it. That answer is found in the sixth and seventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, and is substantially as follows:

First, the objection involves a contradiction. To speak of salvation in sin is as great an absurdity as to speak of life in death. Salvation is deliverance from sin. How then can men be delivered from sin in order that they may live in it. Or, as Paul expresses it, "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?"

Secondly, the very act of faith which secures our justification, secures also our sanctification. It cannot secure the one without securing also the other. This is not only the intention and the desire of the believer, but it is the ordinance of God; a necessary feature of the plan of salvation, and secured by its nature. We take Christ as our Redeemer from sin, from its power as well as from its guilt. And the imputation of his righteousness consequent on faith secures the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as certainly, and for the very same

reasons (the covenant stipulations), that it secures the pardon of our sins. And, therefore, if we are partakers of his death, we are partakers of his life. If we die with Him, we rise with Him. If we are justified, we are sanctified. He, therefore, who lives in sin, proclaims himself an unbeliever. He has neither part nor lot in the redemption of Him who came to save his people from their sins.

Thirdly, our condition, the Apostle says, is analogous to that of a slave, belonging first to one master, then to another. So long as he belonged to one man, he was not under the authority of another. But if freed from the one and made the slave of the other, then he comes under an influence which constrains obedience to the latter. So we were the slaves of sin, but now, freed from that hard master, we have become the servants of righteousness. For a believer, therefore, to live in sin, is just as impossible as for the slave of one man to be at the same time the slave of another. We are indeed free; but not free to sin. We are only free from the bondage of the devil and introduced into the pure, exalted, and glorious liberty of the sons of God.

Fourthly, the objection as made against the Apostle and as constantly repeated since, is urged in the interests of morality and of common sense. Reason itself, it is said, teaches that a man must be good before he can be restored to the favour of God, and if we teach that the number and heinousness of a man's sins are no barrier to his justification, and his good works are no reason why he should be justified rather than the chief of sinners, we upset the very foundations of morality. This is the wisdom of men. The wisdom of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, is very different. According to the Bible the favour of God is the life of the soul. The light of his countenance is to rational creatures what the light of the sun is to the earth, the source of all that is beautiful and good. So long,

therefore, as a soul is under his curse, there is no life-giving or life-sustaining intercourse between it and God. In this state it can only, as the Apostle expresses it, "bring forth fruit unto death." As soon, however, as it exercises faith, it receives the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, God's justice is thereby satisfied, and the Spirit comes and takes up his dwelling in the believer as the source of all holy living. There can therefore be no holiness until there is reconciliation with God, and no reconciliation with God except through the righteousness imputed to us and received by faith alone. Then follow the indwelling of the Spirit, progressive sanctification, and all the fruits of holy living.

It may be said that this scheme involves an inconsistency. there can be no holiness until there is reconciliation, and no reconciliation (so far as adults are concerned) until there is faith. But faith is a fruit of the Spirit, and an act of the renewed soul. Then there is and must be, after all, holy action before there is reconciliation. It might be enough to say in answer to this objection, that logical order and chronological succession are different things; or that the order of nature and order of time are not to be confounded. Many things are contemporaneous or co-instantaneous which nevertheless stand in a certain logical, and even causal relation to each other. Christ commanded the man with a withered arm to stretch forth his hand. He immediately obeyed, but not before he received strength. He called to Lazarus to come forth from the grave; and he came forth. But this presupposes a restoration of life. So God commands the sinner to believe in Christ; and he thereupon receives Him as his Saviour; though this supposes supernatural power or grace.

Our Lord, however, gives another answer to this objection. He says, as recorded in John xvii. 9, "I pray not for the world, but for them which

thou hast given me; for they are thine." The intercession of Christ secures for those given to Him by the Father the renewing of the Holy Ghost. The first act of the renewed heart is faith; as the first act of a restored eye is to see. Whether this satisfies the understanding or not, it remains clear as the doctrine of the Bible that good works are the fruits and consequences of reconciliation with God, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Inconsistent with the Grace of the Gospel.

2. It is objected that the Protestant doctrine destroys the gratuitous nature of justification. If justice be satisfied; if all the demands of the law are met, there can, it is said, be no grace in the salvation of the sinner. If a man owes a debt, and some one pays it for him, the creditor shows no grace in giving an acquittal. This objection is familiar, and so also is the answer. The work of Christ is not of the nature of a commercial transaction. It is not analogous to a pecuniary satisfaction except in one point. It secures the deliverance of those for whom it is offered and by whom it is accepted. In the case of guilt the demand of justice is upon the person of the offender. He, and he alone is bound to answer at the bar of justice. No one can take his place, unless with the consent of the representative of justice and of the substitute, as well as of the sinner himself. Among men, substitution in the case of crime and its penalty is rarely, if ever admissible, because no man has the right over his own life or liberty; he cannot give them up at pleasure; and because no human magistrate has the right to relieve the offender or to inflict the legal penalty on another. But Christ had power, i.e., the right (exousia) to lay down his life and "power to take it again" And God, as absolute judge and sovereign, the Lord of the conscience, and the proprietor of all his creatures, was at full liberty to accept a substitute for sinners. This

is proved beyond contradiction by what God has actually done. Under the old dispensation every sacrifice appointed by the law was a substitute for him in whose behalf it was offered. In the clearest terms it was predicted that the Messiah was to be the substitute of his people; that the chastisement of their sins was to be laid on Him, and that He was to make his soul an offering for sin. He was hailed as He entered on his ministry as the Lamb of God who was to bear the sins of the world. He died the just for the unjust. He redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us. This is what is meant by being a substitute. To deny this is to deny the central idea of the Scriptural doctrine of redemption. To explain it away, is to absorb as with a sponge the life-blood of the Gospel.

It is the glory, the power, and the preciousness of the Protestant doctrine that it makes the salvation of sinners a matter of grace from the beginning to the end. On the part of the eternal Father it was of grace, i.e., of unmerited, mysterious, and immeasurable love that He provided a substitute for sinners, and that He spared not his own Son, but freely gave Him up for us all It was a matter of grace, i.e., of love to sinners, to the ungodly, to his enemies, that the eternal Son of God became man, assumed the burden of our sins, fulfilled all righteousness, obeying and suffering even unto death, that we might not perish but have eternal life. It is of grace that the Spirit applies to men the redemption purchased by Christ; that He renews the heart; that He overcomes the opposition of sinners, making them willing in the day of his power; that He bears with all their ingratitude, disobedience, and resistance, and never leaves them until his work is consummated in glory. In all this the sinner is not treated according to his character and conduct. He has no claim to any one in this long catalogue of mercies. Everything to him is a matter of unmerited grace. Merited

grace, indeed, is a solecism. And so is merited salvation in the case of sinners.

Grace does not cease to be grace because it is not exercised in violation of order, propriety, and justice. It is not the weak fondness of a doting parent. It is the love of a holy God, who in order to reveal that love and manifest the exceeding glory of that attribute when exercised towards the unworthy, did what was necessary to render its exercise consistent with the other perfections of the divine nature. It was indispensable that God should be just in justifying the ungodly, but He does not thereby cease to be gracious, inasmuch as it was He who provided the ransom by which the objects of his love are redeemed from the curse of the law and the power of sin.

God cannot declare the Unjust to be Just.

3. Another standing objection to the Protestant doctrine has been so often met, that nothing but its constant repetition justifies a repetition of the answer. It is said to be absurd that one man should be righteous with the righteousness of another; that for God to pronounce the unjust just is a contradiction. This is a mere play on words. It is, however, very serious play; for it is caricaturing truth.

It is indeed certain that the subjective, inherent quality of one person or thing cannot by imputation become the inherent characteristic of any other person or thing. Wax cannot become hard by the imputation of the hardness of a stone, nor can a brute become rational by the imputation of the intelligence of a man; nor the wicked become good by the imputation of the goodness of other men. But what has this to do with one man's assuming the responsibility of another man? If among men the bankrupt can become solvent by a rich man's assuming his responsibilities, why in the court of God may not the guilty become righteous by the Son of God's assuming their responsibilities? If He

was made sin for us, why may we not be made the righteousness of God in Him? The objection assumes that the word "just" or "righteous" in this connection, expresses moral character; whereas in the Bible, when used in relation to this subject, it is always used in a judicial sense, i.e., it expresses the relation of the person spoken of to justice. Dikaios is antithetical to hupodikos. The man with regard to whom justice is unsatisfied, is hupodikos, "guilty." He with regard to whom justice is satisfied, is dikaios, "righteous." To declare righteous, therefore, is not to declare holy; and to impute righteousness is not to impute goodness; but simply to regard and pronounce chose who receive the gift of Christ's righteousness, free from condemnation and entitled to eternal life for his sake. Some philosophical theologians seem to think that there is real antagonism between love and justice in the divine nature, or that these attributes are incompatible or inharmonious. This is not so in man, why then should it be so in God? The highest form of moral excellence includes these attributes as essential elements of its perfection. And the Scriptures represent them as mysteriously blended in the salvation of man. The gospel is a revelation to principalities and powers in heaven of the polupoikilos sophia tou Theou, because therein He shows that He can be just and yet justify, love, sanctify, and glorify the chief of sinners. For which all sinners should render Him everlasting thanksgiving and praise.

Christ's Righteousness due for Himself.

4. It was natural that Socinus, who regarded Christ as a mere man, should object to the doctrine of the imputation of his righteousness to the believer, that Christ was under the same obligation to obey the law and to take his share of human suffering as other men, and therefore that his righteousness being due for Himself, could not be imputed to others. This objection is substantially urged by some who admit the

divinity of Christ. In doing so, however, they virtually assume the Nestorian, or dualistic view of Christ's person. They argue on the assumption that He was a human person, and that he stood, in virtue of his assumption of our nature, in the same relation to the law as other men. It is admitted, however, that the Son, who became incarnate, was from eternity the second person in the Godhead. If, therefore, humanity as assumed by him was a person, then we have two persons, -- two Christs, -- the one human, the other divine. But if Christ be only one person, and if that person be the eternal Son of God, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory with the Father, then the whole foundation of the objection is gone. Christ sustained no other relation to the law, except so far as voluntarily assumed, than that which God himself sustains. But God is not under the law. He is Himself the primal, immutable, and infinitely perfect law to all rational creatures. Christ's subjection to the law therefore, was as voluntary as his submitting to the death of the cross. As He did not die for Himself, so neither did He obey for Himself. In both forms of his obedience He acted for us, as our representative and substitute, that through his righteousness many might be made righteous.

As to the other form of this objection, it has the same foundation and admits of the same answer. It is said that the obedience and sufferings of Christ, being the obedience and sufferings of a mere man, or at best of only the human element in the constitution of his person, could have only a human, and, therefore, only a finite value, and consequently could be no adequate satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Our Lord told his disciples. "Ye are of more value than many sparrows." If, then, in the sight of God a man is of far greater value than irrational creatures, why should it be thought incredible that the blood of the eternal Son of God should cleanse from all sin? What a man does with

his hands, the man does; and what Christ through his human nature did, in the execution of his mediatorial work, the Son of God did.

Therefore, men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit did not hesitate to say, that the Lord of glory was crucified (1 Cor. ii. 8), and that God purchased the Church" with his own blood." (Acts xx. 28.)

[177] If, then, the obedience rendered, and the sufferings endured, were those of a divine person, we can only shut our mouths and bow down before God in adoring wonder, with the full assurance that the merit of that obedience and of those sufferings, must be abundantly sufficient for the justification of every sinner upon earth, in the past, the present, or the future.

Believers continue Guilty, and liable to Punishment.

5. It is sometimes objected to the Protestant doctrine on this subject, that believers not only recognize themselves as justly exposed to condemnation for their present shortcomings and transgressions, but that the Scriptures so represent them, and constantly speak of God as punishing his people for their sins. How is this to be reconciled with the doctrine that they are not under condemnation; that, as regards them, justice has been fully satisfied, and that no one can justly lay anything to the charge of God's elect.

It must be admitted, or rather it is fully acknowledged that every believer feels himself unworthy of the least of God's mercies. He knows that if God were to deal with him according to his character and conduct, he must inevitably be condemned. This sense of ill-desert or demerit, is indelible. It is a righteous judgment which the sinner passes, and cannot but pass upon himself. But the ground of his justification is not in himself. The believer acknowledges that in himself he deserves nothing but indignation and wrath, not only for what he has been, but for what he now is. This is what he feels when he

looks at himself. Nevertheless, he knows that there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus; that Christ has assumed the responsibility of answering for him at the bar of God; that He constantly pleads his own perfect righteousness, as a reason why the deserved penalty should not be inflicted. If punishment were not deserved, pardon would not be gratuitous; and if not felt to be deserved, deliverance could not be received as a favour. The continued sense of ill-desert, on the part of the believer, is in no wise inconsistent with the Scriptural doctrine that the claims of justice in regard to him have been satisfied by his substitute and advocate. There is a great difference, as often remarked, between demerit and guilt. The latter is the liability in justice to the penalty of the law. The former is personal ill-desert. A criminal who has suffered the legal punishment of his crime, is no longer justly exposed to punishment for that offence. He however thinks of himself no better than he did before. He knows he cannot be subjected to further punishment; but his sense of demerit is not thereby lessened. And so it is with the believer; he knows that, because of what Christ has done for him, he cannot be justly condemned, but he feels and admits that in himself he is as hell-deserving as he was from the beginning. The heart of the believer solves many difficulties which the speculative understanding finds it hard to unravel. And it need not inordinately trouble him, if the latter be dissatisfied with the solution, provided he is sure that he is under the guidance of the Spirit by the word.

This Theory concerns only the Outward.

6. Modern theologians in many instances object to the Protestant doctrine of justification, that it is outward; concerns only legal relations; disregards the true nature of the mystical union, and represents Christ and his righteousness as purely objective, instead of

looking upon Christ as giving Himself, his life to become the life of the believer, and with his life conveying its merits and its power. We are not concerned at present with the theory on which this objection is founded, but simply with the objection itself. What is urged as an objection to the doctrine is true. It does concern what is outward and objective; what is done for the sinner rather than what is done within him. But then it is to be considered, first, that this is what the sinner needs. He requires not only that his nature should be renewed and that a new principle of spiritual or divine life should be communicated to him; but also that his guilt should be removed, his sins expiated, and justice satisfied, as the preliminary condition of his enjoying this new life, and being restored to the favour of God. And secondly, that such is the constant representation of Scripture, our only trustworthy guide in matters of religious doctrine. The Bible makes quite as prominent what Christ does for us, as what He does in us. It says as much of his objective, expiatory work, as of the communication of a higher spiritual life to believers. It is only by ignoring this objective work of Christ, or by merging justification into inward renovation, that this objection has force or even plausibility. Protestants do not depreciate the value and necessity of the new life derived from Christ, because, in obedience to the Scriptures, they insist so strenuously upon the satisfaction which He has rendered by his perfect righteousness to the justice of God. Without the latter, the former is impossible.

---

[177] The text in this passage is indeed disputed. The common text has theou "the Church of God;" which is retained by Mill, Bengel, Knapp, Hahn, and others in their editions of the New Testament. Many MSS, have kuriou kai theou; and others, simply kuriou. The fact that the phrase

"the Church of God" occurs eleven times in the New Testament, while "Church of the Lord" never occurs, is urged as a reason in favour of the latter reading, as it is assumed that transcribers would be apt to adopt a familiar, rather than unexampled expression. There may be some force in this. On the other hand, the presumption is that the sacred writers adhere to their own "usus loquendi." The words in Acts xx. 28 are Paul's words, and as he, at least in ten other cases, speaks of the "Church of God," and never once uses the expression "Church of the Lord," it is in the highest degree improbable that he uses that phrase here. Besides, it is evident that transcribers, critics, and heretics would have a strong disposition to get rid of such a phrase as "the blood of God." Modern critics do not hesitate to assign, as one of their reasons for rejecting the common text, that the expression is "too strong." The passage, however, though sacred, is not essential. the usage pervades the New Testament of predicating of the person of Christ what is true of either element, the human or the divine, of his mysteriously constituted personality. In Hebrews i. 3 the person who upholds the universe by the word of his power, is said to have purged our sins by Himself, i.e., by the sacrifice of Himself. And in ii. 14, the person whom the sacred writer had set forth as higher than the angels, as God, as creator of heaven and earth, as eternal and immutable, is said to have become partaker of flesh and blood, in order that by death He might destroy him that had the power of death. And in Philippians ii. 6, 9, he who was in the form of God and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Nevertheless, Acts xx. 28 be not essential to prove any doctrine, those who believe it as it reads in the common text, to be part of the word of God, are bound to stand by it.

---

§ 10. Departures from the Protestant Doctrine.

Osiander.

During the lifetime of the Reformers, a very earnest controversy began in the Lutheran Church on the nature of justification. This arose from the views of Andreas Osiander, a man of distinguished learning and of a speculative turn of mind; eminent first as a preacher, and afterwards as a professor in the university of Königsberg. His principal work is entitled "De Unico Mediatore Jesu Christo et Justificatione Fidei. Confessio Andreæ Osiandri." His difference of opinion from the other Reformers so clearly indicated in the following words, in which he denounces the errors which he means to oppose: "Omnes horribiliter errant. Primo, quia verbum justificare tantum pro justum reputare et pronunciare intelligunt, atque interpretantur, et non pro eo, quod est, reipsa et in veritate justum efficere. Deinde etiam in hoc quod nullam differentiam tenent inter redemptionem et justificationem, quum tamen magna differentia sit, sicut vel inde intelligi sit, quod homines furem a suspendio redimere possunt, bonum et justum efficere non possunt. Porro etiam in hoc, quod nihil certe statuere possunt, quid tandem justitia Christi sit, quam per fidem in nobis esse, nobisque imputari oporteat. Ac postremo errant omnium rudissime etiam in hoc, quod divinam naturam Christi a justificatione separant, et Christum dividunt atque solvunt, id quod haud dubie execrandi Satanæ opus est." [178] Osiander taught, (1.) That Christ has redeemed us by the satisfaction which He rendered to divine justice. (2.) But he denied that this was any part of our justification. (3.) He maintained that to justify does not mean to declare just, or to render righteous in a judicial or forensic sense, but to render inherently or subjectively just and holy. (4.) That the righteousness of Christ by which the believer is justified, and which he receives by faith, and which is imputed to him

in the judgment of God, is not, as the Protestants taught, the work of Christ, consisting in what He did and suffered as the substitute of sinners, nor is it, as Romanists teach, the work of the Holy Spirit consisting in the infusion of a holy nature or of new habits of grace, but it is the "essential righteousness of God," "the divine essence, "God Himself." (5.) That consequently the proximate and real ground of our acceptance with God, and of our reception into heaven, is what we are, or what we become, in virtue of this in-dwelling of God in the soul.

The speculations of Osiander as to the nature of God and his relation to man, might have led him under any circumstances to adopt the peculiar views above stated, but the proximate cause was no doubt the reaction from the too exclusive prominence given at that time to the objective work of Christ. This is not to be wondered at, and perhaps was not to be blamed. The Romanists, with whom the Protestants had to contend, did not deny the necessity of an inward change in the nature of fallen man. But they made this almost all of Christ's redeeming work. What He did for the expiation of sin and for meeting the demands of justice, was only to open the way for God's giving renewing and sanctifying grace to sinners. Men were themselves to merit eternal life. It was unavoidable therefore, that the Reformers should strenuously insist upon what Christ did for us and that they should protest against confounding justification with sanctification. Osiander's cast of mind made him revolt at this, and carried him completely over to the Romish side, so far as the nature of justification is concerned. He said that the Protestant doctrine of justification is "colder than ice." It is as though a man should pay the ransom of a Turkish slave, and leave him and his children in bondage. Still more violent is his denunciation of the doctrine that

Christ's righteousness, of which we partake through faith, consists of his obedience and sufferings. What good can they do us? Christ obeyed and suffered centuries ago; we cannot appropriate what He then did and make it our own. Imputing it to us does not alter the case. It does not make us better. Speculative as well as Biblical reasons, however, prevented Osiander from accepting the Romish solution of the difficulty. What we are said to receive is "the righteousness of Christ," "the righteousness of God;" but sanctifying grace is never called the righteousness of God. If, therefore, that righteousness by which the believer is constituted righteous, be neither the obedience of Christ, nor infused grace, what can it be other than the essential righteousness of God, the divine essence itself? Calvin, who in his "Institutes" earnestly combats the theory of Osiander, says that he invented "monstrum nescio quod essentialis justitiæ." "Dilucide exprimit, se non ea justitia contentum, quæ nobis obedientia et sacrificio mortis Christi parta est, fingere nos substantialiter in Deo justos esse tam essentia quam qualitate infusa. . . . . Substantialem mixtionem ingerit, qua Deus se in nos transfundens, quasi partem sui faciat. Nam virtute Spiritus sancti fieri, ut coalescamus cum Christo, nobisque sit caput et nos ejus membra, fere pro nihilo ducit, nisi ejus essentia nobis misceatur." [179]

But what theory of the nature of God and of his relation to man did Osiander hold, which admitted of this doctrine of the infusion of the divine essence into the soul? His views on this point were not clearly brought out, but the primary idea which underlies his speculation is the old doctrine of the oneness of God and man. Man is God in at least one form of his existence. He held that Christ is the image, the representative, the realized ideal of the Godhead, not as Logos or Son, but as Godman, the Theanthropos. As from its nature or from the nature

of God this idea realized, this manifestation of God in his true idea must occur, and therefore the incarnation would have taken place had man never sinned. The fall of Adam only modified the circumstances attending the incarnation, determining that it should involve suffering and death. But the incarnation itself, the appearance of God in fashion as a man arose from a law of the divine nature. Adam was created not after the image of God as such, but after the image of Christ; in some sort, a God-man. The affinity of this theory with the modern pantheistic speculations is apparent. Baur, therefore, is doubtless right when he says, at the close of his apologetic notice of Osiander's doctrine, that his idea of the relation between the divine and human "is that which at last found its adequate scientific expression by Schleiermacher and Hegel, that Christ as Redeemer is the perfected creation of human nature; or, that the divine nature is the truth of humanity, and human nature the reality, or existence-form (die Wirklichkeit) of the divine nature." [180]

Stancarus.

Stancarus, a contemporary and opponent of Osiander, went to the extreme of asserting that the righteousness of Christ was the work of his human nature exclusively. This doctrine was however repudiated by the Romanists as well as by Protestants. If it was Christ's human nature as such (and not the divine person) who obeyed, then the human nature in Christ was a distinct subsistence, and thus the unity of his person is destroyed. Besides, if it was not a divine person in his human nature who obeyed and suffered, then we have but a human Saviour, and a righteousness of no higher than a human value. We know from Scripture that it was the Lord of glory who was crucified, the Son of God who, being born of a woman, was made under the law.

Piscator.

The first conspicuous departure from the Protestant doctrine of justification among the Reformed, was on the part of Piscator, whose denial of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ to the believer, excited for some years a good deal of discussion, but it passed away without leaving any distinct trace in the theology of the Reformation. Baur, indeed, assigns to it more importance, as he regards it as the first step in the downfall of the whole doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, over which he rejoices. Piscator was a native of Strasburg, and a member of the Lutheran Church, to whose service his first ministerial and professional labors were devoted. It coming to the knowledge of the ecclesiastical authorities that in his exposition of the Epistle to the Philippians he denied the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ, and taught the doctrine of predestination, he was deprived of his position in the Lutheran Church and passed over to the Reformed. He was soon appointed one of the professors of the new Institution of Hebron founded by the Duke of Nassau. He remained in connection with that institution from 1584 until his death in 1625, in the seventy-ninth year of his age. He was a prolific writer. Besides a new translation of the Bible, he wrote numerous commentaries on books of the Old and New Testaments, and conducted many controversies with Lutherans and Romanists, before he embroiled himself with the theologians of his own church. [181] He took the ground that the "imputatio justitiæ" and "remissio peccatorum" are identical; the former means nothing more than the latter; and consequently that Christ's work consists simply in the expiation of sin. His active obedience to the divine law constitutes no part of the righteousness by which the believer is justified before God. He admits that Christ rendered a twofold obedience, -- the one to the law of God as a rule of duty; the other to the special command given to Him as Mediator. He

came to accomplish a certain work; to do the will of the Father, which was to make satisfaction for sin. In this we are interested; but his obedience to the moral law was for Himself, and was the necessary condition of his satisfaction. He could not have made atonement for others had He not been Himself holy. "Tribuitur morti," he says, [182] "quod ei tribuendum, nimirum, quod sit plenissima satisfactio pro peccatis nostris; sic etiam vitæ obedientiæ tribuitur, quod scriptura ei tribuendum perhibet, nimirum, quod sit causa, sine qua non potuerat Christus idoneus esse mediator inter Deum et hominem." Although Piscator made some effort to prove exegetically that pardon and justification, the remission of sin and imputation of righteousness, are identical, yet his arguments against the received doctrine, that the obedience of Christ is part our justifying righteousness, are not Biblical. The question before his mind was not simply, What do the Scriptures teach? but, What is true, logical, and symmetrical? He saw objections to the imputation of the active obedience of Christ, which seemed to him fatal, and on the ground of those objections he rejected the doctrine. Thus, for example, he argues that Christ's obedience to the law was due from Himself as a man, and therefore not imputable to others. He argues thus, [183] "Qui Christum dicunt ubique ut hominem, Christum dicunt non hominem, dum enim dico ubique, dico Deum, qui solus est in coelo et in terra. Similiter cum dico subjectum legi, dico hominem. Qui ergo Christum subjectum legi negant, negant ipsum esse hominem." Every man as such in virtue of being a man's individually bound to obey the moral law. Christ was a man; therefore He was bound to obey the law for Himself. He did not perceive, or was not willing to admit, that the word "man" is taken in different senses in the different members of this syllogism, and therefore, the conclusion is vitiated. In the first clause, "man" means a human person; in the

second clause, it means human nature. Christ was not a human person, although He assumed human nature. He was a man in the sense in which we are dust and ashes. But because we are dust, it does not follow that all that may be predicated of dust, may be predicated of us; e.g., that we have no life, no reason, no immortality. In like manner, although the eternal Son of God took upon Himself a true body and a reasonable soul, yet as He was a divine person, it does not follow that everything that is true of human persons must be true of Him. Piscator also argues that the law binds either to punishment or to obedience, but not to both at once. Therefore, if Christ's obedience is imputed to us, there was no necessity that He should die for us. On the other hand, if He died for us, there was no necessity that He should obey for us. The principle here assumed may be true with regard to unfallen man. But where sin has been committed there is need of expiation as well as of obedience, and of obedience as well as expiation, if the reward of perfect obedience is to be conferred. Again, he says, if Christ has fulfilled the law for us, we are not bound to keep it. This is the old objection of the Jews; if justified by grace we may live in sin. But Christ has fulfilled the law for us only as a covenant of works. In that sense, says the Apostle, we are not under the law, but it does not thence follow that we are free from all moral obligation arising from our relation to God, as rational creatures. It may be true as Baur, himself a thorough skeptic in the English and American sense of that word, thinks, that this innovation of Piscator prepared the way for the rejection of the whole Scriptural doctrine of satisfaction. Certain it is that both Lutherans and Reformed united, with scarcely a dissenting voice, in the condemnation of Piscator's doctrine. It was judicially repudiated by the national Synod of France on several different occasions; first in 1603, again at La Rochelle in 1607, and afterwards

in 1612 and 1613. The Swiss churches in the "Formula Consensus Helvetica," which received symbolical authority in Switzerland, pronounced clearly in favour of the old doctrine. This matter was soon lost sight of in consequence of the rise of Arminianism of far more historical importance.

The Arminian Doctrine.

Jacobus Arminius, a man of learning, talents, attractive accomplishments, and exemplary character, was born in Holland 1560, and died professor in the University of Leyden, in 1609, having filled the chair of theology since 1603. His departures from the Reformed doctrines in which he had been educated were far less serious than those of his successors, although involving them, apparently, by a logical necessity. His great difficulty was with the doctrine of predestination or the sovereignty of God in election. He could not, however, get rid of that doctrine without denying the entire inability of man to do what is spiritually good. He, therefore, taught that although mankind fell in Adam and are born in a state of sin and condemnation, and are of themselves entirely unable to turn from sin to holiness, yet that they are able to coöperate with the grace of the Holy Spirit given to all men, especially to all who hear the Gospel, in sufficient measure to enable them to repent and believe, and to persevere in holy living unto the end. But whether any man doe thus repent and believe, or, having believed, perseveres in a holy life, depends on himself and not on God. The purpose of election, therefore, is not a purpose to save, and to that end to give faith and repentance to a definite number of individuals, but a purpose to save those who repent, believe, and persevere in faith until the end. The work of Christ has, therefore, an equal reference to all men. He made full satisfaction to God for the sins of all and every man, so that God can

now consistently offer salvation to all men on the conditions laid down in the Gospel.

This is a self-consistent scheme. One part implies, or necessitates admission of the others. The above statement includes all the doctrines presented by the followers of Arminius, after his death, to the authorities in the form of a Remonstrance, as a justification of their views. Hence the Arminians were called Remonstrants. The document just mentioned contains the five points on which its authors and their associates differed from the Reformed faith. The first relates to predestination, which is explained as the purpose "illos in Christo, propter Christum et per Christum servare, qui Spiritus Sancti gratia, in eundem ejus filjum credunt, et in ea, fideique obedientia, per eandem gratiam in finem perseverant: contra vero eos, qui non convertentur et infideles, in peccato et iræ subjectos relinquere, et condemnare, secundum illud Evang. Joann. iii. 36."

The second relates to the work of Christ, as to which it is said, "Proinde Jesum Christum mundi servatorem pro omnibus et singulis mortuum esse, atque ita quidem, ut omnibus per mortem Christi reconciliationem et peccatorum remissionem impetravit: ea tamen conditione, ut nemo illa remissione peccatorum re ipsa fruatur, præter hominem fidelem, et hoc quoque secundum Evang. Joann. iii. 16, et 1 Joann. ii. 2."

The third, concerning the sinner's ability, declares, "Hominem vero salutarem fidem a se ipso non habere, nec vi liberi sui arbitrii, quandoquidem in statu defectionis et peccati nihil boni, quandoquidem vere bonum est, quale quid est fides salutaris, ex se possit cogitare, vel facere: sed necessarium esse eum a Deo in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum regigni et renovari mente, affectibus, seu voluntate et omnibus facultatibus, ut aliquid boni possit intelligere, cogitare, velle et

perficere. Ev. Joann. xv. 5." No Augustinian, whether Lutheran or Calvinist, can say more than that, or desire more to be said by others. The fourth article, concerning grace, however, shows the point of departure: "Hanc Dei gratiam esse initium, progressum ac perfectionem omnis boni, atque id eo quidem usque ut ipse homo regenitus absque hac præcedentia, sen adventitia excitante, consequente et cooperante gratia, neque boni quid cogitare, velle, aut facere possit, neque etiam ulli malæ tentatione resistere; adeo quidem ut omnia bona opera, quæ excogitare possumus, Dei gratiæ in Christo tribuenda sint; quod vero modum operationis illius gratiæ, illa non irresistibilis; de multis enim dicitur eos Spiritui Sancto resistere, Act. vii. 51 et alibi multis locis." It was not to be expected, in a brief exposition of principles designed for the justification of those who hold them, as members of a Reformed or Calvinistic church, that doubtful terms should be explained. It is beyond controversy, however, and, it is believed, is not controverted, that irresistible is here used in the sense of certainty efficacious. The Holy Spirit operates on the hearts of all men. Some are thereby renewed and brought to faith and repentance; others are not. This difference, according to the Remonstrants, is not to be referred to the nature of the influence exerted, but to the fact that some yield to this grace and coöperate with it; while others reject and resist it.

The fifth article refers to the perseverance of the saints, and is indefinite. It admits that the Spirit furnishes grace abundantly sufficient to enable the believer to persevere in holiness: "Sed an illi ipsi negligentia sua initium sui esse in Christo deserere non possint, et præsentem mundum iterum amplecti, a sancta doctrina ipsis semel tradita deficere, conscientiæ naufragium facere, a gratia excidere; penitus ex sacra Scriptura esset expendum, antequam illud cum

plena animi tranquillitate et plerophoria docere possent." Of course no man who believed the doctrine could write thus, and this doubtful mode of expression was soon laid aside, and "falling from grace," in the common sense of the phrase, was admitted to be an Arminian doctrine.

It will be observed that the doctrine of justification is not embraced in the five points in the Remonstrance as presented to the authorities in Holland, and as made the basis of the decisions of the Synod of Dort. The aberration of the Arminians, however, from the faith of the Reformed churches, extended to all the doctrines connected with the plan of salvation. Arminius himself, at least, held far higher and more Scriptural views on original sin, inability, and the necessity of supernatural grace, than those which have since become so prevalent even among the Reformed or Calvinistic churches themselves. In matters concerning the method of salvation, especially as to the nature of Christ's work and its application to the believer, they at first adhered closely to the language of the Reformed confessions. Thus they did not hesitate to say that Christ made full satisfaction for the sins of men; that He was a ransom, a sacrifice, a propitiation; that He made expiation for sin; that his righteousness or obedience is the ground of our acceptance with God; that the faith which saves is not mere assent to truth, or pious confidence in God, but specifically faith in Christ as the Saviour of men; and that justification is an act of God pronouncing the sinner just, or in which He pardons sin and accepts the sinner as righteous. All this is satisfactory to the ear. Language, however, admits a different interpretations and it soon became apparent and avowed that the Remonstrants intended something very different from what the Reformed Church meant to express by the same terms.

1. They said that Christ's work was a satisfaction to divine justice. But they did not mean by satisfaction, either a "solutio," a real value

rendered for what was due; nor even an "acceptio," taking one thing for another as an equivalent; but an "acceptilatio," a gracious acceptance as a satisfaction of that which in its own nature was no equivalent; as though God should accept the life of a brute for that of a man; or faith for perfect obedience. Neither did the Remonstrants mean by justice the attribute which requires the righteous distribution of rewards and punishments, and which renders it necessary that the penalty of the law should be executed in case of transgression.

With regard to this latter point (the nature of justice) the language of Grotius, and of the great body of the Remonstrant or Arminian theologians, is perfectly explicit. Grotius says: "Poenas infligere, aut a poenis aliquem liberare, quem punire possis, quod justificare vocat Scriptura, non est nisi rectoris, qua talis primo et per se: ut, puta, in familia patris; in republica regis, in universo Dei. . . . . Unde sequitur, omnino hic Deum considerandum, ut rectorem." [184] Again, [185] "Ratio [cur rectori relaxare legem talem non liceat, nisi causa aliqua accedat, si non necessaria, certe sufficiens'] . . . . est, quod actus ferendi aut relaxandi legem non sit actus absoluti dominii, sed actus imperii, qui tendere debeat ad boni ordinis conservationem." [186] "Poena enim omnis propositum habet bonum commune." "Prudentia quoque hoc nomine rectorem ad poenam incitat. Augetur præterea causa puniendi, ubi lex aliqua publicata est, quæ poenam minatur. Nam tunc omissio poenæ ferme aliquid detrahit de legis authoritate apud subditos." [187]

Here everything is purely governmental. It is not justice, in the proper and ordinary sense of the word, that is satisfied, but God's wise and benevolent regard to the interests of his moral government. This changes everything. If God's justice be not satisfied guilt is not removed, and sin is not expiated. And therefore conscience is not

appeased; nor can the real authority and honour of the law be upheld. As to the other point, the nature of the satisfaction rendered it was not a real equivalent, which by its intrinsic value met the obligations of the sinner, but it was something graciously accepted as such. Although Grotius rejects the use of the word "acceptilatio," and endeavours to show that it does not express his meaning, nevertheless, though he repudiates the word, he retains the idea. He says, [188] "Ea est pretii natura, ut sui valore aut æstimatione alterum moveat ad concedendam rem, aut jus aliquod, puta impunitatem." This amounts to the principle of Duns Scotus that a thing avails (is worth) for what God pleases to take it. Although Grotius does not carry out the principle to the length to which the Schoolmen carried it, and say that God might have accepted the death of one man as a satisfaction for the sins of the world, or the blood of bulls or of goats as a real expiation, nevertheless, he teaches that God graciously accepted "aliquid pro aliquo," the death of Christ for the death of all the world, not because of its being a real equivalent in itself, but because as ruler, having the right to remit sin without any satisfaction, He saw that the interests of his government could thereby be promoted. Still more clearly is this idea expressed by Limborch: [189] "In eo errant quam maxime, quod velint redemtionis pretium per omnia equivalens esse debere miseriæ illi, e qua redemtio fit: redemtionis pretium enim constitui solet pro libera æstimatione illius, qui captivum detinet, non autem solvi pro captivi merito. . . . . Ita pretium, quod Christus persolvit, juxta Dei Patris æstimationem persolutum est."

According to Grotius, Christ died as an example, "exemplum poenæ." The whole efficacy of his work was its moral impression on the universe. It was not an expiation or satisfaction for past sins, but a means of

deterring from the commission of sin in the future. This, as Baur [190] and Strauss [191] remark, is the point in which the theory of Grotius and that of Socinus coincide. They both refer the efficacy of Christ's work to the moral impression which it makes on the minds of intelligent creatures. They refer that moral influence, indeed, to different causes, but moral impression is all the efficacy it has. Although the word satisfaction is retained by Grotius, the idea attached to it by the Church is rejected. The leading Remonstrant or Arminian theologians, as Episcopius, Curcellæus, and Limborch, differ from Grotius in their mode of presenting this subject. Instead of regarding the work of Christ as an example of punishment, designed to deter from the commission of sin, they adhere to the Scriptural mode of regarding Him as a ransom and sacrifice. The difference however is more in form than in reality. They admit that Christ redeems us by giving Himself as a ransom for many. But a ransom, as Curcellæus says, is not an equivalent; it is anything the holder of the captive sees fit to accept. It is admitted, also, that Christ gave Himself as a sacrifice for our salvation; but a sacrifice is said not to be a satisfaction to justice, but simply the condition on which pardon is granted. Under the Old Testament God pardoned sin on the occasion of the sacrifice of irrational animals; under the New Testament, on the occasion of the sacrifice of Christ. "Sacrificia," says Limborch, [192] "non sunt solutiones debitorum, neque plenariæ pro peccatis satisfactiones; sed illis peractis conceditur gratuita peccati remissio." "Redemtionis pretium constitui solet pro libera æstimatione illius, qui captivum detinet." We know, however, from Scripture that a sacrifice was not merely an arbitrarily appointed antecedent of gratuitous forgiveness; it was not simply an acknowledgment of guilt. We know also that the blood of bulls and of goats under the Old Testament could not take away

sin; it availed only to the purifying of the flesh, or the remission of ceremonial penalties. The only efficacy of the Old Testament sacrifices, so far as sin committed against God is concerned, was sacramental; that is, they signified, sealed, and applied the benefits of the only real and effectual expiation for sin, to those who believed. As the victim symbolically bore the penalty due to the offender, so the eternal Son of God really bore our sins, really became a curse for us, and thus made a true and perfect satisfaction to God for our offences.

2. As the Remonstrants denied that Christ's work was a real satisfaction for sin, they of necessity denied any real justification of the sinner. Justification with them is merely pardon. This is asserted by Grotius in the passage above cited; and even the Rev. Richard Watson, whose excellent system of theology, or "Theological Institutes," is deservedly in high repute among the Wesleyan Methodists, not only over and over defines justification as pardon, but elaborately argues the question. "The first point," he says, "which we find established by the language of the New Testament is, that justification, the pardon and remission of sins, the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are terms and phrases of the same import." [193] He then goes on to establish that position.

If therefore, pardon and justification are distinct things, the one the executive act of a ruler, the other a judicial act; the one setting aside the demands of justice, the other a declaration that justice is satisfied; then those who reduce justification to mere pardon, deny the doctrine of justification as understood and professed by the Lutheran and Reformed churches. It of course is not intended that these Remonstrant or Arminian theologians do not hold what they call justification; nor is it denied that they at times, at least, express

their doctrine in the very language of the Symbols of the Protestant churches. Thus the Remonstrants [194] say, "Justificatio est actio Dei, quam Deus pure pute in sua ipsius mente efficit, quia nihil aliud est, quam volitio aut decretum, quo peccata remittere, et justitiam imputare aliquando vult iis, qui credunt, id est, quo vult poenas, peccatis eorum promeritas, iis non infligere, eosque tanquam justos tractare et premio afficere." Nevertheless they tell us that they mean by this only pardon. Protestants, when they say justification includes pardon "and" the imputation of righteousness, mean two distinct things by pardon and imputation of righteousness. The Remonstrants regard them as identical, and, therefore, can use the very language of Protestants, while rejecting their doctrine. As every one feels and knows that when a criminal is pardoned by the executive, and allowed to resume his rights of property and right of voting, he is not thereby justified; so every candid mind must admit that there is an immense difference between the Remonstrant or Arminian doctrine of justification and that held as the cardinal principle of the Reformation by both Lutherans and Reformed.

3. This difference becomes still more apparent when we consider what the Remonstrants make the ground of justification As they deny that Christ made any real satisfaction to divine justice (as distinguished from benevolence), so they deny that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer as the ground of his justification. On this point, Limborch [195] says, "Hæc autem, quæ nobis imputatur, non est Christi justitia; nus quam enim Scriptura docet, Christi justitiam nobis imputari; sed tantum fidem nobis imputari in justitiam, et quidem propter Christum." And Curcellæus [196] says, "Nullibi docet Scriptura justitiam Christi nobis imputari. Et id absurdum est. Nemo enim in se injustus aliena justitia potest esse formaliter justus, non magis, quam aliena albedine Æthiops esse albus."

As the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to the believer, the ground of his justification, that which is accepted as righteousness, is faith and its fruits, or faith and evangelical obedience. On this subject Limborch says, [197] that under the new covenant God demands "obedientiam fidei, hoc est, non rigidam et omnibus æqualem, prout exigebat lex; sed tantam, quantam fides, id est, certa de divinis promissionibus persuasio, in unoquoque efficere potest; in qua etiam Deus multas imperfectiones et lapsus condonat, modo animo sincero præceptorum ipsius observationi incumbamus, et continuo in eadem proficere studeamus."

And again, [198] "Deus non judicat hominum justitiam esse perfectam, imo eam judicat esse imperfectam; sed justitiam, quam imperfectam judicat, gratiose accipit ac si perfecta esset." He, therefore, [199] thus defines justification, "Est gratiosa æstimatio, seu potius acceptatio justitiæ nostræ imperfectæ (quæ, si Deus rigide nobiscum agere vellet, in judicio Dei nequaquam consistere posset) pro perfecta, propter Jesum Christum."

The same view is presented when he speaks of faith in its relation to justification. Faith is said to be imputed for righteousness; but Limborch says, [200] "Sciendum, quando dicimus, nos fide justificari, nos non excludere opera, quæ fides exigit et tanquam foecunda mater producit; sed ea includere." Again, [201] "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 vitæ æternæ præmium conferre vult."

Fletcher [202] says, "With respect to the Christless law of paradisaical obedience, we entirely disclaim sinless perfection." "We

shall not be judged by that law; but by a law adapted to our present state and circumstances, a milder law, called the law of Christ." "Our Heavenly Father never expects of us, in our debilitated state, the obedience of immortal Adam in paradise."

Dr. Peck [203] says, "The standard of character set up in the Gospel must be such as is practicable by man, fallen as he is. Coming up to this standard is what we call Christian perfection."

Under the covenant of works as made with Adam, perfect obedience was the condition of acceptance with God and of eternal life; under the Gospel, for Christ's sake, imperfect, or evangelical obedience, is the ground of justification, i.e., it is that (propter quam) on account of which God graciously grants us the remission of sin and the reward of eternal life.

We have then the three great systems. First, that of the Romanists, which teaches that on account of the work of Christ God grants, through Christian baptism, an infusion of divine grace, by which all sin is purged from the soul and all ground for the infliction of the penalty is removed and the sinner rendered inherently just or holy. This is the first justification. Then in virtue of the new principle of spiritual life thus imparted, the baptized or regenerated are enabled to perform good works, which are really meritorious and on account of which they are admitted to heaven.

Secondly, the Arminian theory, that on account of what Christ has done, God is pleased to grant sufficient grace to all men, and to accept the imperfect obedience which the believer is thus enabled to render in lieu of the perfect obedience required under the covenant made with Adam, and on account of that imperfect obedience, eternal life is graciously bestowed.

Thirdly, the Protestant doctrine that Christ, as the representative and

substitute of sinners or of his people, takes their place under the law, and in their name and in their behalf fulfils all righteousness, thereby making a real, perfect, and infinitely meritorious satisfaction to the law and justice of God, which righteousness is imputed, or set to the account of the believer, who is thereupon and on that account freely pardoned and pronounced righteous in the sight of God, and entitled not only to the remission of sin but also to eternal life.

Being united to Christ by faith, the believer becomes partaker of his life, so that it is not he that lives but Christ that liveth in him, and the life which the believer now lives in the flesh is by faith of the Son of God, who loved him, and gave Himself for him.

Comparison of the Different Doctrines.

The first remark which suggests itself on the comparison of these several schemes is, that the relation between the believer and Christ is far more close, peculiar, and constant on the Protestant scheme than on any other. He is dependent on Him every hour; for the imputation of his righteousness; for the supplies of the Spirit of life; and for his care, guidance, and intercession. He must look to Him continually; and continually exercise faith in Him as an ever present Saviour in order to live. According to the other schemes, Christ has merely made the salvation of all men possible. There his work ended. According to Romanists, He has made it possible that God should give sanctifying grace in baptism; according to the Remonstrants, He has rendered it possible for Him to give sufficient grace to all men whereby to sanctify and save themselves. We are well aware that this is theory; that the true people of God, whether Romanists or Remonstrants, do not look on Christ thus as a Saviour afar off. They doubtless have the same exercises towards Him that their fellow believers have; nevertheless, such is the theory. The theory places a great gulf between the soul and

Christ.

Secondly, it hardly admits of question that the Protestant view conforms to the Scriptural mode of presenting the plan of salvation. Christ in the Bible is declared to be the head of his people, their representative; they were in Him in such a sense that they died in Him; they are raised with Him, and sit with Him in heavenly places. They were in Him as the race was in Adam, and as branches are in the vine. They individually receive the sprinkling of that blood which cleanses from all sin. They are constituted righteous by his obedience. As He was made sin for them, so are they made the righteousness of God in Him. He is not only an example of punishment as Grotius represents, a mere governmental device, but a sacrifice substituted for us, on whose head every believer must lay his hand and to whom he must transfer the burden of his sins.

Thirdly, what is included indeed in the above, but is so important and decisive as to require distinct and repeated mention; all schemes, other than the Protestant, refer the proximate ground of our acceptance with God to our own subjective character. It is because of our own goodness that we are regarded and treated as righteous. Whereas conscience demands, the Scriptures reveal, and the believer instinctively seeks something better than that. His own goodness is badness. It cannot satisfy his own bleared vision; how then can it appear before the eyes of God? It matters not how the Romanist may exalt his "inward habits of grace;" or how the Arminian may sublimate his evangelical obedience to perfection; neither can satisfy either the conscience or God.

Fourthly, the Protestant doctrine is the only one on which the soul can live. This has been urged before when speaking of the work of Christ. It is fair to appeal from theology to hymnology from the head to the

heart; from what man thinks to what God makes men feel. It is enough to say on this point, that Lutheran and Reformed Christians can find nowhere, out of the Bible, more clear, definite, soul-satisfying expression of their doctrinal views upon this subject, than are to be found in many, of the hymns of the Latin and Arminian churches. As a single example may be cited the following stanzas from John Wesley's "Hymns and Spiritual Songs": --

"Join, earth and heaven to bless
The Lord our Righteousness.
The mystery of redemption this,
This the Saviour's strange design --
Man's offence was counted his.
Ours his righteousness divine.
"In Him complete we shine;
His death, his life, is mine;
Fully am I justified,
Free from sin, and more than free,
Guiltless, since for me He died;
Righteous, since He lived for me."

---

[178] Confessio, Königsberg, 1551; by count, pp. 42, 43, of the text.

[179] Institutio, III. xi. 5, edit. Berlin, 1834, part ii. p. 8.

[180] Baur, Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, II. i. 1, Tübingen, 1838, p. 330, note.

[181] Theses Theolog., vol. iii. locus 39: "De causa meritoria justificationis hominis coram Deo, sive de ea re, quæ a Deo ad justitiam imputatur."

[182] Loc. xxvi. p. 331.

[183] Loc. xxvi. p. 334.

[184] De Satisfactione Christi, cap. 2; Works, edit. London, 1679, vol. iii. p. 306, b (19-24).

[185] Ibid. cap. 5; p. 317, b (35-41).

[186] Ibid. cap. 2; p. 308, b (62, 63).

[187] Ibid. cap. 5; p. 316, b (9-13).

[188] De Satisfactione Christi, cap. 8; Works, edit. London, 1679, vol. iii. p. 328, b (12-14).

[189] Theologia Christiana, III. xxi. 8, edit. Amsterdam, 1715, p. 262, a.

[190] Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, II. i. 4, Tübingen, 1838, p. 429.

[191] Dogmatik, Tübingen and Stuttgart, 1841, vol. ii. p. 315.

[192] Theologia Christiana, III. xxi. 6, 8, ut supra, pp. 261, a, 262, a.

[193] II. xxiii.; edit. New York, 1832, p. 426.

[194] Apologia pro Confessione Remonstrantium, cap. 11, 12; Episcopii Opera, edit. Rotterdam, 1665, vol. ii. p. 166, a, of second set.

[195] Theologia Christiana, VI. iv. 18, ut supra, p. 703, a.

[196] Relig. Christ. Inst. 7, 9, 6.

[197] Theologia Christiana, VI. iv. 37, ut supra, p. 706, a.

[198] Ibid. VI. iv. 41; p. 706, b, 707, a.

[199] Ibid. VI. iv. 18; p. 703, a.

[200] Ibid. VI. iv. 32; p. 705, b.

[201] Ibid. VI. iv. 31; p. 705, a.

[202] Last Check to Antinomianism, sect. i; Works, N. Y. 1833, vol. ii. pp. 493, 494.

[203] Christian Perfection, New York, 1843, p. 294.

---

§ 11. Modern Views on Justification.

Rationalistic Theories.

These cannot be given in detail. Certain classes of opinions can be referred to only in the briefest manner. The Rationalists were divided into two classes; first, those who regarded the Scriptures as a supernatural revelation of natural religion, or of the truths of reason; and secondly, those who denied the supernatural origin of the Scriptures altogether, assigning to them no higher authority than belongs to the writings of good and wise men.

The former class came to agree very nearly with the latter as to what the Bible actually teaches, or, at least, as to what is by us to be regarded and received as true. Those who admitted the divine origin of the Scriptures got rid of its distinctive doctrines by the adoption of a low theory of inspiration, and by the application of arbitrary principles of interpretation. Inspiration was, in the first instance, confined to the religious teachings of the Bible, then to the ideas or truths, but not to the form in which they were presented, nor to the arguments by which they were supported. The fact that Christ saves men in some way was admitted, but not as a sacrifice nor as a ransom, nor by being a substitute for sinners. The miracles of Christ were acknowledged as historical facts, but they were explained as mere natural events distorted by the imaginations of spectators and historians. It was granted by some that Christ and the Apostles did teach the Church doctrines, but this, it was said, was done only by way of accommodation to the prejudices, superstitions, or modes of thought of the men of that generation. The first step in this process was the denial of all distinction between the prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices of Christ. In this way a wet sponge was passed over all the doctrines of redemption, and their outlines obliterated. This unnatural process could not be long continued, and, therefore, the majority of

Rationalists soon threw off all regard to the normal authority of the Bible, and avowed their faith in nothing which did not commend itself to their own understanding as true, and for that reason alone.

As to the doctrine of justification, the whole tendency of the efforts during this period was, as Baur correctly says, [204] to make the reconciliation of man to God the work of the man himself. "A man was entitled to regard himself as reconciled with God as soon as he determined to repent and to reform." God was regarded as a father. A father is displeased with a son only so long as he is disobedient. The only end of any chastisement he may inflict, is the reformation of his child. If that be accomplished, all necessity and all propriety of punishment cease. Wegscheider, a representative of this class of theologians, says, [205] "Quicunque e vita turpi, qua poenas sibi contraxit, ad virtutem emerserit, is eadem proportione, qua jam in virtutis studio progressus fuerit, in gratiam cum Deo reversus, ab eodem præmiis dignus judicabitur."

Philosophical Theories.

The philosophical theories on this subject were as different as the systems on which they were founded. Some of these systems were theistic, others pantheistic, and others monistic, i.e., founded "a the oneness of God and man, without denying the distinct personality of either.

The influence of Kant's philosophy upon theology, for a time at least, was very great, and in some aspects salutary. As he exalted the power of the pure reason, making it give law to the outward, subordinating, as his disciples say, the objective to the subjective, so in the sphere of religion and morality he exalted the power and authority of the practical reason. Everything was subordinate to moral excellence. Happiness was not the end. It was only a means of promoting and

rewarding what is morally good. The attainment of the highest amount of moral excellence requires perfect harmony between happiness and goodness, that is, that rational creatures should be happy in exact proportion to their goodness, and miserable in proportion as they are wicked. The punishment of sin is therefore inevitable. It is determined by the immutable moral order of the universe, which can no more be changed or set aside than any physical law on which the existence or order of the external world depends.

From these principles some of the Kantian theologians inferred that the pardon of sin is impossible. Misery is as inseparable from sin as pain is from the laceration of the body. If the only punishment of sin, however, be its natural consequences, then the removal of sin effects the removal of punishment. This determines the view which many of the disciples of Kant take of the nature of redemption. It is purely subjective. Men are delivered from sin and thereby from its punishment. To others, however, this view was unsatisfactory, (1.) Because the punishment of sin is not purely or exclusively natural. It is not so even in this world, as is proved by the deluge, by the destruction of the cities of the plain, and by a thousand other instances. Much less is it true with regard to the future world. Conscience is not the only worm that never dies, or remorse the only fire which is never quenched. (2.) Because this theory reverses the natural order of events. It makes reformation precede pardon, whereas pardon must precede reformation. On this point Bretschneider [206] quotes even Ewald [207] as saying, "It is as unpsychological as it is unchristian so to present Christian reformation, that a man must become better before he is forgiven. It is precisely through the love of God anticipating our reformation, by which the man morally dead is quickened, that the elements of all religion, gratitude, trust, and love are called into exercise." This is

certainly Paul's doctrine. (3.) The theory in question overlooks guilt, responsibility to justice for sins already committed. (4.) The ends of punishment (according to the Kantians) are, first, the satisfaction of the moral excellence of God, who by necessity of his moral perfection must punish sin; secondly, the improvement of the offender; and thirdly, the upholding the moral order of the universe. The two former of these ends, Bretschneider says, may be answered by the reformation of the sinner. When a man ceases to sin, he ceases to be opposed to God, and God ceases to be opposed to him. But the third end of punishment, namely, preserving the moral order of the universe, is not answered by the sinner's reformation. He is not the only person to be considered. The interests of morality would suffer, if he were rendered happy notwithstanding his past transgression. The question then is, is there any way in which the authority of the moral law can be sustained, and yet the sinner be forgiven and rendered blessed? The Church answer to this question, the disciples of Kant reject as contrary to reason; but reason, says Bretschneider, has nothing to object to the doctrine stated generally that God can consistently pardon sin for Christ's sake. He sums up under the following heads, what reason may accept in regard to this whole subject. (1.) That the divine nature of Christ rendered his sufferings more important for the spiritual world and more available for man than they otherwise would have been. (2.) We cannot properly say that He suffered the penalty of the law, or the punishment of our sins, but that He endured his unmerited sufferings for the good of the world. (3.) That He did not make satisfaction for sin, but rendered secure the moral order of the universe. (4.) Although He did not make satisfaction, He procured or mediated our pardon. He is not our sponsor, but our "mediator salutis." (5.) The expression "the merit of Christ" does not mean any good imputed to us, or any title belonging

to us, but simply the claim of Christ that his sufferings shall avail to the good of men. (6.) The word "reconciliation" is anthropopathic. It does not express any change in God; but either objectively the possibility of pardon, or subjectively the hope of pardon. (7.) "To impute the merit of Christ" does not mean that God regards Christ's obedience as our obedience, or his sufferings as our punishment, but simply that, through love, God has determined to render his sufferings available for the good of men. (8.) That Christ's death was vicarious in so far that in consequence thereof sin may be pardoned in the renewed. (9.) Justification is the application to individuals of the general declaration of God that He will save all who strive to reform. This is the highest form in which theologians regarded as rationalistic are willing to receive the doctrines of atonement and justification.

Speculative Theologians.

The views of the speculative theologians on these points have already been presented in the chapters on the person of Christ and on his work, as fully as is proper in such a work as this.

However much this class of theologians may differ as to their philosophical principles, or as to the length to which they carry those principles in their explanation of Christian doctrine, they agree, first, in rejecting the Church view of the plan of salvation; they deny that Christ obeyed the law and bore its penalty vicariously, or as the substitute of sinners; they deny that his righteousness is imputed to the believer as the ground of his justification; they deny that saving faith consists in receiving and resting on the righteousness of Christ as something objective; they deny that justification is a forensic or judicial act in which God pronounces the sinner just, not on the ground of his subjective state or character, but on the ground of what Christ has done for him. All this they pronounce mechanical, external,

magical, unreal, and unsatisfactory. On the other hand, they agree in representing justification as an act by which the sinner is made inherently or subjectively just; and consequently that his acceptance with God, and his title to eternal life, are founded on what he is; they agree in regarding faith as that state of mind which renders the sinner receptive of the infusion of whatever it is that renders him thus subjectively righteous in the sight of God. What that is, is the main point on which their representations differ. Those who regard man as only a form of the manifestation of God, say that one man's being justified and not another, means that God is more fully developed in the one than in the other; or that the one realizes more truly the idea of man than the other; and this, after all, consists in one's coming to the consciousness of his oneness with God, which others have not attained. "The most universal and essential idea of redemption and reconciliation is man's becoming one with God. The necessary objective assumption, on which alone the individual can be one with God, or redeemed and reconciled, is the truth, that man as such is one with God (dass der Mensch an sich mit Gott Eins ist)." [208] This, according to one view, is an eternal process; God is ever becoming man, and man is ever returning into God. According to Schleiermacher, as already repeatedly stated, this manifestation of God in man was hindered and could never become perfect by a process of natural development; and, therefore, by a new creative act Christ was produced, in whom the idea of man was fully realized, or in whom the oneness of God and man was clearly exhibited, and from Him a new process of development commenced as perfectly natural as the process before his advent, and the redemption of man consists in the communication of the sinlessness and blessedness of Christ to the individual. This is expressed commonly by saying that the life of Christ, -- not the Holy Spirit as derived from

Him; not his divine nature; not his humanity; but his divine-human life, -- is communicated to the Church and to all its members. In other words, as Christ is God in human form, so is every believer. The incarnation goes forward in the Church. In the language of the older mystics, what is communicated is "the essential righteousness of God," or "the essence of God," the life of God, or God Himself.

According to this view the objective work of Christ, what He did and suffered is of no avail for us; it is not that which makes us righteous, or by which we are redeemed. Redemption and reconciliation are a purely subjective process; something which takes place in the sinner's own soul, and not something which was done for him. It matters little whether there was a historical Christ or not; or, at least, whether the facts recorded of Him be true or untrue; whether the Gospels are historical or mythical.

According to another view, the work of Christ was in no sense a satisfaction to divine justice; neither his obedience nor his suffering was designed to be set over to his people with its merit, as the ground of their justification. The Word became flesh. He assumed our fallen humanity into personal union with Himself. This necessitated conflict and suffering as the only way in which the new life could triumph over the law of sin and death which belonged to our fallen humanity. This was the atonement of Christ, the triumph of health over disease. This was the victory of Christ over sin and hell. Thus He becomes the author of salvation to men. Humanity in Christ suffered and died, and rose again. That humanity is our nature. It is that which constitutes us what we are. By union with the Church, which is the body of Christ animated by his theanthropic nature or life, we become one with Him. What is communicated to us is not his merit, nor his Spirit, but his essence, his substance, his life. There is no dualism between the soul

and body. They are one life. The soul externalizes itself in the body, they are one. So there is no dualism in Christ; not a divine and human substance; not a divine and human life; but one life which is simply and purely human and yet divine; for God and man are one; and humanity reaches its completion only when thus identified with the divine. This divine-human life passes over from Christ to the Church; and this takes place in the way of history, growth, and development. Partaking thus of the life of Christ, we partake of its righteousness, its holiness, and its glory. Thus redemption is purely subjective. It is wrought in us, although the source is without us. As we partake of Adam's sin and condemnation, because we partake of his nature; so we partake of Christ's righteousness and holiness because we partake of his divine-human life, or of humanity as healed and exalted in Him. [209]

Ebrard of Erlangen.

There is an important class of modern theological writers, of whom Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard of Erlangen may be taken as a representative, who consider themselves faithful to the doctrines of the Reformation, while developing them into new forms. As Ebrard represents this class of writers among the Reformed, so Delitzsch does the same for the Lutheran theologians. These writers are abundantly orthodox in their exposition of the nature of Christ's work. This is especially true of Delitzsch in his admirable treatise on "The Vicarious Satisfaction of Christ." [210] As these writers identify regeneration and justification, their views may be found briefly stated in the chapter on regeneration.

Christ, it is admitted, made expiation for sin and satisfied the justice of God as our substitute by his vicarious obedience and sufferings. This righteousness, however, becomes ours not by being received by faith and imputed to us by the just judgment of God, but by regeneration, whereby we become partakers of the life, substance, or

essence, however it may be designated, of Christ. On this subject Ebrard says: "Regeneration is the substantial objective ground both of the transient act of justification, and of the progressive work of sanctification; whereas conversion (repentance and faith) is the subjective condition of both. And justification as the act of the Father, is a forensic judicial act; as the act of Christ, it is identical with regeneration, i.e., with the real implantation of Christ in us and of us in Christ." Both propositions, therefore, he says, are equally true, namely, "Christ justifies us; and faith justifies us." In explaining this, he says: "Dikaios before God is one who does not merit punishment; who is free from guilt in the sight of God's eternal law, either because he is absolutely sinless, or holy, never having contracted guilt, as in the case of Christ; or because his guilt has been expiated, and his lack of the righteousness demanded by the law is covered. Dikaoun means either to acknowledge as dikaios one who is dikaios or to make dikaios one who is not dikaios." The latter is its sense when used in reference to sinners. In their case, "The act of dikaiosis consists, (1.) In the gift of the expiation (Sühne) made by Christ without the sinner's coöperation; and (2.) In the gift of the absolute righteousness of Christ, in such sense that God does not regard the sinner as he is by nature, and by self-development, but as he is as implanted in Christ." There is, therefore, a clear distinction to be made between the appropriation of righteousness, and the procuring of righteousness. "Christ has procured and merited (erworben hat) righteousness by his historical life and sufferings; it is applied by Christ's being born in us." "The Scriptures," he says, "do not speak of Christ's righteousness being imputed to us. They teach that it comes upon us (Rom. v. 18), and becomes our own. It is our own, however, because the person of Christ becomes ours in the strictest possible

(allerrealsten, the most literal) sense of the terms." What Ebrard contends for is (die substantielle Lebenseinheit mit der Person Christi), the substantial oneness of life with Christ; [211] or as he often elsewhere expresses it, "the mysterious, mystical communication of the substance of Christ to the central substance of man." [212] Dr. Alexander Schweizer of Zürich, [213] although differing much in other points from Ebrard, agrees with him in this. The essential element in the work of Christ, he says, "is the founding and upholding a community animated or pervaded by his theanthropic life (gottmenschlichen Lebenspotenz). Dr. Nevin [214] says, "Our nature reaches after a true and real union with the nature of God, as the necessary complement and consummation of its own life. The idea which it embodies can never be fully actualized, under any other form. The incarnation is the proper completion of humanity. Christ is the true ideal man." "The incarnation was no mere theophany; no transient wonder; no illusion exhibited to the senses. . . . . The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many; but flesh,' or humanity in its universal conception. How else could He be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such? How else could the value of his mediatorial work be made over to us in a real way, by a true imputation, and not a legal fiction only?" [215] "Christianity is a life, not only as revealed at first in Christ, but as continued also in the Church. It flows over from Christ to his people, always in this form. They do not simply bear his name and acknowledge his doctrine. They are so united to Him as to have part in the substance of his life itself." [216] He had before said, [217] that "by the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of Jesus Christ, our humanity as fallen in Adam was exalted again to a new and imperishable divine life." "The object of the incarnation was to couple the human nature in

real union with the Logos, as a permanent source of life." Again, [218] "the new life of which Christ is the source and organic principle, is in all respects a true human life; . . . . . not a new humanity, wholly dissevered from that of Adam; but the humanity of Adam itself, only raised to a higher character, and filled with new meaning and power, by its union with the divine nature. . . . . Christ's life, as now described, rests not in his separate person, but passes over to his people; thus constituting the Church, which is his body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." "Christ communicates his own life substantially to the soul on which He acts, causing it to grow into his very nature. This is the mystical union; the basis of our whole salvation; the only medium by which it is possible for us to have an interest in the grace of Christ under any other view." [219] With his substance, his life, his divine-human nature thus communicated to the soul come his merit, his holiness, his power, his glory. These are predicates of the nature which becomes ours, constituting our personal life and character. Even the resurrection is to be effected, not by the power of Christ operating "ab extra," as when He raised Lazarus from the dead, but by "a new divine element, introduced into our nature by the incarnation." [220]

Objections to these Theories.

In opposition to these views it may be said very briefly in the way of recapitulation of what has been more fully said in the chapters above referred to, --

1. That this is a philosophy. The scheme has its entire basis in a philosophical theory as to the nature of man and his relation to God. This is undeniable, and is hardly denied. Dr. Nevin states three "scientific principles," ignorance of which led the Reformers to a misapprehension and imperfect representation of Christianity, and the

recognition of which and of their application to theology, enables the modern theologian to set forth the nature and plan of salvation in a much more satisfactory light. Those principles are, (1.) The true import of organic law. The Reformers did not make a clear distinction, he says, "between the idea of the organic law which constitutes the proper identity of a human body, and the material volume it is found to embrace as exhibited to the senses." There may be, therefore, a real communication of Christ and even of his body to his people without a communication of his flesh. (2.) The absolute unity involved in personality. In the case of Christ, body, soul, and divinity are united in "a single indivisible life," so that where the one is, all are. To communicate Christ to the soul is therefore to communicate that indivisible life, including in it as an organizing, organic principle, body, soul, and divinity. (3.) The distinction between individual and generic life. "In every sphere of life," it is said, "the individual and the general are found closely united in the same subject." The acorn, in one view, is only a single existence; but it includes the force of a life capable of reaching far beyond itself. The life of a forest of oaks is only the expansion of the life of the original acorn, "and the whole general existence thus produced is bound together, inwardly and organically, by as true and close a unity as that which holds in any of the single existences embraced in it, separately considered." Thus also Adam, in one view, was a man; in another, he was the man. A whole world of separate personalities lay involved in his life, as a generic principle or root. "Adam lives in his posterity as truly as he has ever lived in his own person." In like manner, although in a higher form, the life of Christ is to be viewed under the same twofold aspect In one view the Saviour was a man; but in another, He was the man, "the Son of man, in whose person stood revealed the true

idea of humanity, under its ultimate and most comprehensive form. Without any loss or change of character in the first view, his life is carried over in this last view continually into the persons of his people. He lives in Himself, and yet lives in their really and truly at the same time." As we participate in Adam's whole nature, soul and body, so the people of Christ participate in his whole nature, body, soul, and divinity. These are one indivisible life; and that one theanthropic life is communicated to believers and constitutes them Christians. In this is included all their participation in the righteousness, merit, and glory of their Redeemer. [221]

Behind and under these three scientific principles there is another without which the three mentioned amount to nothing; namely, the unity of God and man. Man in his highest form; the ideal or perfect man; He in whom the idea of humanity is fully realized, is God. What does it amount to, if we admit that "organic law" constitutes identity, as in the case of man; or that personality includes the idea of "one indivisible life;" that in man there is not one life of the body and another of the soul, that these are only different manifestations of one and the same life; that the soul can no more be without the body than the body without the soul; and that in Christ there is not one life of the divinity and another of his humanity? Suppose we deny what the Church in all ages has affirmed, that there are two energeiai in Christ, what does this amount to? Or what does it avail to admit the realistic doctrine of a generic life; if that life (one and indivisible) be merely human, Adamic? How can it redeem us? It is only on the assumption that the human and the divine are one, that this unity, fully realized in Christ, constitutes the "one indivisible life" which passes over to us; that it has any redeeming power; and that it exalts man from his degradation, and brings him back to conscious as

well as real unity with God.

This theory as presented by Schleiermacher, its author in modern times, was undeniably pantheistic; as held by many of his disciples, it is, in their apprehension, theistic. In either form the leading idea of the identity of God and man is retained. [222] Christ is the ideal man. In Him the idea of humanity is fully realized. and therefore He is God. The manifestation of God in the form of man, belongs to the divine nature. The incarnation is entirely independent of the fall of man; or, admitting that the failure of the race to reach its true ideal in the first instance was the occasion of a new, special, and supernatural intervention, yet the whole end of that intervention was to realize the original idea of humanity as God made flesh.

The watchword of this whole system is, in the language of Dr. Ullmann, "The life of Christ is Christianity;" i.e., the one indivisible life of Christ; the life of God in the form of humanity. And that life as communicated to men brings them to this real, substantial life union with God. "What," asks Dr. Ullmann, "is that in the personality of Christ by which He is constituted a perfect Saviour in the way of atonement and redemption? We reply generally, his own substantial nature, at once human and divine; his life filled with all the attributes of God, and representing at the same time the highest conception of nature and man; complete and self-sufficient in its own fulness, and yet by this fulness itself the free principle of a new corresponding life-process, in the way of self-communication, for the human world. This life itself, however, has again its central heart, to which especially we must look for the peculiar being of Christ. Here the whole theology of the present time, in all its different tendencies, may be said to have but one voice. That which constitutes the special being of Christ, makes Him to be what He is and gives Him

thus his highest significance for the world, is the absolute unity of the divine and human in his nature. Deity and manhood in Him come fully together and are made one. This is the last ground of Christianity. Here above all we are to look for its distinctive character." He goes on to show that on this point all are agreed. God and man are one. The difference is between the pantheistic and the Christian view which acknowledges a personal God and a positive revelation. "For the whole apprehension of Christianity, we may say, not only that much, but that all depends on the question, which of these views shall be adopted; whether this central fact shall be regarded as a general unity of the divine and human' realizing itself in the consciousness of the race as such, or be conceived of as a concrete union of God and man,' that actualizes itself from a definite point and only under certain moral conditions." [223] That is, whether God is incarnate in the race or in the Church. According to the latter view, the life of Christ, his human life, "filled with all the attributes of God," passes over to his people, by a process of natural development. As we are fallen men by partaking of the nature or generic life of Adam, we are God-men, and therefore redeemed by partaking of the divine human nature or generic life of Christ.

That the oneness of God and man is the ultimate principle on which this heteron euangelion rests, is obvious not only from the general character of the philosophy from which it is derived, but also from the fact that everything is made to depend upon the life of Christ becoming the life of his people, not by his controlling their life by his Spirit dwelling in them, but by a substantial union and identification of their life with his, of them with Him. We can measurably understand what is meant by life, by organic life, by a life principle or force which develops itself, and communicates and transmits itself in a given

form. We know what is meant when it is said that the life of the acorn is developed into an oak, and communicated to other acorns, and thus to other oaks in endless succession and boundless multiplication. But here the essential idea is the unity and sameness of the life transmitted. You cannot combine the "organic law," or life, of the apple with that of the acorn, so that the life transmitted should be "an acorn-apple-life." Much less can you combine the organic life principle of an animal with that of the acorn, so as to produce an "acorn-bovine," or, "an acorn-equine life." Least of all can you combine the intellectual life of man with that of the oak, so as to have a "human-oak-life." Therefore if the life of God and the life of man be so combined as to constitute one life and that a divine-human life, then God and man must be one; i.e., one substance, one life differently manifested. Those who press the modern doctrine of the correlation of forces to the extreme of making thought and gravity identical, may accept these conclusions. With them the universe and all it contains, all its physical, mental, æsthetic, moral, and religious phenomena are to be referred to one and the same force variously modified. The same force modified by the brain produces all the phenomena of mind; as modified by animal tissues, all the phenomena of animal life; and as modified by vegetable organisms all the phenomena of vegetable life, -- a theory which has been annihilated as by a bolt from heaven by the single question. Where is the brain which elaborated the mind, which framed the universe?

It may indeed be said, and is said by modern theologians, that God became man, and therefore man may become God. God and man, they say, were so united as to become one nature or life in the person of Christ. But this is contrary to Scripture and to the faith of the Church universal. There is not a historical Church on earth, and never has

been, whose creed does not teach that in the person of Christ two distinct natures or substances are united, that He was born, not merely "per," but "ex matre sua Maria," of her substance; that He is as man consubstantial with men, as God consubstantial with the Father; or as the Apostle expresses it, kata sarka, He is the son of David, kata pneuma the Son of God. Humanity and divinity in Him are no more identified or reduced to one life, than soul and body in man are identified or reduced to one life.

This whole modern theory of the Gospel rests, therefore, ultimately on the idea of the identity of God and man; that man is a "modus existendi" of God.

The grand objection to this scheme is that it is a philosophy. It is a product of the human mind. It is the wisdom of the world. It is the recent philosophy of the speculative school of Germany, clothed in Biblical forms and phrases. The reason why the Reformers did not present the plan of salvation in this form, is declared to be that they were ignorant of modern philosophy. It is because Hegel thought that the Gospel admitted of being cast into the mould of his philosophy that he pronounced Christianity to be the absolute religion. All, therefore, that the Bible says of the "wisdom of the wise," "of the wisdom of men," of "the wisdom of the world," of "philosophy as a vain deceit," applies, and was intended to apply to this scheme and to all of like nature. "To the poor the gospel is preached." The Gospel is designed for babes and sucklings. He that runs may read and understand it. This system not one man in ten thousand can understand.

These Theories Unscriptural.

2. The second great objection to this scheme is that it is unscriptural. The Bible tells us that Christ saves us as a priest. This a child can understand. He knows that a priest takes the place of those

for whom he acts; that he approaches God in their behalf; that he makes expiation for sin; that he does what satisfies the demands of God's justice against the sinner, so that He can be just and yet justify the ungodly. He knows that a priest saves, not by what he does in us, not by imparting his life to us, but by what he does for us; by an objective, and not by a subjective work. What there is of an inward work, and that is much and absolutely necessary, is not the work of a priest, under which aspect the work of Christ is so prominently presented in the Scriptures. Again, Christ saves us as a sacrifice; but a sacrifice is a substitute; it bears the sins of the offender; dies in his stead, and by its vicarious death delivers the offerer from the penalty which he had incurred. A sacrifice is not a symbol of an inward conflict between good and evil; its proximate design is not to effect a subjective change in the sinner; it does not produce or communicate a new principle of life, much less its own generic life to the offerer by which his real redemption is effected.

In like manner the Bible teaches that Christ gave Himself as a ransom for many. But a ransom is a price paid. Those delivered by it are bought. They are delivered by purchase. A ransom meets and satisfies the claims of a third party. This is its essential idea, and cannot be omitted without rejecting the very truth, which the Scriptures, in the use of the term, design to teach. This again is an objective work. It is something which the person redeemed neither does, nor inwardly experiences; but which is done for him and without him and not in him. Moreover, the whole idea of redemption, the primary truth taught in setting forth Christ as a Redeemer, is that He delivers his people not by power, not by instruction, not by moral influence, not by any subjective change wrought in them, and not by any new form of life imparted to them, but by purchase. This is the signification and the

meaning of the word. The words apolutrosis, lutroun, agorazein, exagorazein, are never used in Scripture in reference to the work of Christ in any other sense than that of deliverance by purchase or payment of a ransom; and to substitute any other mode of deliverance, is to put man's thoughts in the place of God's truth; it is to substitute the human for the divine; the worthless for the priceless. Moreover, Christ is constantly represented as a rock, a refuge, a hiding place. The duty required of sinners is trust; relying on Him and his work, as something out of themselves on which to place their hope toward God.

These Theories lead Men to trust to themselves.

3. This introduces the third great objection to this scheme. It makes redemption subjective. It is what we are; what we become; it is the Christ within us; the new heart, the new nature, the new life, the divine-human life of Christ, or whatever else it may be called, which is at once the ground of our justification and the source of sanctification. This is utterly inconsistent with the Bible, and with the experience of the people of God in all ages and under all dispensations. In no instance are believers represented as trusting to what is within them, but to what is without them. The Protestant doctrine, as we have seen, makes full provision for an inward work of deliverance from the power of sin, as well as for redemption from the curse of the law; for sanctification as well as for justification. But it does not confound the two, neither does it refer either or both to the new principle of life, the new seed or leaven implanted or inserted which works as "an organic law," and by a regular process of development, as natural as the operation of any other law. The whole work of the Spirit is ignored in this new theory of redemption. What in the Bible is referred to the Spirit of God is, by the theologians of

this class, referred to the "divine-human" nature of Christ. The latter, and not the former, is the proximate and efficient source of holiness of heart and life. "Christ," says Dr. Nevin, "does dwell in us, by his Spirit; but only as his Spirit constitutes the very form and power of his own presence as the incarnate and everlasting Word." [224] That is, the Spirit is the power of the incarnate Word, i.e., of the divine-human life of Christ. "The life," he adds, "thus wrought in our souls by his agency, is not a production out of nothing, but the very life of Jesus Himself organically continued in this way over into our persons." "It is with the mediatorial life of Christ that the Christian salvation, in the form now contemplated, is concerned. In this is comprehended the entire new creation revealed by the Gospel; the righteousness of Christ, and all the benefits He has procured for his people. But the mediatorial life, by the communication of which only all this grace is made to pass over to men, is one and undivided;" and this life, as he goes on to show, includes his body, soul, and divinity. To the same effect, [225] it is said, "That the whole spiritual life of the Christian, including the resurrection of his body, is thus organically connected with the mediatorial life of the Lord Jesus, might seem to be too plainly taught in the New Testament to admit of any question; and yet we find many slow to allow the mystery, notwithstanding. A very common view appears to be, that the whole salvation of the Gospel is accomplished in a more or less outward and mechanical way, by supernatural might and power, rather than by the Spirit of the Lord as a revelation of a new historical life in the person of the believer Himself. So we have an outward imputation of righteousness to begin with; a process of sanctification carried forward by the help of proper spiritual machinery brought to bear on the soul, including perhaps, as its basis, the notion of an abrupt

creation de novo,' by the fiat of the Holy Ghost; and finally, to crown all, a sudden unprepared refabrication of the body, to be superadded to the life of the spirit already complete in its state of glory." The doctrines of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; of the regeneration and sanctification of the soul by the supernatural power of the Spirit, and the resurrection of the body by the power of God at the last day, are rejected and despised; and the doctrine substituted for them is, that the divine-human life of Christ, as a new organic law, develops itself in the Church, just as the life of the acorn develops itself in the oak and in the forest, by a natural, historical process, so that the members of the Church, in virtue of their participation of this life, are justified and sanctified, and their bodies (since the life of Christ is a human life actualizing itself outwardly in a body as well as inwardly in a soul), ultimately raised from the dead, are fashioned after the glorious body of Christ. The resurrection of the body is as much a natural process as the development of a seed into a flower, or of a grub into a butterfly. This is Dr. Nevin's own illustration: "The birth of the butterfly, as it mounts in the air on wings of light, is comparatively sudden, too; but this is the revelation only of a life which had been gradually formed for this efflorescence before, under cover of the vile, unsightly larve." "The new creation," he says, "is indeed supernatural; but as such it is strictly conformable to the general order and constitution of life. It is a new creation in Christ Jesus, not by Him in the way of mere outward power. The subjects of it are saved, only by being brought within the sphere of his life, as a regular, historical, divine-human process, in the Church. The new nature implanted in them at their regeneration, is not a higher order of existence framed for them at the moment out of nothing by the fiat of God, but truly and

strictly a continuation of Christ's life over in their persons." [226]

This is the modern view of Christianity introduced by Schleiermacher, modified more or less by his disciples, and which has passed over into England and into this country. Humanity as revealed in Adam as a generic life was too feeble. Its development failed and would have ever failed to reach the ideal. Therefore God interposed and interrupted the process of natural development by the production of a new ideal man containing in himself a generic life, a seed, a principle, an organic law, which develops itself in the Church by a historical process, just as the life of Adam developed itself in his posterity. We, therefore, are justified, not by what Christ did, but by his life in us, which is as truly and properly our life, as the life we derived from Adam is our own life. We must stand before God to be justified or condemned, accepted or rejected, on the ground of what we are. We have nothing to offer but our own subjective, inherent character such as it is. The man is to be pitied who dares to do this. It is surely better to agree with Paul, who renounced his own righteousness, his own goodness, everything pertaining to himself, everything subjective, and trusted only and confidently to the righteousness of Christ received by faith.

---

[204] Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, III. i. Tübingen, 1830, p. 565.

[205] Institutiones Theologiæ, III. ii. § 140, 5th edit. Halle, 1826, p. 438.

[206] Dogmatik, § 159, 3d edit. Leipzig, vol. II. p. 320, note.

[207] Die Religionslehren der Bibel, II. v. zu nro. 27; Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1812, vol. ii. p. 149.

[208] Baur, Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, Tübingen, 1830, p. 628.

[209] See Mystical Presence, by John W. Nevin, D. D.; Morell's Philosophy of Religion, and Princeton Review, April, 1848.

[210] Ueber den festen Schriftgrund der Kirchenlehre von der stellvertretenden Genugthuung, printed as a second Appendix to his elaborate commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[211] Christliche Dogmatik, II. i. 2, § 443; Königsberg, 1852, vol. ii. pp. 311, 312, 314.

[212] Ibid. p. 310.

[213] Glaubenslehre, Zürich, 1847, vol. ii. p. 335.

[214] Mystical Presence, Philadelphia, 1846, pp. 200, 201.

[215] Mystical Presence, Philadelphia, 1846, pp. 210, 211.

[216] Ibid. p. 218.

[217] Ibid. p. 165.

[218] Ibid. p. 167.

[219] Ibid. p. 168.

[220] Ibid. p. 226.

[221] See Mystical Presence, section first of the Scientific Statement.

[222] See this clearly presented in Dr. Ullmann's paper on "The Distinctive Character of Christianity," in the Studien und Kritiken for January, 1845, translated by Dr. Nevin and prefixed as a Preliminary Essay to his work on The Mystical Presence.

[223] See Nevin's Mystical Presence, pp. 27, 28, 29.

[224] Mystical Presence, pp. 197, 198.

[225] Ibid. p. 228, note.

[226] Mystical Presence, pp. 228, 229.

CHAPTER XVIII: SANCTIFICATION

SANCTIFICATION

---

§ 1. Its Nature.

Sanctification in the Westminster Catechism is said to be "the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness."

Agreeably to this definition, justification differs from sanctification, (1.) In that the former is a transient act, the latter a progressive work. (2.) Justification is a forensic act, God acting as judge, declaring justice satisfied so far as the believing sinner is concerned, whereas sanctification is an effect due to the divine efficiency. (3.) Justification changes, or declares to be changed, the relation of the sinner to the justice of God; sanctification involves a change of character. (4.) The former, therefore, is objective, the latter subjective. (5.) The former is founded on what Christ has done for us; the latter is the effect of what He does in us. (6.) Justification is complete and the same in all, while sanctification is progressive, and is more complete in some than in others.

Sanctification is declared to be a work of God's free grace. Two things are included in this. First, that the power or influence by which it is carried on is supernatural. Secondly, that granting this influence to any sinner, to one sinner rather than another, and to one more than to another, is a matter of favour. No one has personally, or in himself, on the ground of anything he has done, the right to claim this divine influence as a just recompense, or as a matter of justice.

It is a Supernatural Work.

In representing, in accordance with Scripture, sanctification as a supernatural work, or as a work of grace, the Church intends to deny the Pelagian or Rationalistic doctrine which confounds it with mere moral reformation. It not unfrequently happens that men who have been immoral in their lives, change their whole course of living. They become outwardly correct in their deportment, temperate, pure, honest, and benevolent. This is a great and praiseworthy change. It is in a high degree beneficial to the subject of it, and to all with whom he is connected. It may be produced by different causes, by the force of conscience and by a regard for the authority of God and a dread of his disapprobation, or by a regard to the good opinion of men, or by the mere force of an enlightened regard to one's own interest. But whatever may be the proximate cause of such reformation, it falls very far short of sanctification. The two things differ in nature as much as a clean heart from clean clothes. Such external reformation may leave a man's inward character in the sight of God unchanged. He may remain destitute of love to God, of faith in Christ, and of all holy exercises or affections.

Nor is sanctification to be confounded with the effects of moral culture or discipline. It is very possible, as experience proves, by careful moral training, by keeping the young from all contaminating influences, and by bringing them under the forming influences of right principles and good associates, to preserve them from much of the evil of the world, and to render them like the young man in the Gospel whom Jesus loved. Such training is not to be undervalued. It is enjoined in the Word of God. It cannot, however, change the nature. It cannot impart life. A faultless statue fashioned out of pure marble in all its beauty, is far below a living man.

The word supernatural, as before said, is used in two senses. First, for that which is above nature, and by nature is meant everything out of God. An effect, therefore, is said to be supernatural, in the production of which nature exercises no efficiency. But secondly, the word is often used to mark the distinction between the providential efficiency of God operating according to fixed laws, and the voluntary agency of the Holy Spirit. The Bible makes a wide distinction between the providence of God and the operations of his grace. The difference between the two is, in some respects, analogous to that between the efficiency of a law, or of a uniformly acting force, and the agency of a person. The one is ordered, the other is exercised from time to time, the Spirit distributing his gifts to every one severally as He wills.

In the providential agency of God, the effects produced never transcend the power of second causes as upheld and guided by Him; whereas the effects produced by the Spirit do transcend the power of second causes. The effect is due neither to the power of the truth, nor to that of the rational subject in whom the effect is produced. It is due to the power of God over and above the power of the second causes concerned. The effects of grace, or fruits of the Spirit, are above the sphere of the natural they belong to the supernatural. The mere power of truth, argument, motive, persuasion, or eloquence cannot produce repentance, faith, or holiness of heart and life. Nor can these effects be produced by the power of the will, or by all the resources of man, however protracted or skilful in their application. They are the gifts of God, the fruits of the Spirit. Paul may plant and Apollos water, but it is God who gives the increase.

In this latter sense of the word supernatural, the cooperation of second causes is not excluded. When Christ opened the eyes of the blind no second cause interposed between his volition and the effect. But men

work out their own salvation, while it is God who worketh in them to will and to do, according to his own good pleasure. In the work of regeneration, the soul is passive. It cannot cooperate in the communication of spiritual life. But in conversion, repentance, faith, and growth in grace, all its powers are called into exercise. As, however, the effects produced transcend the efficiency of our fallen nature, and are due to the agency of the Spirit, sanctification does not cease to be supernatural, or a work of grace, because the soul is active and cooperating in the process.

Proof of its Supernatural Character.

That sanctification is a supernatural work in the sense above stated is proved, --

1. From the fact that it is constantly referred to God as its author. It is referred to God absolutely, or to the Father, as in 1 Thessalonians v. 23, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly." Hebrews xiii. 20, 21, "The God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus . . . . make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight." It is also referred to the Son, as in Titus ii. 14, He "gave himself for us, that he might . . . . purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Ephesians v. 25, He "loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Predominantly sanctification is referred to the Holy Spirit, as his peculiar work in the economy of redemption. Hence He is called the Spirit of all grace; the Spirit of joy, of peace, of love, of faith, and of adoption. All Christian graces are set forth as fruits of the Spirit. We are said to be born of the Spirit, and by Him

to he enlightened, taught, led, and cleansed. We are said to be in the Spirit, to live, to walk, and to rejoice in the Spirit. The Spirit dwells in the people of God, and is the abiding source of all the actings of that spiritual life which He implants in the soul. The Bible teaches that the Son and Spirit are in the Holy Trinity subordinate to the Father, as to their mode of subsistence and operation, although the same in substance, and equal in power and glory. Hence it is that the same work is often attributed to the Father, to the Son, and to the Spirit; and as the Father and Son operate through the Spirit, the effects due to the agency of God are referred specially to the Holy Ghost.

This reference of sanctification to God proves it to be a supernatural work, because the insufficiency of second causes to produce the effect is declared to be the ground of this reference. It is because men cannot cleanse or heal themselves, that they are declared to be cleansed and healed by God. It is because rites, ceremonies, sacraments, truth, and moral suasion, cannot bring the soul back to God, that it is said to be transformed, by the renewing of the mind, through the power of the Spirit, into the image of God. We are, therefore, declared to be God's workmanship, created unto good works. And it is not we that live, but Christ that liveth in us.

All Holy Exercises referred to the Spirit as their Author.

2. This reference of sanctification to God as its author, the more decisively proves the supernatural character of the work, because the reference is not merely general, as when the wind and rain, and the production of vegetable and animal life, are referred to his universal providential agency. The reference is special. The effect is one which the Scriptures recognize as not within the sphere of second causes, and therefore ascribe to God. They recognize the free agency of man; they

acknowledge and treat him as a moral and rational being; they admit the adaptation of of truth to convince the understanding, and of the motives presented to determine the will and to control the affections, and nevertheless they teach that these secondary causes and influences be utterly ineffectual to the conversion and sanctification of the soul, without the demonstration of the Spirit. The sacred writers, therefore, constantly pray for this divine influence, "extrinsecus accidens," to attend the means of grace and to render them effectual, as well for sanctification as for regeneration and conversion. Every such prayer, every thanksgiving for grace imparted, every recognition of the Christian virtues as fruits of the Spirit, and gifts of God, are so many recognitions of the great truth that the restoration of man to the image of God is not a work of nature, either originated or carried on by the efficiency of second causes, but is truly and properly supernatural, as due to the immediate power of the Spirit producing effects for which second causes are inadequate.

We are taught to pray for Repentance, Faith, and other Graces.

3. We accordingly find the Apostle and the sacred writers generally, referring not only regeneration, the communication of spiritual life to those spiritually dead, but the continuance of that life in its activity and growth, not merely to the power of God, but to his almighty power. Paul prays in Ephesians i. 19, that his readers might know "what is 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." The same almighty power which was exhibited in the resurrection of Christ, is exercised in the spiritual resurrection of the believer. And as the power which raised Christ from the dead was exercised in his ascension and glorification; so also the same power, according to the Apostle, which is exerted in

the spiritual resurrection of the believer, is exercised in carrying on his sanctification, which is inward and real glorification.

Accordingly, in the same Epistle (iii. 7), he ascribes all the grace whereby he was fitted for the apostleship, "to the effectual working of his power." And further on (ver. 20), to encourage the people of God to pray for spiritual blessings, he reminds them of his omnipotence whereby He was "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." It is almighty power, therefore, and not the impotence of secondary influences, which works in the believer and carries on the work of his salvation.

They who are in Christ, therefore, are new creatures. They are created anew in Christ Jesus. This does not refer exclusively to their regeneration, but to the process by which the sinner is transformed into the image of Christ.

Argument from the Believer's Union with Christ.

4. All that the Scriptures teach concerning the union between the believer and Christ, and of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, proves the supernatural character of our sanctification. Men do not make themselves holy; their holiness, and their growth in grace, are not due to their own fidelity, or firmness of purpose, or watchfulness and diligence, although all these are required, but to the divine influence by which they are rendered thus faithful, watchful, and diligent, and which produces in them the fruits of righteousness. Without me, saith our Lord, ye can do nothing. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. The hand is not more dependent on the head for the continuance of its vitality, than is the believer on Christ for the continuance of spiritual life in the soul.

Argument from related Doctrines.

5. This, however, is one of those doctrines which pervade the whole Scriptures. It follows of necessity from what the Bible teaches of the natural state of man since the fall; it is assumed, asserted, and implied in all that is revealed of the plan of salvation. By their apostasy, men lost the image of God; they are born in a state of alienation and condemnation. They are by nature destitute of spiritual life. From this state it is as impossible that they should deliver themselves, as that those in the grave should restore life to their wasted bodies, and when restored, continue and invigorate it by their own power. Our whole salvation is of Christ. Those who are in the grave hear his voice. They are raised by his power. And when they live it is He who lives in them. This is the doctrine which our Lord Himself so clearly and so frequently teaches, and upon which his Apostles so strenuously insist. St. Paul in the sixth and seventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, where he treats of this subject "in extenso," has for his main object to prove that as we are not justified or our own righteousness, so we are not sanctified by our own power, or by the mere objective power of the truth. The law, the revelation of the will of God, including everything which He has made known to man either as a rule of obedience or as exhibiting his own attributes and purposes, was equally inadequate to secure justification and sanctification. As it demanded perfect obedience and pronounced accursed those who continue not in all things written in the book of the law to do them, it can only condemn. It can never pronounce the sinner just. And as it was a mere outward presentation of the truth, it could no more change the heart than light could give sight to the blind. He winds up his discussions of the subject with the exclamation, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." His deliverance was to be effected by

God through Jesus Christ. We learn from the eighth chapter that he was fully confident of this deliverance, and we learn also the ground on which that confidence rested. It was not that he had in regeneration received strength to sanctify himself, or that by the force of his own will, or by the diligent use of natural or appointed means, the end was to be accomplished without further aid from God. On the contrary, his confidence was founded, (1.) On the fact that he had been delivered from the law, from its curse, and from its inexorable demand of perfect obedience. (2.) On the fact that he had received the Spirit as the source of a new, divine, and imperishable life. (3.) This life was not a mere state of mind, but the life of God, or the Spirit of God dwelling in the heart; which indwelling secured not only the continuance of "spiritual mindedness," but even the resurrection from the dead. "For if," says he, "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 (zoopoiesei make alive with the life of Christ) your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (4.) Being led by the Spirit of God as the controlling principle of their inward and outward life, believers are the sons of God. The Spirit of God which is in them being the Spirit of the Son, is in them the Spirit of sonship, i.e., it produces in them the feelings of sons toward God, and assures them of their title to all the privileges of his children. (5.) The sanctification and ultimate salvation of believers are secured by the immutable decree of God. For those "whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son; . . . . moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." This last includes sanctification; the inward glory of the soul; the divine image as retraced by the Spirit of God, which to and in the believer is

the Spirit of glory. (1 Pet. iv. 14.) The indwelling of the Spirit renders the believer glorious. (6.) The infinite and immutable love which induced God to give his own Son for our salvation, renders it certain that all other things shall be given necessary to keep them in the love and fellowship of God. Salvation, therefore, from beginning to end is of grace; not only as being gratuitous to the exclusion of all merit on the part of the saved, but also as being carried on by the continued operation of grace, or the supernatural power of the Spirit. Christ is our all. He is of God made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

---

§ 2. Wherein it consists.

Admitting sanctification to be a supernatural work, the question still remains, What does it consist in? What is the nature of the effect produced? The truth which lies at the foundation of all the Scriptural representations of this subject is, that regeneration, the quickening, of which believers are the subject, while it involves the implanting, or communication of a new principle or form of life, does not effect the immediate and entire deliverance of the soul from all sin. A man raised from the dead may be and long continue to be, in a very feeble, diseased, and suffering state. So the soul by nature dead in sin, may be quickened together with Christ, and not be rendered thereby perfect. The principle of life may be very feeble, it may have much in the soul uncongenial with its nature, and the conflict between the old and the new life may be protracted and painful. Such not only may be, but such in fact is the case in all the ordinary experience of the people of God. Here we find one of the characteristic and far-reaching differences between the Romish and Protestant systems of doctrine and religion. According to the Romish system, nothing of the nature of sin

remains in the soul after regeneration as effected in baptism. From this the theology of the Church of Rome deduces its doctrine of the merit of good works; of perfection; of works of supererogation; and, indirectly, those of absolution and indulgences. But according to the Scriptures, the universal experience of Christians, and the undeniable evidence of history, regeneration does not remove all sin. The Bible is filled with the record of the inward conflicts of the most eminent of the servants of God, with their falls, their backslidings, their repentings, and their lamentations over their continued shortcomings. And not only this, but the nature of the conflict between good and evil in the heart of the renewed is fully described, the contending principles are distinguished and designated, and the necessity, difficulties, and perils of the struggle, well as the method of properly sustaining it, are set forth repeatedly and in detail. In the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans we have an account of this conflict elaborately described by the Apostle as drawn from his own experience. And the same thing occurs in Galatians v. 16, 17. This I say then, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Again, in Ephesians vi. 10-18, in view of the conflict which the believer has to sustain with the evils of his own heart and with the powers of darkness, the Apostle exhorts his brethren to be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. . . . . "Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand."

With the teachings of the Scriptures the experience of Christians in all ages and in all parts of the Church agrees. Their writings are

filled with the account of their struggles with the remains of sin in their own hearts; with confessions; with prayers for divine aid; and with longings after the final victory over all evil, which is to be experienced only in heaven. The great lights of the Latin Church, the Augustines and Bernards and Fénélons, were humble, penitent, struggling believers, even to the last, and with Paul did not regard themselves as having already attained, or as being already perfect. And what the Bible and Christian experience prove to be true, history puts beyond dispute. Either there is no such thing as regeneration in the world, or regeneration does not remove all sin from those who are its subjects.

Putting off the Old, and putting on the New Man.

Such being the foundation of the Scriptural representations concerning sanctification, its nature is thereby determined. As all men since the fall are in a state of sin, not only sinners because guilty of specific acts of transgression, but also as depraved, their nature perverted and corrupted, regeneration is the infusion of a new principle of life in this corrupt nature. It is leaven introduced to diffuse its influence gradually through the whole mass. Sanctification, therefore, consists in two things: first, the removing more and more the principles of evil still infecting our nature, and destroying their power; and secondly, the growth of the principle of spiritual life until it controls the thoughts, feelings, and acts, and brings the soul into conformity to the image of Christ.

Paul details his own Experience in Romans vii. 7-25.

The classical passages of the New Testament on the nature of this work are the following, -- Romans vii. 7-25. This is not the place to enter upon the discussion whether the Apostle in this passage is detailing his own experience or not. This is the interpretation given to it by Augustinians in all ages. It is enough to say here that the "onus

probandi" rests on those who take the opposite view of the passage. It must require very strong proof that the Apostle is not speaking of himself and giving his own experience as a Christian, when, --

1. His object in the whole discussion throughout the sixth and seventh chapters, is to prove that the law, as it cannot justify, neither can it sanctify; as it cannot deliver from the guilt, so neither can it free us from the power of sin. This is not the fault of the law, for it is spiritual, holy, just, and good. It commends itself to the reason and the conscience as being just what it ought to be; requiring neither more nor less than what it is right should be demanded, and threatening no penalty which want of conformity to its requirements does not justly merit. What is the effect of the objective presentation of the ideal standard of moral perfection to which we are bound to be conformed on the penalty of death? The Apostle tells us that the effects are, (a.) A great increase of knowledge. He had not known lust, had not the law said, Thou shalt not covet. (b.) A sense of moral pollution, and consequently of shame and self-loathing. (c.) A sense of guilt, or of just exposure to the penalty of the law of which our whole lives are a continued transgression. (d.) A sense of utter helplessness. The standard, although holy, just, and good, is too high. We know we never can of ourselves conform to it; neither can we make satisfaction for past transgression. (e.) The result of the whole is despair. The law kills. It destroys not only all self-complacency, but all hope of ever being able to effect our own salvation. (f.) And thus it lead. the sinner to look out of himself for salvation; i.e., for deliverance from the power, as well as the guilt of sin. The law is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. Why could not the Apostle say all this of himself? There is nothing here inconsistent with the character or experience of a true believer. It is as true of the Christian that he is not

sanctified by moral suasion, by the objective presentation of truth, as it is of the unrenewed sinner, that he is not regenerated by any such outward influences. It is, therefore, perfectly pertinent to the Apostle's object that he should detail his own experience that sanctification could not be effected by the law.

2. But in the second place, he uses the first person singular throughout. He says, "I had not known sin," "I died," "The commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death," "I consent unto the law that it is good," "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members," etc., etc. We are bound to understand the Apostle to speak of himself in the use of such language, unless there be something in the context, or m the nature of what is said, to render the reference to him impossible. It has been shown, however, that the context favours, if it does not absolutely demand the reference of what is said to the Apostle himself. And that there is nothing in the experience here detailed inconsistent with the experience of the true children of God, is evident from the fact that the same humility, the same sense of guilt, the same consciousness of indwelling sin, the same conviction of helplessness, here expressed, are found in all the penitential portions of Scripture. Job, David, Isaiah, and Nehemiah, make the same confessions and lamentations that the Apostle here makes. The same is true of believers since the coming of Christ. There is no one of them, not even the holiest, who is not constrained to speak of himself as Paul here speaks, unless indeed he chooses to give the language of the Apostle a meaning which it was never intended to express.

3. While the passage contains nothing inconsistent with the experience of true believers, it is inconsistent with the experience of unrenewed men. They are not the subjects of the inward conflict here depicted.

There is in them indeed often a struggle protracted and painful, between reason and conscience on the one side, and evil passion on the other. But there is not in the unrenewed that utter renunciation of self, that looking for help to God in Christ alone, and that delight in the law of God, of which the Apostle here speaks.

What Romans vii. 7-25 teaches.

Assuming, then, that we have in this chapter an account of the experience of a true and even of an advanced Christian, we learn that in every Christian there is a mixture of good and evil; that the original corruption of nature is not entirely removed by regeneration; that although the believer is made a new creature, is translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, he is but partially sanctified; that his selfishness pride, discontent, worldliness, still cleave to, and torment him, that they effectually prevent his "doing what he would," they prevent his living without sin, they prevent his intercourse with God being as intimate and uninterrupted as he could and does desire. He finds not only that he is often, even daily, overcome so as to sin in thought, word, and deed, but also that his faith, love, zeal, and devotion are never such as to satisfy his own conscience; much less can they satisfy God. He therefore is daily called upon to confess, repent, and pray for forgiveness. The Apostle designates these conflicting principles which he found within himself, the one, indwelling sin; "sin that dwelleth in me;" or the "law in my members;" "the law of sin;" the other, "the mind," "the law of my mind," "the inward man." His internal self, the Ego, was sometimes controlled by the one, and sometimes by the other. We learn, further, that the control of the evil principle is resisted, that subjection to it is regarded as a hateful bondage, that the good principle is in the main victorious, and that through Christ it will

ultimately be completely triumphant. Sanctification therefore, according to this representation, consists in the gradual triumph of the new nature implanted in regeneration over the evil that still remains after the heart is renewed. In other words, as elsewhere expressed, it is a dying unto sin and living unto righteousness. (1 Pet. ii. 24.)

Galatians v. 16-26.

Another passage of like import is Galatians v. 16-26, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not full the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would," etc., etc. The Scriptures teach that the Spirit of God dwells in his people, not only collectively as the Church, but individually in every believer, so that of every Christian it may be said, he is a temple of the Holy Ghost. God is said to dwell wherever He permanently manifests his presence, whether as of old in the temple, or in the hearts of his people, in the Church, or in heaven. And as the Spirit dwells in believers, He there manifests his life-giving, controlling power, and is in them the principle, or source, or controlling influence which determines their inward and outward life. By the flesh, in the doctrinal portions of Scripture, is never, unless the word be limited by the context, meant merely our sensuous nature, but our fallen nature, i.e., our nature as it is in itself, apart from the Spirit of God. As our Lord says (John iii. 6), "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." These then are the principles which "are contrary the one to the other." No man can act independently of both. He must obey one or the other. He may sometimes obey the one, and sometimes the other; but one or the other must prevail. The Apostle says of believers that they have

crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. They have renounced the authority of the evil principle; they do not willingly, or of set purpose, or habitually yield to it. They struggle against it, and not only endeavour, but actually do crucify it, although it may die a long and painful death.

Ephesians iv. 22-24.

In Ephesians iv. 22-24, we are told: "Put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and" put ye "on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." By the old man is to be understood the former self with all the evils belonging to its natural state. This was to be laid aside as a worn and soiled garment, and a new, pure self, the new man, was to take its place. This change, although expressed in a figure borrowed from a change of raiment, was a profound inward change produced by a creating process, by which the soul is new fashioned after the image of God in righteousness and holiness. It is a renewing as to the Spirit, i.e., the interior life of the mind; or as Meyer and Ellicott, the best of modern commentators, both interpret the phrase, "By the Spirit" (the Holy Spirit) dwelling in the mind. This is a transformation in which believers are exhorted to cooperate; for which they are to labour, and which is therefore a protracted work. Sanctification, therefore, according to this representation, consists in the removal of the evils which belong to us in our natural condition, and in being made more and more conformed to the image of God through the gracious influence of the Spirit of God dwelling in us.

It is not, however, merely in such passages as those above cited that the nature of sanctification is set forth. The Bible is full of exhortations and commands addressed to the people of God, to those

recognized and assumed to be regenerate, requiring them, on the one hand, to resist their evil passions and propensities, to lay aside all malice, and wrath, and pride, and jealousy; and on the other, to cultivate all the graces of the Spirit, faith, love, hope, long-suffering, meekness, lowliness of mind, and brotherly kindness. At the same time they are reminded that it is God who worketh in them both to will and to do, and that therefore they are constantly to seek his aid and to depend upon his assistance.

It follows from this view of the subject that sanctification is not only, as before proved, a supernatural work, but also that it does not consist exclusively in a series of a new kind of acts. It is the making the tree good, in order that the fruit may be good. It involves an essential change of character. As regeneration is not an act of the subject of the work, but in the language of the Bible a new birth, a new creation, a quickening or communicating a new life, and in the language of the old Latin Church, the infusion of new habits of grace; so sanctification in its essential nature is not holy acts, but such a change in the state of the soul, that sinful acts become more infrequent, and holy acts more and more habitual and controlling. This view alone is consistent with the Scriptural representations, and with the account given in the Bible of the way in which this radical change of character is carried on and consummated.

---

§ 3. The Method of Sanctification.

It has already been shown that although sanctification does not exclude all cooperation on the part of its subjects, but, on the contrary, calls for their unremitting and strenuous exertion, it is nevertheless the work of God. It is not carried on as a mere process of moral culture by moral means; it is as truly supernatural in its method as in

its nature. What the Bible teaches in answer to the question, How a soul by nature spiritually dead, being quickened by the mighty power of God, is gradually transformed into the image of Christ, is substantially as follows, --

The Soul is led to exercise Faith.

1. It is led to exercise faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, to receive Him as its Saviour, committing itself to Him to be by his merit and grace delivered from the guilt and power of sin. This is the first step, and secures all the rest, not because of its inherent virtue or efficacy, but because, according to the covenant of grace, or plan of salvation, which God has revealed and which He has pledged Himself to carry out, He becomes bound by his promise to accomplish the full salvation from sin of every one who believes.

The Effect of Union with Christ.

2. The soul by this act of faith becomes united to Christ. We are in Him by faith. The consequences of this union are, (a.) Participation in his merits. His perfect righteousness, agreeably to the stipulations of the covenant of redemption, is imputed to the believer. He is thereby justified. He is introduced into a state of favour or grace, and rejoices in hope of the glory of God. (Rom. v. 1-3.) This is, as the Bible teaches, the essential preliminary condition of sanctification. While under the law we are under the curse. While under the curse we are the enemies of God and bring forth fruit unto death. It is only when delivered from the law by the body or death of Christ, and united to Him, that we bring forth fruit unto God. (Rom. vi. 8; vii. 4-6.) Sin, therefore, says the Apostle, shall not reign over us, because we are not under the law. (Rom. vi. 14.) Deliverance from the law is the necessary condition of deliverance from sin. All the relations of the believer are thus changed. He is translated from the kingdom of

darkness and introduced into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Instead of an outcast, a slave under condemnation, he becomes a child of God, assured of his love, of his tenderness, and of his care. He may come to Him with confidence. He is brought under all the influences which in their full effect constitute heaven. He therefore becomes a new creature. He has passed from death to life; from darkness to light, from hell (the kingdom of Satan) to heaven. He sits with Christ in heavenly places. (Eph. ii. 6.) (b.) Another consequence of the union with Christ effected by faith, is the indwelling of the Spirit. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us, in order that we might receive the promise of the Holy Ghost. (Gal. iii. 13, 14.) It was not consistent with the perfections or purposes of God that the Spirit should be given to dwell with his saving influences in the apostate children of men, until Christ had made a full satisfaction for the sins of the world. But as with God there are no distinctions of time, Christ was slain from the foundation of the world, and his death availed as fully for the salvation of those who lived before, as for that of those who have lived since his coming in the flesh. (Rom. iii. 25, 26; Heb. ix. 15.) The Spirit was given to the people of God from the beginning. But as our Lord says (John x. 10) that He came into the world not only that men might have life, but that they might have it more abundantly, the effusion, or copious communication of the Spirit is always represented as the great characteristic of the Messiah's advent. (Joel ii 28, 29; Acts ii. 16-21; John vii. 38, 39.) Our Lord, therefore, in his last discourse to his disciples, said it was expedient for them that He went away, for "if I go not away, the Comforter (the Parakletos, the helper) will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." (John xvi. 7.) He was to supply the place of Christ as to his visible presence,

carry on his work, gather in his people, transform them into the likeness of Christ, and communicate to them all the benefits of his redemption. Where the Spirit is, there Christ is; so that, the Spirit being with us, Christ is with us; and if the Spirit dwells in us, Christ dwells in us. (Rom. viii. 9-11.) In partaking, therefore, of the Holy Ghost, believers are partakers of the life of Christ. The Spirit was given to Him without measure, and from him flows down to all his members. This participation of the believer in the life of Christ, so that every believer may say with the Apostle, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20), is prominently presented in the Word of God. (Rom. vi. 5; vii. 4; John xiv. 19; Col. iii. 3, 4.) The two great standing illustrations of this truth are the vine and the human body. The former is presented at length in John xv. 1-8, the latter in 1 Corinthians xii. 11-27; Romans xii. 5; Ephesians i. 22, 23; iv. 15, 16; v. 30; Colossians i. 18; ii. 19; and frequently elsewhere. As the life of the vine is diffused through all the branches, sustaining and rendering them fruitful; and as the life of the head is diffused through all the members of the body making it one, and imparting life to all, so the life of Christ is diffused through all the members of his mystical body making them one body in Him; having a common life with their common head. This idea is urged specially in Ephesians iv. 15, 16, where it is said that it is from Christ that the whole body fitly joined together, through the spiritual influence granted to every part according to its measure, makes increase in love. It is true that this is spoken of the Church as a whole. But what is said of Christ's mystical body as a whole is true of all its members severally. He is the prophet, priest, and king of the Church; but He is also the prophet, priest, and king of every believer. Our relation to Him is individual and personal. The Church as a whole is the temple of

God; but so is every believer. (1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19.) The Church is the bride of Christ, but every believer is the object of that tender, peculiar love expressed in the use of that metaphor. The last verse of Paul Gerhardt's hymn, "Ein Lämmlein geht und trägt die Schuld," every true Christian may adopt as the expression of his own hopes: --

"Wann endlich ich soll treten ein
In deines Reiches Freuden,
So soll diess Blut mein Purpur seyn,
Ich will mich darein kielden;
Es soll seyn meines Hauptes Kron'
In welcher ich will vor den Thron
Des höchsten Vaters gehen,
Und dir, dem er mich anvertraut,
Als eine wohlgeschmückte Braut,
An deiner Seiten stehen."

The Inward Work of the Spirit.

3. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit thus secured by union with Christ becomes the source of a new spiritual life, which constantly increases in power until everything uncongenial with it is expelled, and the soul is perfectly transformed into the image of Christ. It is the office of the Spirit to enlighten the mind; or, as Paul expresses it, "to enlighten the eyes of the understanding" (Eph. i. 18), that we may know the things freely given to us of God (1 Cor. ii. 12); i.e., the things which God has revealed; or, as they are called in v. 14, "The things of the Spirit of God." These things, which the natural man cannot know, the Spirit enables the believer "to discern," i.e., to apprehend in their truth and excellence; and thus to experience their power. The Spirit, we are taught, especially opens the eyes to see the glory of Christ, to see that He is God manifest in the flesh; to discern not

only his divine perfections, but his love to us, and his suitableness in all respects as our Saviour, so that those who have not seen Him, yet believing on Him, rejoice in Him with joy unspeakable and full of glory. This apprehension of Christ is transforming; the soul is thereby changed into his image, from glory to glory by the Spirit of the Lord. It was this inward revelation of Christ by which Paul on his way to Damascus was instantly converted from a blasphemer into a worshipper and self-sacrificing servant of the Lord Jesus.

It is not, however, only one object which the opened eye of the believer is able to discern. The Spirit enables him to see the glory of God as revealed in his works and in his word; the holiness and spirituality of the law; the exceeding sinfulness of sin; his own guilt, pollution, and helplessness; the length and breadth, the height and depth of the economy of redemption; and the reality glory, and infinite importance of the things unseen and eternal. The soul is thus raised above the world. It lives in a higher sphere. It becomes more and more heavenly in its character and desires. All the great doctrines of the Bible concerning God, Christ, and things spiritual and eternal, are so revealed by this inward teaching of the Spirit, as to be not only rightly discerned, but to exert, in a measure, their proper influence on the heart and life. Thus the prayer of Christ (John xvii. 17), "Sanctify them through thy truth," is answered in the experience of his people.

God calls the Graces of his People into Exercise.

4. The work of sanctification is carried on by God's giving constant occasion for the exercise of all the graces of the Spirit. Submission, confidence, self-denial, patience, and meekness, as well as faith, hope, and love, are called forth, or put to the test, more or less effectually every day the believer passes on earth. And by this

constant exercise he grows in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is, however, principally by calling his people to labour and snffer for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and for the good of their fellow-men, that this salutary discipline is carried on. The best Christians are in general those who not merely from restless activity of natural disposition, but from love to Christ and zeal for his glory, labour most and suffer most in his service.

The Church and Sacraments as means of Grace.

5. One great end of the establishment of the Church on earth, as the communion of saints, is the edification of the people of God. The intellectual and social life of man is not developed in isolation and solitude. It is only in contact and collision with his fellow-men that his powers are called into exercise and his social virtues are cultivated. Thus also it is by the Church-life of believers, by their communion in the worship and service of God, and by their mutual good offices and fellowship, that the spiritual life of the soul is developed. Therefore the Apostle says, "Let us consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together. as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." (Heb. x. 24, 25.)

6. The Spirit renders the ordinances of God, the word, sacraments, and prayer, effectual means of promoting the sanctification of his people, and of securing their ultimate salvation. These, however, must be more fully considered in the sequel.

The Kingly Office of Christ.

7. In this connection, we are not to overlook or undervalue the constant exercise of the kingly office of Christ. He not only reigns

over his people, but He subdues them to Himself, rules and defends them, and restrains and conquers all his and their enemies. These enemies are both inward and outward, both seen and unseen; they are the world, the flesh, and the devil. The strength of the believer in contending with these enemies, is not his own. He, is strong only in the Lord, and in the power of his might. (Eph. vi. 10.) The weapons, both offensive and defensive, are supplied by Him, and the disposition and the skill to use them are his gifts to be sought by praying without ceasing. He is an ever present helper. Whenever the Christian feels his weakness either in resisting temptation or in the discharge of duty, he looks to Christ, and seeks aid from Him. And all who seek find. When we fail, it is either from self-confidence, or from neglecting to call upon our ever present and almighty King, who is always ready to protect and deliver those who put their trust in Him. But there are dangers which we do not apprehend, enemies whom we do not see, and to which we would become an easy prey, were it not for the watchful care of Him who came into the world to destroy the works of the devil, and to bruise Satan under our feet. The Christian runs his race "looking unto Jesus;" the life he lives, he lives by faith in the Son of God; it is by the constant worship of Christ; by the constant exercise of love toward Him; by constant endeavours to do his will; and by constantly looking to Him for the supply of grace and for protection and aid, that he overcomes sin and finally attains the prize of the high-calling of God.

---

§ 4. The Fruits of Sanctification, or Good Works.

Their Nature.

The fruits of sanctification are good works. Our Lord says "A good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, For every tree is known by his own fruit: for of

thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes." (Luke vi. 43, 44.) By good works, in this connection, are meant not only the inward exercises of the religious life, but also outward acts, such as can be seen and appreciated by others.

There are three senses in which works may be called good, --

1. When as to the matter of them they are what the law prescribes. In this sense even the heathen perform good works; as the Apostle says, Romans ii. 14, "The Gentiles . . . do by nature the things contained in the law." That is, they perform acts of justice and mercy. No man on earth is so wicked as never, in this sense of the term, to be the author of some good works. This is what the theologians call civil goodness, whose sphere is the social relations of men.

2. In the second place, by good works are meant works which both in the matter of them, and in the design and motives of the agent, are what the law requires. In other words, a work is good, when there is nothing either in the agent or in the act which the law condemns. In this sense not even the works of the holiest of God's people are good. No man is ever, since the fall, in this life, in such an inward state that he can stand before God and be accepted on the ground of what he is or of what he does. All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. (Is. lxiv. 6.)

Paul found to the last a law of sin in his members. He groaned under a body of death. In one of his latest epistles he says he had not attained, or was not already perfect, and all Christians are required to pray daily for the forgiveness of sin. What the Scriptures teach of the imperfection of the best works of the believer, is confirmed by the irrepressible testimony of consciousness. It matters not what the lips may say, every man's conscience telis him that he is always a sinner, that he never is free from moral defilement in the sight of an infinitely holy God. On this subject the Form of Concord [227] says,

"Lex Dei credentibus bona opera ad eum modum præscribit, ut simul, tanquam in speculo, nobis commonstret, ea omnia in nobis in hac vita adhuc imperfecta et impura esse;" and [228] "Credentes in hac vita non perfecte, completive vel consummative (ut veteres locuti sunt) renovantur. Et quamvis ipsorum peccata Christi obedientia absolutissima contecta sint, ut credentibus non ad damnationem imputentur, et per Spiritum Sanctum veteris Adami mortificatio et renovatio in spiritu mentis eorum inchoata sit: tamen vetus Adam in ipsa natura, omnibusque illius interioribus et exterioribus viribus adhuc semper inhæret."

Calvin [229] says, "Seligat ex tota sua vita sanctus Dei servus, quod in ejus cursu maxime eximium se putabit edidisse, bene revolvat singulas partes: deprehendet procul dubio alicubi quod carnis putredinem sapiat, quando numquam ea est nostra alacritas ad bene agendum quæ esse debet, sed in cursu retardando multa debilitas. Quanquam non obscuras esse maculas videmus, quibus respersa sint opera sanctorum, fac tamen minutissimos esse nævos duntaxat: sed an oculos Dei nihil offendent, coram quibus ne stellæ quidem puræ sunt? Habemus, nec unum a sanctis exire opus, quod, si in se censeatur, non mereatur justam opprobrii mercedem."

Romish Doctrine on Good Works.

Against the doctrine that the best works of the believer are imperfect, the Romanists are especially denunciatory. And with good reason. It subverts their whole system, which is founded on the assumed merit of good works. If the best works of the saints merit "justam opprobrii mercedem" (i.e., condemnation), they cannot merit reward. Their argument on this subject is, that if the Protestant doctrine be true which declares the best works of the believer to be imperfect; then the fulfilment of the law is impossible; but if this be so, then the law is not binding; for God does not command impossibilities. To this it may

be answered, first, that the objection is inconsistent with the doctrine of Romanists themselves. They teach that man in his natural state since the fall is unable to do anything good in the sight of God, until he receives the grace of God communicated in baptism. According to the principle on which the objection is founded, the law does not bind the unbaptized. And secondly, the objection assumes the fundamental principle of Pelagianism, namely that ability limits obligation; a principle which, in the sphere of morals, is contrary to Scripture, consciousness, and the common judgment of mankind. We cannot be required to do what is impossible because of the limitation of our nature as creatures, as to create a world, or raise the dead; but to love God perfectly does not exceed the power of man as he came from the hands of his maker. It is not absolutely, but only relatively impossible, that is, in relation of the thing commanded, to us not as men, but as sinners. Although it is essential to the Romish doctrine of merit, of indulgences, of works of supererogation, and of purgatory, that the renewed should be able perfectly to fulfil the demands of the law, nevertheless, Romanists themselves are compelled to admit the contrary. Thus Bellarmin says, [230] "Defectus charitatis, quod videlicet non faciamus opera nostra tanto fervore dilectionis, quanto faciemus in patria, defectus quidem est, sed culpa et peccatum non est. . . . . Unde etiam charitas nostra, quamvis comparata ad charitatem beatorum sit imperfecta, tamen absolute perfecta dici potest." That is, although our love is in fact imperfect, it may be called perfect. But calling it perfect, does not alter its nature. To the same effect another of the leading theologians of the Roman Church, Andradius, says, "Peccata venalia per se tam esse minuta et levia, ut non adversentur perfectioni caritatis, nec impedire possint perfectam et absolutam legis obedientiam: utpote quæ non sint ira Dei et

condemnatione, sed venia digna, etiamsi Deus cum illis in judicium intret." [231] That is, sins are not sins, because men choose to regard them as trivial.

Works of Supererogation.

But if no work of man since the fall in this life is perfectly good, then it not only follows that the doctrine of merit must be given up, but still more obviously, all works of supererogation are impossible. Romanists teach that the renewed may not only completely satisfy all the demands of the law of God, which requires that we should love Him with all the heart, and all the mind, and all the strength, and our neighbour as ourselves; but that they can do more than the law demands, and thus acquire more merit than they need for their own salvation, which may be made available for those who lack.

It is impossible that any man can hold such a doctrine, unless he first degrades the law of God by restricting its demands to very narrow limits. The Romanists represent our relation to God as analogous to a citizen's relation to the state. Civil laws are limited to a narrow sphere. They concern only our social and political obligations. It is easy for a man to be a good citizen; to fulfil perfectly all that the law of the land requires. Such a man, through love to his country, may do far more than the law can demand. He may not only pay tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, and honour to whom honour; but he may also devote his time, his talents, his whole fortune to the service of his country. Thus also, according to Romanists, men may not only do all that the law of God requires of men as men, but they may also through love, far exceed its demands. This Möhler represents as a great superiority of Romish ethics over the Protestant system. The latter, according to him, limits man's obligations to his legal liabilities, to what in justice may be exacted from him on pain of

punishment. Whereas the former rises to the higher sphere of love, and represents the believer cordially and freely rendering unto God what in strict justice could not be demanded of him. "It is the nature of love, which stands far, even immeasurably higher than the demands of the law, never to be satisfied with its manifestation, and to become more and more sensitive, so that believers, who are animated with this love, often appear to men who stand on a lower level as fanatics or lunatics." [232] But what if the law itself is love? What if the law demands all that love can render? What if the love which the law requires of every rational creature calls for the devotion of the whole soul, with all its powers to God as a living sacrifice? It is only by making sin to be no sin; by teaching men that they are perfect when even their own hearts condemn them; it is only by lowering the demands of the law which, being founded on the nature of God, of necessity requires perfect conformity to the divine image, that any man in this life can pretend to be perfect, or be so insane as to imagine that he can go beyond the demands of the law and perform works of supererogation.

Precepts and Counsels.

The distinction which Romanists make between precepts and counsels, rests upon the same low view of the divine law. By precepts are meant the specific commands of the law which bind all men, the observance of which secures a reward, and non-observance a penalty. Whereas counsels are not commands; they do not bind the conscience of any man, but are recommendations of things peculiarly acceptable to God, compliance with which merits a much higher reward than the mere observance of precepts. There are many such counsels in the Bible, the most important of which are said to be celibacy, monastic obedience, and poverty. [233] No man is bound to remain unmarried, but if he voluntarily determines to do so

for the glory of God, that is a great virtue. No one is bound to renounce the acquisition of property, but if he voluntarily embraces a life of absolute poverty, it is a great merit. Our Lord, however, demands everything. He saith, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." "He that findeth his life, shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." (Matt. x. 31, 39.) "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke xiv. 26.) The law of Christ demands entire devotion to Him. If his service requires that a man should remain unmarried, he is bound to live a life of celibacy; if it requires that he should give up all his property and take up his cross, and follow Christ, he is bound to do so; if it requires him to lay down his life for Christ's sake, he is bound to lay it down. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Nothing can go beyond this. There can be no sacrifice and no service which a man can make or render, which duty, or the law of Christ, does not demand when such sacrifice or service becomes necessary as the proof or fruit of love to Christ. There is no room, therefore, for this distinction between counsels and precepts, between what the law demands and what love is willing to render. And therefore the doctrine of works of supererogation is thoroughly anti-Christian.

They Sense in which the Fruits of the Spirit in Believers are called Good.

3. Although no work even of the true people of God, while they continue in this world, is absolutely perfect, nevertheless those inward exercises and outward acts which are the fruits of the Spirit are properly designated good, and are so called in Scripture. Acts ix. 36,

it was said of Dorcas that she "was full of good works." Ephesians ii. 10, believers are said to be "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." 2 Timothy iii. 17, teaches that the man of God should be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Titus ii. 14, Christ gave Himself for us that He might "purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." There is no contradiction in pronouncing the same work good and bad, because these terms are relative, and the relations intended may be different. Feeding the poor, viewed in relation to the nature of the act is a good work. Viewed in relation to the motive which prompts it, it may be good or bad. If done to be seen of men, it is offensive in the sight of God. If done from natural benevolence, it is an act of ordinary morality. If done to a disciple in the name of a disciple, it is an act of Christian virtue. The works of the children of God, therefore, although stained by sin, are truly and properly good, because, (1.) They are, as to their nature or the thing done, commanded by God. (2.) Because, as to the motive, they are the fruits, not merely of right moral feeling, but of religious feeling, i.e., of love to God; and (3.) Because they are performed with the purpose of complying with his will, of honouring Christ and of promoting the interests of his kingdom.

It follows from the fundamental principle of Protestantism, that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice, that no work can be regarded as good or obligatory on the conscience which the Scriptures do not enjoin. Of course it is not meant that the Bible commands in detail everything which the people of God are bound to do, but it prescribes the principles by which their conduct is to be regulated, and specifies the kind of acts which those principles require or forbid. It is enough that the Scriptures require children to obey their parents, citizens the magistrate, and believers to hear the Church,

without enjoining every act which these injunctions render obligatory. In giving these general commands, the Bible gives all necessary limitations, so that neither parents, magistrates, nor Church can claim any authority not granted to them by God, nor impose anything on the conscience which He does not command. As some churches have enjoined a multitude of doctrines as articles of faith, which are not taught in Scripture, so they have enjoined a multitude of acts, which the Bible neither directly, nor by just or necessary inference requires. They have thus imposed upon those who recognize their authority as infallible in teaching, a yoke of bondage which no one is able to bear. After the example of the ancient Pharisees, they teach for doctrines the commandments of men, and claim divine authority for human institutions. From this bondage it was one great design of the Reformation to free the people of God. This deliverance was effected by proclaiming the principle that nothing is sin but what the Bible forbids and nothing is morally obligatory but what the Bible enjoins. Such, however, is the disposition, on the one hand, to usurp authority, and, on the other, to yield to it, that it is only by the constant assertion and vindication of this principle, that the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free can be preserved.

---

[227] VI. 21; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 723.

[228] VI. 7; Ibid. p. 719.

[229] Institutio, III. xiv. 9; edit. Berlin, 1834, part ii. p. 37.

[230] De Justificatione, IV. xvii; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 933, b.

[231] See Chemnitz Examen, De Bonis Operibus, III. edit. Frankfort, 1574, part i. p. 209, a.

[232] Möhler, Symbolik, 6th edit. Mainz, 1843, p. 216.

[233] Bellarmin, De Membris Ecclesiæ Militantis, lib. II. de Monachis, cap. 7, 8; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. ii. pp. 363-365.

---

§ 5. Necessity of Good Works.

On this subject there has never been any real difference of opinion among Protestants, although there was in the early Lutheran Church some misunderstanding. First. It was universally admitted that good works are not necessary to our justification; that they are consequences and indirectly the fruits of justification, and, therefore, cannot be its ground. Secondly, it was also agreed that faith, by which the sinner is justified, is not as a work, the reason why God pronounces the sinner just. It is the act by which the sinner receives and rests upon the righteousness of Christ, the imputation of which renders him righteous in the sight of God. Thirdly, faith does not justify because it includes, or is the root or principle of good works; not as "fides obsequiosa." Fourthly, it was agreed that it is only a living faith, i.e., a faith which works by love and purifies the heart, that unites the soul to Christ and secures our reconciliation with God. Fifthly, it was universally admitted that an immoral life is inconsistent with a state of grace; that those who wilfully continue in the practice of sin shall not inherit the kingdom of God. The Protestants while rejecting the Romish doctrine of subjectve justification, strenuously insisted that no man is delivered from the guilt of sin who is not delivered from its reiguing power; that sanctification is inseparable from justification, and that the one is just as essential as the other.

The controversy on this subject was due mainly to a misunderstanding, but in a measure also to a real difference of opinion as to the office of the law under the Gospel. Melancthon taught that repentance was the effect of the law and anterior to faith, and used forms of expression

which were thought to imply that good works, or sanctification, although not the ground of justification, were nevertheless a "causa sine qua non" of our acceptance with God. To this Luther objected, as true sanctification is the consequence, and in no sense the condition of the sinner's justification. We are not justified because we are holy; but being justified, we are rendered holy. Agricola (born in Eisleben, 1492, died 1566), a pupil of Luther, and greatly influential as a preacher, took extreme ground against Melancthon. He not only held that repentance was not due to the operation of the law, and was the fruit of faith, but also that the law should not be taught under the Gospel, and that good works are not necessary to salvation. The believer is entirely free from the law, is not under the law but under grace; and being accepted for what Christ did, it is of little consequence what he does. Luther denounced this perversion of the Gospel, which overlooked entirely the distinction between the law as a covenant of works demanding perfect obedience as the condition of justification, and the law as the revelation of the immutable will of God as to what rational creatures should be and do in character and conduct. He insisted that faith was the receiving of Christ, not only for the pardon of sin, but also as a saviour from its power; that its object was not merely the death, but also the obedience of Christ. [234]

The controversy was renewed not long after in another form, in consequence of the position taken by George Major, also a pupil of Luther and Melancthon, and for some years professor of theology and preacher at Wittenberg. He was accused of objecting to the proposition "we are saved by faith alone" and of teaching that good works were also necessary to salvation. This was understood as tantamount to saying that good works are necessary to justification. Major, indeed, denied

the justice of this charge. He said he did not teach that good works were necessary as being meritorious, but simply as the necessary fruits of faith and part of our obedience to Christ; nevertheless, he maintained that no one could be saved without good works. How then can infants be saved? And how can this unconditional necessity of good works be consistent with Paul's doctrine that we are justified by faith without works? Whom God justifies He glorifies. Justification secures salvation; and, therefore, if faith alone, or faith without works, secures justification, it secures salvation. It is very evident that this was a dispute about words. Major admitted that the sinner was in a state of salvation the moment he believed, but held that if his faith did not produce good works it was not a saving faith. In his sermon "On the Conversion of Paul," he said: "As thou art now justified by faith alone, and hast become a child of God, and since Christ and the Holy Ghost through that faith dwell in thy heart, so are good works necessary, not to obtain salvation (which thou already hast as a matter of grace, without works, through faith alone on the Lord Jesus Christ), but to hold fast your salvation, that it be not lost, and also because if thou dost not produce good works, it is an evidence that thy faith is false and dead, a mere pretence or opinion." Amsdorf, the chief representative of the extremists in this controversy, laid down his doctrine in the following propositions: (1.) Etsi hæc oratio: bona opera sunt necessaria ad salutem in doctrina legis abstractive et de idea tolerari potest, tamen multæ sunt graves causæ, propter quas vitanda, et fugienda est non minus, quam hæc oratio: Christus est creatura. (2.) In foro justificationis hæc propositio nullo modo ferenda est. (3.) In foro novæ obedientiæ post reconciliationem nequaquam bona opera ad salutem, sed propter alias causas necessaria sunt. (4.) Sola fides justificat in principio, medio, et fine. (5.)

Bona opera non sunt necessaria ad retinendam salutem. (6.) Synonyma sunt et æquipollentia, seu termini convertibiles, justificatio et salvatio, nec ulla ratione distrahi aut possunt aut debent. (7.) Explodatur ergo ex ecclesia cothurnus papisticus propter scandala multiplicia, dissensiones innumerabiles et alias causas, de quibus Apostoli Act. xv. loquuntur."

The "Form of Concord," in which this and other controversies in the Lutheran Church were finally adjusted, took the true ground on this subject, midway between the two extreme views. It rejects the unqualified proposition that good works are necessary to salvation, as men may be saved who have no opportunity to testify to their faith by their works. On the other hand, it utterly condemns the unwarrantable declaration that good works are hurtful to salvation; which it pronounces to be pernicious and full of scandal. It teaches that "Fides vera nunquam sola est, quin caritatem et spem semper secum habeat." [235]

The same doctrine was clearly taught in the Lutheran Symbols from the beginning, so that the charge made by Romanists, that Protestants divorced morality from religion, was without foundation, either in their doctrine or practice. In the "Apology for the Augsburg Confession" it is said: "Quia fides affert Spiritum Sanctum, et parit novam vitam in cordibus, necesse est, quod pariat spirituales motus in cordibus. Et qui sint illi motus, ostendit propheta, cum ait: Dabo legem meam in corda eorum.' Postquam igitur fide justificati et renati sumus, incipimus Deum timere, diligere, petere, et expectare ab eo auxilium. . . . . Incipimus et diligere proximos, quia corda habent spirituales et sanctos motus. Hæc non possunt fieri, nisi postquam fide justificati sumus et renati accipimus Spiritum Sanctum. . . . . Profitemur igitur, quod necesse est, inchoari in nobis et subinde magis

magisque fieri legem. Et complectimur simul utrumque videlicet spirituales motus et externa bona opera. Falso igitur calumniantur nos adversarii, quod nostri non doceant bona opera, cum ea non solum requirant, sed etiam ostendant, quomodo fieri possint." [236]

Antinomianism.

Antinomianism has never had any hold in the churches of the Reformation. There is no logical connection between the neglect of moral duties, and the system which teaches that Christ is a Saviour as well from the power as from the penalty of sin; that faith is the act by which the soul receives and rests on Him for sanctification as well as for justification; and that such is the nature of the union with Christ by faith and indwelling of the Spirit, that no one is, or can be partaker of the benefit of his death, who is not also partaker of the power of his life; which holds to the divine authority of the Scripture which declares that without holiness no man shall see the Lord (Heb. xii. 14); and which, in the language of the great advocate of salvation by grace, warns all who call themselves Christians: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.) It is not the system which regards sin as so great an evil that it requires the blood of the Son of God for its expiation, and the law as so immutable that it requires the perfect righteousness of Christ for the sinner's justification, which leads to loose views of moral obligation; these are reached by the system which teaches that the demands of the law have been lowered, that they can be more than met by the imperfect obedience of fallen men, and that sin can be pardoned by priestly intervention. This is what logic and history alike teach.

[234] See Dorner, Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, Munich, 1867, pp. 336-344.

[235] Epitome, III. xi.; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. 1846, p. 586.

[236] III. iv., v., xv.; Hase, pp. 83, 85.

---

§ 6. Relation of Good Works to Reward.

Romish Doctrine.

On this subject the Romanists make a distinction between works done before, and those done after regeneration. Works as to the matter of them good, when performed from mere natural conscience, have no other merit than that of congruity. They are necessarily imperfect, and constitute no claim on the justice of God. But works performed under the control of gracious principles infused in baptism, are perfect; they have therefore real merit, i.e., the merit of condignity. They give a claim for reward, not merely on the ground of the divine promise, but also on the divine justice. To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. (Rom. iv. 4.) On this subject the Council of Trent, [237] says: "Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus, quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam, et Jesu Christi meritum cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum; anathema sit." Bellarmin [238] says: "Habet communis catholicorum omnium sententia, opera bona justorum vere, ac proprie esse merita, et merita non cujuscunque premii, sed ipsius vitæ æternæ." The conditions of such meritorious works, according to Bellarmin, are: (1.) That they be good in their nature. (2.) Done in obedience to God.

(3.) By a man in this life. (4.) That they be voluntary. (5.) That the agent be in a state of justification and favour with God. (6.) That they be prompted by love. (7.) That some divine promise be attached to them.

Refutation of this Romish Doctrine.

1. This whole doctrine of merit is founded on the assumption that justification, their term for regeneration, removes everything of the nature of sin from the soul; that works performed by the renewed being free from sin are perfect; that a renewed man can not only fulfil all the demands of the law, but also do more than the law requires. As these assumptions are contrary to Scripture, and to the experience of all Christians, the doctrine founded on them must be false.

2. The doctrine is inconsistent, not only with the express declarations of the word of God, but also with the whole nature and design of the Gospel. The immediate or proximate design of the plan of salvation, as the Scriptures abundantly teach, is the manifestation of the grace of God, and therefore it must be gratuitous in all its parts and provisions, to the entire exclusion of all merit. Unless salvation be of grace it is not a revelation of grace, and if of grace it is not of works.

3. The doctrine is so repugnant to the inward teachings of the Spirit, as well as to the teachings of his word, that it cannot be practically believed even by those who profess it. The children of God, in spite of their theories and their creeds, do not trust for their salvation, either in whole or in part, to what they are or to what they do; but simply and exclusively to what Christ is and has done for them. In proof of this, appeal may be made to the written or recorded experience of all the great lights of the Latin Church. If every Christian is intimately convinced that he is unholy in the sight of God; that all

his best acts are polluted; and that in no one thing and at no time does he come up to the standard of perfection; it is impossible that he can believe that he merits eternal life on the ground of his own works.

4. As the doctrine of merit is opposed to the nature and design of the Gospel, and to the express declarations of Scripture that we are not justified or saved by works, but gratuitously for Christ's sake, so it is derogatory to the honour of Christ as our Saviour. He gave Himself as a ransom; he offered Himself as a sacrifice; it is by his obedience we are constituted righteous; it is, therefore, only on the assumption that his ransom, sacrifice, and obedience are inadequate that the merit of our works can be needed or admitted. The Romanists attempt to evade the force of this objection by saying that we owe to Christ the grace or spiritual life by which we perform good works. Had He not died for our sins, God would not in baptism wash away our guilt and pollution and impart those "habits of grace" by which we are enabled to merit eternal life. This does not help the matter; for salvation remains a debt as a matter of justice on the ground of our good works. It is this which is so contrary to Scripture, to the intimate conviction of every Christian, and to the glory of Christ, to whom the whole honour of our salvation is due.

Doctrine of the older Protestant Divines.

The older theologians, in order the more effectually to refute the doctrine of merit, assumed that a work, to be meritorious, must be (1.) "Indebitum," i.e., not due. Something which we are not bound to do. (2.) Our own. (3.) Absolutely perfect. (4.) Equal, or bearing a due proportion to the recompense. (5.) And, therefore, that the recompense should be due on the gound of justice, and not merely of promise or agreement. On these conditions, all merit on the part of creatures is impossible. It is, however, clearly recognized in Scripture that a

labourer is worthy of his hire. To him that worketh, says the Apostle, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt. It is something due in justice. This principle also is universally recognized among men. Even on the theory of slavery, where the labourer himself his time, and strength, and all he has, are assumed to belong to his master, the servant has a claim to a proper recompense, which it would be unjust to withhold from him. And in every department of life it is recognized as a simple matter of justice, that the man who performs a stipulated work, earns his wages. The payment is not a matter of favour; it is not due simply because promised; but because it has been earned. It is a debt. So in the case of Adam, had he remained perfect, there would have been no ground in justice why he should die, or forfeit the favour of God; which favour is life.

The passage in Luke xvii. 10, is relied upon as proving that a creature can in no case perform a meritorious act, i.e., an act which lays a claim in justice for a reward. Our Lord there says, "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.'" This does not teach that the labourer is not worthy of his hire. The passage is part of a parable in which our Lord says, that a master does not thank his servant for merely doing his duty. It does not call for gratitude. But it does not follow that it would be just to withhold the servant's wages, or to refuse to allow him to eat and drink. God is just, and being just, He rewards every man according to his works, so long as men are under the law. If not under the law, they are dealt with, not on the principles of law, but of grace.

But although Protestants deny the merit of good works, and teach that salvation is entirely gratuitous, that the remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, and the gift of the Holy Spirit are granted to

the believer, as well as admission into heaven, solely on the ground of the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ; they nevertheless teach that God does reward his people for their works. Having graciously promised for Christ s sake to overlook the imperfection of their best services, they have the assurance founded on that promise that he who gives to a disciple even a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple, shall in no wise lose his reward. The Scriptures also teach that the happiness or blessedness of believers in a future life, will be greater or less in proportion to their devotion to the service of Christ in this life. Those who love little, do little; and those who do little enjoy less. What a man sows that shall he also reap. As the rewards of heaven are given on the ground of the merits of Christ, and as He has a right to do what He will with his own, there would be no injustice were the thief saved on the cross as highly exalted as the Apostle Paul. But the general drift of Scripture is in favour of the doctrine that a man shall reap what he sows; that God will reward every one according to, although not on account of his works.

---

[237] Sess. vi. canon 32; Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, vol. i. p. 37.

[238] De Justificatione, v. i.; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 949, a.

---

§ 7. Perfectionism.

Protestant Doctrine.

The doctrine of Lutherans and Reformed, the two great branches of the Protestant Church, is, that sanctification is never perfected in this life; that sin is not in any case entirely subdued; so that the most advanced believer has need as long as he continues in the flesh, daily

to pray for the forgiveness of sins.

The question is not as to the duty of believers. All admit that we are bound to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. Nor is it a question as to the command of God; for the first, original, and universally obligatory commandment is that we should love God with all our heart and our neighbour as ourselves. Nor does the question concern the provisions of the Gospel. It is admitted that the Gospel provides all that is needed for the complete sanctification and salvation of believers. What can we need more than we have in Christ, his Spirit, his word and his ordinances? Nor does it concern the promises of God; for all rejoice in the hope, founded on the divine promise, that we shall be ultimately delivered from all sin. God has in Christ made provision for the complete salvation of his people: that is, for their entire deliverance from the penalty of the law, from the power of sin, from all sorrow, pain, and death; and not only for mere negative deliverance, but for their being transformed into the image of Christ, filled with his Spirit, and glorified by the beauty of the Lord. It is, however, too plain that, unless sanctification be an exception, no one of these promises besides that which concerns justification, is perfectly fulfilled in this life. Justification does not admit of degrees. A man either is under condemnation, or he is not. And, therefore, from the nature of the case, justification is instantaneous and complete, as soon as the sinner believes. But the question is, whether, when God promises to make his people perfectly holy, perfectly happy, and perfectly glorious, He thereby promises to make them perfect in holiness in this life? If the promises of happiness and glory are not perfectly fulfilled in this life, why should the promise of sanctification be thus fulfilled? It is, however, a mere question of fact. All admit that God can render his people perfect before death as

well as after it. The only question is, Has He promised, with regard to sanctification alone, that it shall be perfected on this side of the grave? and, Do we see cases in which the promise has been actually fulfilled? The answer given to these questions by the Church universal is in the negative. So long as the believer is in this world, he will need to pray for pardon.

The grounds of this doctrine are, --

1. The spirituality of the divine law and the immutability of its demands. It condemns as sinful any want of conformity to the standard of absolute perfection as exhibited in the Bible. Anything less than loving God constantly with all the heart, all the soul, all the mind, and all the strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, is sin.

2. The express declaration of Scripture that all men are sinners. This does not mean simply that all men have sinned, that all are guilty, but that all have sin cleaving to them. "If," declares the Apostle, "we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (1 John i. 8.) As the wise man had said before him, "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." (Eccles. vii. 20.) And in 1 Kings viii. 46, it is said, "There is no man that sinneth not." And the Apostle James, iii. 2, says: "In many things we offend all." It is a manifest perversion of the simple grammatical meaning of the words to make hamartian ouk echomen to refer to the past. The verb is in the present tense. The truth is not in us, says the Apostle, if we say we have no sin, i.e., that we are not now polluted by sin. In the context he sets forth Christ as the "Word of Life," as having life in Himself, and as being the source of life to us. Having fellowship with Him, we have fellowship with God. But God is light, i.e., is pure, holy, and blessed; if, therefore, we walk in darkness, i.e., in ignorance and sin, we can have no fellowship with Him. But if we walk

in the light, as He is in the light, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. If we say we have no sin, and do not need now and at all times the cleansing power of Christ's blood, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

Argument from the General Representations of Scripture.

The declarations of Scripture, which are so abundant, that there is none righteous, no not one; that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; that no flesh living is just in the sight of God; and that every one must lay his hand upon his mouth, and his mouth in the dust in the sight of the infinitely holy God, who accuses his angels of folly, refer to all men without exception; to Jews and Gentiles; to the renewed and unrenewed; to babes in Christ and to mature Christians. All feel, and all are bound to acknowledge that they are sinners whenever they present themselves before God; all know that they need constantly the intervention of Christ, and the application of his blood, to secure fellowship with the Holy One. As portrayed in Scripture, the inward life of the people of God to the end of their course in this world, is a repetition of conversion. It is a continued turning unto God; a constant renewal of confession, repentance, and faith; a dying unto sin, and living unto righteousness. This is true of all the saints, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles of whose inward experience the Bible gives us any account.

Passages which describe the Conflict between the Flesh and the Spirit.

3. More definitely is this truth taught in those passages which describe the conflict in the believer between the flesh and the Spirit. To this reference has already been made. That the seventh chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans is an account of his own inward life at the time of writing that Epistle, has already, as it is believed, been sufficiently proved; and such has been the belief of the great body of

evangelical Christians in all ages of the Church. If this be the correct interpretation of that passage, then it proves that Paul, at least, was not free from sin; that he had to contend with a law in his members, warring against the law of his mind; that he groaned constantly under the burden of indwelling sin. At a still later period of his life, when he was just ready to be offered up, he says to the Philippians, iii. 12-14, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." This is an unmistakable declaration on the part of the Apostle that even at this late period of his life he was not yet perfect; he had not attained the end of perfect conformity to Christ, but was pressing forward, as one in a race, with all earnestness that he might reach the end of his calling. To answer this, as has been done by some distinguished advocates of perfectionism, by saying that Paul's not being perfect, is no proof that other men may not be is not very satisfactory.

The parallel passage in Galatians, v. 16-26, is addressed to Christians generally. It recognizes the fact that they are imperfectly sanctified; that in them the renewed principle, the Spirit as the source of spiritual life, is in couffict with the flesh, the remains of their corrupt nature. It exhorts them to mortify the flesh (not the body, but their corrupt nature), and to strive constantly to walk under the controlling influence of the Spirit. The characteristic difference between the unrenewed and the renewed is not that the former are entirely sinful, and the latter perfectly holy; but that the former are

wholly under the control of their fallen nature, while the latter have the Spirit of God dwelling in them, which leads them to crucify the flesh, and to strive after complete conformity to the image of God. There was nothing in the character of the Galatian Christians to render this exhortation applicable to them alone. What the Scriptures teach concerning faith, repentance, and justification, is intended for all Christians; and so what is taught of sanctification suits the case of all believers. Indeed, if a man thinks himself perfect, and apprehends that he has already attained what his fellow believers are only striving for, a great part of the Bible must for him lose its value. What use can he make of the Psalms, the vehicle through which the people of God for millenniums have poured out their hearts? How can such a man sympathize with Ezra, Nehemiah, or any of the prophets? How strange to him must be the language of Isaiah, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts."

Argument from the Lord's Prayer.

4. Not only do the holy men of God throughout the Scriptures in coming into his presence, come with the confession of sin and imperfection, praying for mercy, not only for what they were but also for what they are, but our Lord has taught all his disciples whenever they address their Father in heaven to say, "Forgive as our trespasses." This injunction has ever been a stumbling block in the way of the advocates of perfection from Pelagius to the present day. It was urged by Augustine in his argument against the doctrine of his great opponent that men could be entirely free from sin in the present life. The answer given to the argument from this source has been substantially the same as that given by Pelagius. It is presented in its best form by

the Rev. Richard Watson. [239] That writer says, "(1.) That it would be absurd to suppose that any person is placed under the necessity of trespassing, in order that a general prayer designed for men in a mixed condition might retain its aptness to every particular ease. (2.) That trespassing of every kind and degree is not supposed by this prayer to be continued, in order that it might be used always in the same import, or otherwise it might be pleaded against the renunciation of any trespass or transgression whatever. (3.) That this petition is still relevant to the case of the entirely sanctified and the evangelically perfect, since neither the perfection of the first man nor that of angels is in question; that is, a perfection measured by the perfect law, which in its obligation, contemplates all creatures as having sustained no injury by moral lapse, and admits, therefore, of no excuse from infirmities and mistakes of judgment; nor of any degree of obedience below that which beings created naturally perfect, were capable of rendering. There may, however, be an entire sanctification of a being rendered naturally weak and imperfect, and so liable to mistake and infirmity, as well as to defect as to the degree of that absolute obedience and service which the law of God, never bent to human weakness, demands from all. These defects, and mistakes, and infirmities, may be quite consistent with the entire sanctification of the soul and the moral maturity of a being still naturally infirm and imperfect."

The first and second of these answers do not touch the point. No one pretends that men are placed under the necessity of sinning, "in order that" they may be able to repeat the Lord's prayer. This would indeed be absurd. The argument is this. If a man prays to be forgiven, he confesses that he is a sinner, and if a sinner, he is not free from sin or perfect. And therefore, the use of the Lord's prayer by all

Christians, is an acknowledgment that no Christian in this life is perfect. The third answer which is the one principally relied upon and constantly repeated, involves a contradiction. It assumes that what is not sin requires to be forgiven. Mr. Watson says the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses," may be properly used by those who are free from sin. This is saying that sin is not sin. The argument by which this position is sustained also involves a contradiction. Our "infirmities" are sins if judged by "the perfect law"; but not if judged by "the evangelical law." As we are not to be judged by the former, but by the latter, want of conformity tc the law is not sin. The only inability under which men, since the fall, labour, arises from their sinfulness, and therefore is no excuse for want of conformity to that law which it is said, and said rightly, is "never bent to human weakness."

Argument from the Experience of Christians.

5. Appeal may be made on this subject to the testimony of the Church universal. There are no forms of worship, no formulas for private devotion, in any age or part of the Church, which do not contain confession of sin and prayer for forgiveness. The whole Christian Church with all its members prostrates itself before God, saying, "Have mercy upon us miserable sinners." If here and there one and another among this prostrate multitude refuse to bow and join in this confession, they are to be wondered at and pitied. They are, however, not to he found. Consciousness is too strong for theory, and therefore,

6. We may appeal to the conscience of every believer. He knows that he is a sinner. He never is in a state which satisfies his own conviction as to what he ought to be. He may call his deficiencies infirmities, weaknesses, and errors, and may refuse to call them sins. But this does not alter the case. Whatever they are called, it is admitted that they need God's pardoning mercy.

[239] Theological Institutes, II. xxix.; edit. New York, 1832, p. 545.

§ 8. Theories of Perfectionism.

Pelagian Theory.

The two radical principles of Pelagianism are, first, that the nature of man is uninjured by the fall, so that men are free from sin until by voluntary transgression they incur guilt. Secondly, that our natural powers, since, as well as before the fall, are fully competent to render complete obedience to the law.

From these principles Pelagius inferred, (1.) That a man (even among the heathen) might live from birth to death free from all sin, although he did not assert that any man ever had so lived. (2.) That when converted, men might, and numbers of men did, live without sin; perfectly obeying the law. (3) That this obedience was rendered in the exercise of their ability, assisted by the grace of God.

By grace, Pelagius says that we are to understand, (1.) The goodness of God in so constituting our nature that we can completely obey the law in virtue of our free agency. (2.) The revelation, precepts, and example of Christ. (3.) The pardon of sins committed before conversion. (4.) The moral influences of the truth and of the circumstances in which we are placed. The effect of grace thus understood, is simply to render obedience more easy.

In the Council of Carthage, A.D. 418, the Pelagians were condemned, among other things, for teaching, (1.) That the effect of grace was merely to render obedience more easy. (2.) That the declaration of the Apostle John, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," is, as to some, a mere expression of humility. (3.) That the petition in the Lord's prayer, "Forgive us our

trespasses," is not suited to the saints. They use it only as expressing the desire and necessity of others.

According to the Pelagian theory, therefore, (1.) The sin from which the believer may be perfectly free is the voluntary transgression of known law. Nothing else is of the nature of sin. (2.) The law to which perfect conformity in this life is possible, and in many cases actual, is the moral law in all its strictness. (3.) This obedience may be rendered without any supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit.

Romish Theory.

Romanists teach, (1.) That by the infusion of grace in justification as effected by or in baptism, everything of the nature of sin is removed from the soul. (2.) That good works performed in a state of grace are free from the taint of sin, and are perfect. "Si quis in quolibet bono opere justum saltem venaliter peccare dixerit . . . . anathema sit." [240] (3.) That the law may be and often is, perfectly obeyed by the children of God in this life. (4.) That men may not only do all that the law requires, but may even go beyond its demands. (5.) Nevertheless, as there is in higher law than that by which men are to be judged, no man is entirely free from venial sins, i.e., sins which do not bring the soul under condemnation, and therefore all men in this life have need to say, "Forgive us our trespasses."

From this statement it appears,

1. That by sin from which advanced believers are said to be free, is meant only what merits condemnation, and in itself deserves the forfeiture of grace or divine favour. It is admitted that "concupiscence," or the remains of original sin, is not removed by baptism, but it is not of the nature of sin, in the sense just stated. Neither are venial sins, i.e., sins which do not forfeit grace, properly sins, if judged by the law under which believers are now

placed. So far, therefore, as the negative part of perfection, or freedom from sin is concerned, the Romanists do not mean freedom from moral faults, but simply freedom from what incurs the sentence of the law. It is perfection as judged by a lower standard of judgment.

2. The law to which we are now subject, and the demands of which Romanists say are satisfied by the obedience of the saints, is not the moral law in its original strictness, but the sum of that which is due from man in his present circumstances; in other words, the demands of the law are accommodated to the condition of men in this life. This is evident, because they say that the saints obey the law so far as it is now binding, and because they admit that saints commit venial sins, which can only mean sins which, under a stricter rule of judgment, would merit condemnation.

3. As stated above, they distinguish between the law and love. The former is that which all men, and especially Christians, are bound to observe, but love is a higher principle which prompts to doing more than the law or justice demands. Consequently, the positive part of perfection, or conformity to the law, does not imply the highest degree of moral excellence of which our nature is susceptible, but only such as answers to the lower demands of the law to which we are now subject. In a passage already quoted, Bellarmin says, "Defectus charitatis, quod videlicet non faciamus opera nostra tanto fervore dilectionis, quanto faciemus in patria, defectus quidem est, sed culpa, et peccatum non est. Unde etiam charitas nostra, quamvis comparata ad charitatem beatorum sit imperfecta, tamen absolute perfecta dici potest." [241] In like manner Moehler says, [242] "In modern times the attempt has been made to sustain the old orthodox doctrine by assuming that the moral law makes ideal demands, which, as every other ideal, must remain unattainable. If this be true, then the man who falls short of this

ideal is as little responsible, and as little deserving of punishment, as an epic poet who should fall short of the Iliad of Homer."

The Romish theory is consistent. In baptism all sin is washed away. By the infusion of grace full ability is given to do all that is required of us. Nothing can be required beyond what we are able to perform, and, therefore, the demands of the law are suited to our present state. By obedience to this modified law, we merit increased supplies of grace and eternal life.

The perfection, therefore, which Romanists insist upon is merely relative; not an entire freedom from sin, but only from such sins as merit condemnation; not holiness which is absolutely perfect, but perfect only relatively to the law under which we are now placed. It is clear that there is a radical difference between Romanists and Protestants as to the nature of sin and the limits of moral obligation. If they were to adopt our definition of sin, they would not pretend to any perfection in the present life.

The Arminian Theory.

The perfection which the Arminians teach is attainable, and which, in many cases, they say is actually attained in this life, is declared to be complete conformity to the law; including freedom from sin, and the proper exercise of all right affections and the discharge of all duties.

Episcopius defines it to be, keeping the commandments of God with a perfect fulfilment; or loving God as much as we ought to love Hun, according to the requirements of the Gospel; or according to the covenant of grace. "By a perfection of degrees is meant that highest perfection which consists in the highest exertion of human strength assisted by grace." "This perfection includes two things, (1.) A perfection proportioned to the powers of each individual; (2.) A desire

of making continual progress, and of increasing one s strength more and more."

Limborch defines it as "keeping the precepts of the Gospel after such manner, and in such degree of perfection as God requires of us under the denunciation of eternal damnation." This obedience is "perfect as being correspondent to the stipulations contained in the divine covenant." "It is not a sinless or absolutely perfect obedience, but such as consists in a sincere love and habit of piety, which excludes all habit of sin, with all enormous and deliberate actions." [243] This perfection has three degrees (1.) That of beginners. (2.) That of proficients. (3.) That of the truly perfect, who have subdued the habit of sin, and take delight in the practice of virtue.

Wesley [244] says; "Perfection is the loving God with all the heart, mind, soul, and strength. This implies that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words, and actions, are governed by love." Dr. Peck [245] says that it is "a state of holiness which fully meets the requirements of the Gospel."

Although these definitions differ in some respects, they agree in the general idea that perfection consists in entire conformity to the law to which we are now subject, and by which we are to be judged.

The Law to which Believers are subject.

What, according to the Arminian theory, is that law? The answer to that question is given in a negative, and in a positive form. Negatively, it is said by Dr. Peck not to be the Adamic law, or the law originally given to Adam. Fletcher [246] says: "With respect to the Christless law of paradisiacal obedience, we utterly disclaim sinless perfection." "We shall not be judged by that law; but by a law adapted to our present state and circumstances, called the law of Christ." "Our Heavenly

Father never expects of us, in our debilitated state, the obedience of immortal Adam in paradise." The positive statements are, "It is the law of Christ." "The Gospel." "The standard of character set up in the Gospel must be such as is practicable by man, fallen as he is. Coming up to this standard is what we call Christian perfection." [247]

From this it appears that the law according to which men are pronounced perfect, is not the original moral law, but the mitigated law suited to the debilitated state of man since the fall. The sin from which the believer may be entirely free, is not all moral imperfection which in itself deserves punishment, but only such delinquencies as are inconsistent with the mitigated law of the Gospel.

On this point the language of Limborch above quoted, is explicit. It is not "an absolutely sinless perfection" that is asserted. And Fletcher says, We utterly disclaim "sinless perfection" according to the paradisiacal law. Wesley says, By sin is meant (1.) Voluntary transgression of known law. In this sense all who are born of God are free from sin. (2.)It means all unholy tempers, self-will, pride, anger, sinful thoughts. From these the perfect are free. (3.) But mistakes and infirmities are not sins. "These are," indeed, "deviations from the perfect law, and consequently need atonement. Yet they are not properly sins." "A person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please, I do not." [248] The question, however, is not what Wesley or any other man chooses to call sin; but what does the law of God condemn. Nothing which the law does not condemn can need expiation. If these transgressions, therefore, need atonement, they are sins in the sight of God. Our refusing to recognize them as such does not alter their nature, or remove their guilt.

According to the Arminian system, especially as held by the Wesleyans,

this perfection is not due to the native ability, or free will of man, but to the grace of God, or supernatural influence of the Spirit.

Perfection is a matter of grace, (1.) Because it is solely on account of the work of Christ that God lowers the demands of the law, and accepts as perfect the obedience which the milder law of the Gospel demands. (2.) Because the ability to render this obedience is due to the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. (3.) Because believers constantly need the intercession of Christ as our High Priest, to secure them from condemnation for involuntary transgressions, which, judged by the law, would incur its penalty.

Oberlin Theory.

This theory is so called because its prominent advocates are the officers of the Oberlin University in Ohio. President Mahan [249] says, perfection in holiness implies a full and perfect discharge of our entire duty; of all existing obligations in respect of God and all other beings. It is loving God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength. It implies the entire absence of selfishness and the perpetual presence and all pervading influence of pure and perfect love.

Professor Finney says: "By entire sanctification, I understand the consecration of the whole being to God. In other words, it is the state of devotedness to God and his service required by the moral law. The law is perfect. It requires just what is right, all that is right, and nothing more. Nothing more nor less can possibly be perfection or entire sanctification than obedience to the law. Obedience to the law of God in an infant, a man, an angel, and in God himself, is perfection in each of them. And nothing can possibly be perfection in any being short of this; nor can there possibly be anything above it." [250]

The law which now binds men and to which they are bound to be perfectly

conformed, is the original moral law given to Adam. But that law demands nothing more and nothing less than what every man in his inward state and outward circumstances is able to render. The law meets man at every step of his ascending or descending progress. The more grace, knowledge, or strength he has, the more does the law demand. On the other hand, the less of knowledge, culture, moral susceptibility, or strength he possesses, the less does the law require of him.

President Mahan says, Perfection does not imply that we love God as the saints do in heaven, but merely that we love Him as far as practicable with our present powers.

Professor Finney says, The law does not require that we should love God as we might do, had we always improved our time, or had we never sinned. It does not suppose that our powers are in a perfect state. The service required is regulated by our ability.

The principle of this perfect obedience is our own natural ability. A free moral agent must be able to be and to do all that the law can justly demand. Moral ability, natural ability, gracious ability, are distinctions which Professor Finney pronounces perfectly nonsensical. "It is," he says, "a first truth of reason that moral obligation implies the possession of every kind of ability which is required to render the required act possible." [251]

The Oberlin theory of perfection is founded on the following principles: --

1. Holiness consists in disinterested benevolence, i.e., a perfect willingness that God should do whatever the highest good of the universe demands. A man either has, or has not, this willingness. If he has, he has all that is required of him. He is perfect. If he has not this willingness he is in rebellion against God. Therefore it is said, "Perfection, as implied in the action of our voluntary powers in full

harmony with our present convictions of duty is an irreversible condition of eternal life." [252]

2. There is no sin but in the voluntary transgression of known law.

3. There is no moral character in anything but generic volitions, or those purposes which terminate on an ultimate end. There is no moral character in feeling, and much less in states of mind not determined by the will. When a man's purpose is to promote the happiness of the universe he is perfectly holy; when it is anything else, he is perfectly sinful.

4. Every man, in virtue of being a free agent, has plenary ability to fulfil all his obligations. This principle, though mentioned last, is the root of the whole system.

The Relation between these Theories of Perfection.

The Pelagian and the Oberlin theories agree as to their views of the nature of sin; the ability of man; and the extent of the obligation of the law.

They differ as to their views of the nature of virtue or holiness. The Pelagian system does not assume that disinterested benevolence, or the purpose to promote the highest good of the universe, is the sum of all virtue; i.e., it does not put the universe in the place of God, as that to which our allegiance is due. They differ also in that, while the Oberlin divines maintain the plenary ability of man, they give more importance to the work of the Holy Spirit; and in that, it is generally admitted that although men have the ability to do their whole duty, yet that they will not exert it aright unless influenced by the grace of God.

The Romish and Arminian theories agree, (1.) In that both teach that the law to which we are bound to be conformed is not "ideal excellence;" not the Adamic law; not the moral law in its original

strictness; but a milder law suited to our condition since the fall.

(2.) That by freedom from sin is not meant freedom from what the law in its strictness condemns, and what in its nature needs expiation and pardon, but from everything which the milder law, "the law of Christ," condemns. (3.) They agree in denying to men since the fall ability perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but attribute the ability and disposition to obey to the grace of God; or the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit.

They differ as to the mode in which this grace is communicated, in that the Romanists say that it is only through the sacraments, whereas Arminians say that sufficient grace is given to all men, which, if duly improved, secures such larger measures of grace as will enable the believer to become perfect. They differ also as to the nature of good works in so far as Romanists include under that category many things not commanded in the Scriptures; and as they teach the possibility of performing works of supererogation, which the Arminians deny. The Romanists also teach that good works merit eternal life, which evangelical Arminians do not.

These theories, however, all agree in teaching that the law of God has been lowered in so far that its demands are satisfied by a less degree of obedience than was required of Adam, or of man in his normal state; and therefore in calling that perfection which in fact is not perfection, either in the sight of God or of an enlightened conscience. It is a contradiction to say that a man is perfect whose acts and shortcomings need expiation and the pardoning mercy of God.

It may be safely assumed that no man living has ever seen a fellow-man whom, even in the imperfect light in which a man reveals himself to his fellows, he deems perfect. And no sound minded man can regard himself as perfect, unless he lowers the standard of judgment to suit his case.

And here lies one of the special dangers of the whole system. If the law of God can be relaxed in its demands to suit the state of its subjects, then there is no limit to be assigned to its condescension. Thus perfectionism has sometimes, although not among the Methodists, lapsed into antinomianism.

---

[240] Council of Trent, Sess. V., Canon 25; Streitworlf, vol. i. p. 36.

[241] De Justificatione, IV. xvii.; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iv. p. 933, b.

[242] Symbolik, 6th edit. Mainz, 1843, p. 216.

[243] Theologia Christiana, V. lxxix. 2, 8, 14; edit. Amsterdam, 1715, pp. 658, a, 659, b, 661, a.

[244] Plain Account of Christian Perfection, p. 48.

[245] Christian Perfection, New York, 1843, p. 292.

[246] See above, p. 192.

[247] Peck, Christian Perfection, p. 294.

[248] Plain Account, pp. 62-67.

[249] Christian Perfection, p. 7.

[250] Oberlin Evangelist, vol. ii. p. 1.

[251] Sermons, vol. iv. No. 18.

[252] Oberlin Quarterly Review, May 1846, p. 468.

CHAPTER XIX: THE LAW

THE LAW

---

§ 1. Preliminary Principles.

The Personality of God involved in the Idea of Law; and, therefore, all Morality is founded on Religion.

The principal meanings of the word law are, (1.) An established order in the sequence of events. A law, in this sense, is a mere fact. That the planets are distant from the sun according to a determined proportion; that the leaves of a plant are arranged in a regular spiral around the stem; and that one idea by association suggests another, are simple facts. Yet they are properly called laws, in the sense of established orders of sequence or relation. So also what are called the laws of light, of sound, and of chemical affinity, are, for the most part, mere facts. (2.) A uniformly acting force which determines the regular sequence of events. In this sense the physical forces which we see in operation around us, are called the laws of nature. Gravitation, light, heat, electricity, and magnetism, are such forces. The fact that they act uniformly gives them the character of laws. Thus the Apostle speaks also of a law of sin in his members which wars against the law of the mind. (3.) Law is that which binds the conscience. It imposes the obligation of conformity to its demands upon all rational creatures. This is true of the moral law in its widest sense. It is also true of human laws within the sphere of their legitimate operation.

In all these senses of the word, law implies a law-giver; that is, an intelligence acting voluntarily for the attainment of an end. The

irregular, or unregulated action of physical forces produces chaos; their ordered action produces the cosmos. But ordered action is action preëstablished, sustained, and directed for the accomplishment of a purpose.

This is still more obviously true with regard to moral laws. The slightest analysis of our feelings is sufficient to show that moral obligation is the obligation to conform our character and conduct to the will of an infinitely perfect Being, who has the authority to make his will imperative, and who has the power and the right to punish disobedience. The sense of guilt especially resolves itself into a consciousness of being amenable to a moral governor. The moral law, therefore, is in its nature the revelation of the will of God so far as that will concerns the conduct of his creatures. It has no other authority and no other sanction than that which it derives from Him. The same is true with regard to the laws of men. They have no power or authority unless they have a moral foundation. And if they have a moral basis, so that they bind the conscience, that basis must be the divine will. The authority of civil rulers, the rights of property, of marriage, and all other civil rights, do not rest on abstractions, nor on general principles of expediency. They might be disregarded without guilt, were they not sustained by the authority of God. All moral obligation, therefore, resolves itself into the obligation of conformity to the will of God. And all human rights are founded on the ordinance of God. So that theism is the basis of jurisprudence as well as of morality. This doctrine is taught by Stahl, perhaps the greatest living authority on the philosophy of law. "Every philosophical science," he says, "must begin with the first principle of all things, that is, with the Absolute. It must, therefore, decide between Theism and Pantheism, between the doctrine that the first cause or principle

is the personal, extramundane, self-revealing God, and the doctrine that the first principle is an impersonal power immanent in the world." [253] It is not pantheism, but fetichism to make all things God. The real question is, Whether the Absolute has personality and self-consciousness or not? Stahl had previously said to the same effect, that every philosophy, and every religion, and especially the Christian, must proceed on a theory of the universe (a Weltanschauung). It is the Christian doctrine of God and of this relation to the world, that he makes the foundation of legal and political science (of Rechts- und Staatslehre). [254] He therefore calls his system "theological" in so far as it makes the nature and will of God the foundation of all duties and the source of all rights.

He recognizes, however, the distinction between morality and religion. "Morality," he says, "is the perfection (Vollendung) of man in himself (so far as the will is concerned); or the revelation of the divine being in man. Man is the image of God, and therefore in his nature is like God, perfect or complete in himself; and conformity to the divine image is for him the goal and command. (Matt. v. 45). Religion, on the other hand, is the bond between man and God, or what binds men to God, so that we should know and will only in Hun, refer everything to Him, entire consecration, the personal union with God. Thus, love of our neighbour, courage, spirituality (the opposite of sensuality), may be simply moral virtues; whereas faith and the love of God are purely religious. The courage of Napoleon's guard was a moral virtue (a state of the will); the courage of Luther was religious (a power derived from his relation to God)." [255]

Religion and morality, although thus different, are not independent. They are but different phases of our relation to God. Stahl, therefore, controverts the doctrine of Grotius, that there would be a jus naturale

if there were no God; which is really equivalent to saying that there would be an obligation to goodness if there were no such thing as goodness. Moral excellence is of the very essence of God. He is concrete goodness; infinite reason, excellence, knowledge, and power in a personal form; so that there can be no obligation to virtue which does not involve obligation to God. Wolf carried out the doctrine of Grotius to the length of saying that an Atheist, if consistent, would act just as the Christian acts. This principle of Grotius, says Stahl, contained the germ of separation from religion, which unfolded itself with Kant into an ignoring, and, with those who followed him, into the denial of God. [256]

"The primary idea of goodness, is the essential, not the creative, will of God. The divine will in its essence is infinite love, mercy, patience, truth, faithfulness, rectitude, spirituality, and all that is included in holiness, which constitutes the inmost nature of sod. The holiness of God, therefore, neither precedes his will sanctitas antecedens voluntatem' of the Schoolmen), nor follows it, but is his will itself. The good is not a law for the divine will (so that God wills it because it is good); neither is it a creation of his will (so that it becomes good because He wills it); but it is the nature (das Urwollen) of God from everlasting to everlasting." [257] Again it is said, "Hence it follows that moral goodness is concrete, specific, ... absolute, original, as little determined by logical laws as by a relation to external ends. . . . This is not the doctrine of modern ethics. According to the eudaimonistic view adopted by the English philosophers, by Thomasius, and others, the good is good because it tends to produce happiness. According to the rationalists, the good is conformity with the laws of thought (Denkrichtigkeit). . . . . This was the real doctrine of Wolf, who made

morality to consist in order (Regelmässigkeit); still more decidedly was it the doctrine of Kant, with whom the moral law is a consequence of the laws of thought. He says, expressly, that the idea of moral good must be derived from preceding law, that is, the law of reason." [258]

These two principles, then, are to be taken for granted; first, that moral good is good in its own nature, and not because of its tendencies, or because of its conformity to the laws of reason and, second, that all law has its foundation in the nature and will of God. These principles are very comprehensive. They are of special importance in the exposition of the law in its aspect as the revealed will of God designed to regulate human character and conduct.

Protestant Principles limiting Obedience to Human Laws.

There is another principle regarded as fundamental by all Protestants, and that is, that the Bible contains the whole rule of duty for men in their present state of existence. Nothing can legitimately bind the conscience that is not commanded or forbidden by the Word of God. This principle is the safeguard of that liberty wherewith Christ has made his people free. If it be renounced, we are at the mercy of the external Church, of the State, or of public opinion. This is simply the principle that it is right to obey God rather than man. Our obligation to render obedience to human enactments in any form, rests upon our obligation to obey God; and, therefore, whenever human laws are in conflict with the law of God we are bound to disobey them. When heathen emperors commanded Christians to worship idols, tne martyrs refused. When popes and councils commanded Protestants to worship the Virgin Mary, and to acknowledge the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, the Protestant martyrs refused. When the Presbyterians of Scotland were required by their rulers in Church and State to submit themselves to the authority of prelatical bishops, they refused. When the Puritans of

England were called upon to recognize the doctrine of "passive obedience," they again refused. And it is to the stand thus taken by those martyrs and confessors that the world is indebted for all of the religious and civil liberty it now enjoys.

Whether any enactment of the Church or State conflicts with the truth or law of God, is a question which every man must decide for himself. On him individually rests the responsibility, and therefore to him, as an individual, belongs the right of judgment.

Although these principles, when stated in in thesi, are universally recognized among Protestants, they are nevertheless very frequently disregarded. This is true not only of the past when the Church and State both openly claimed the right to make laws to bind the conscience. It is true at the present time. Men still insist on the right of making that sin which God does not forbid; and that obligatory which God has not commanded. They proscribe rules of conduct and terms of church fellowship, which have no sanction in the Word of God. It is just as much a duty for the people of God to resist such usurpations, as it was for the early Christians to resist the authority of the Roman Emperors in matters of religion, or for the early Protestants to refuse to recognize the right of the Pope to determine for them what they were to believe, and what they were to do. The essence of infidelity consists in a man's putting his own convictions on matters of truth and duty above the Bible. This may be done by fanatics in the cause of benevolence, as well as by fanatics in any other cause. It is infidelity in either case. And as such it should be denounced and resisted unless we are willing to renounce our allegiance to God, and make ourselves the servants of men.

Christian Liberty in Matters of Indifference.

It is perfectly consistent with the principle above stated, that a

thing may be right or wrong according to circumstances, and, therefore, it may often be wrong for a man to do what the Bible does not condemn. Paul himself circumcised Timothy; yet he told the Galatians that if they allowed themselves to be circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing. Eating meat offered in sacrifice to idols was a matter of indifference. Yet the Apostle said, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend."

There are two important principles involved in these Scriptural facts. The first is, that a thing indifferent in itself may become even fatally wrong if done with a wrong intention. Circumcision was nothing, and uncircumcision was nothing. It mattered little whether a man was circumcised or not. But if any one submitted to circumcision as an act of legal obedience, and as the necessary condition of his justification before God, he thereby rejected the Gospel, or, as the Apostle expressed it, he fell from grace. He renounced the gratuitous method of justification, and Christ became of no effect to him. In like manner, eating meat which had been offered in sacrifice to an idol, was a matter of indifference. "Meat," says Paul, "commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse." Yet if a man ate such meat as an act of reverence to the idol, or under circumstances which implied that it was an act of worship, he was guilty of idolatry. And, therefore, the Apostle taught that participation in feasts held within the precincts of an idol's temple, was idolatry.

The other principle is that, no matter what our intention may be, we sin against Christ when we make such use of our liberty, in matters of indifference, as causes others to offend. In the first of these cases the sin was not in being circumcised, but in making circumcision a

condition of our justification. In the second case, the idolatry consisted not in eating meat offered in sacrifice to idols, but in eating it as an act of worship to the idol. And in the third case, the sin was not in asserting our liberty in matters of indifference, but in causing others to offend.

The rules which the Scriptures clearly lay down on this subject are: (1.) That no man or body of men has the right to pronounce that to be sinful which God does not forbid. There was no sin in being circumcised, or in eating meat, or in keeping the sacred days of the Hebrews. (2.) That it is a violation of the law of love, and therefore a sin against Christ, to make such use of our liberty as to cause others to sin. "Take heed," says the Apostle, "lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak." "When ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." (1 Cor. viii. 9, 12.) "It is good (i.e., morally obligatory) neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." "All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. (Rom. xiv. 21, 20.) (3). Nothing in itself indifferent can be made the ground of permanent and universal obligation. Because it was wrong in Galatia to submit to circumcision, it does not follow that it was wrong in Paul to circumcise Timothy. Because it was wrong in Corinth to eat meat, it does not follow that it is wrong always and everywhere. An obligation arising out of circumstances must vary with circumstances. (4.) When it is obligatory to abstain from the use of things indifferent, is a matter of private judgment. No man has the right to decide that question for other men. No bishop, priest, or church court has the right to decide it. Otherwise it would not be a matter of liberty. Paul constantly recognized the right (exousia) of

Christians to judge in such cases for themselves. He does this not by implication only, but he also expressly asserts it, and condemns those who would call it in question. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." (Rom. xiv. 3, 4, 5.) It is a common saying that every man has a pope in his own bosom. That is, the disposition to lord it over God's heritage is almost universal. Men wish to have their opinions on moral questions made into laws to bind the consciences of their brethren. This is just as much a usurpation of a divine prerogative when done by a private Christian or by a church court, as when done by the Bishop of Rome. We are as much bound to resist it in the one case as in the other. (5.) It is involved in what has been said that the use which a man makes of his Christian liberty can never be legitimately made the ground of church censure, or a term of Christian communion.

Scriptural Usage of the Word Law.

The Scriptures uniformly understand by law a manifestation of the will of God. All the operations of nature are ordered by laws of his appointment. And his will is represented as the ultimate foundation of moral obligation. In Hebrew it is called tvrh, instruction, because it is, as the Apostle says, "the form of knowledge and of the truth." It is the standard of right and wrong. In Greek it is called nomos, custom, and then, as custom or usage regulates the conduct of men, whatever has that authority does in fact control action, is called nomos. In the New Testament it is constantly used in this wide sense. It is sometimes applied to a rule of conduct however revealed;

sometimes to the Scriptures as the supernaturally revealed will of God, as the rule of faith and practice; sometimes to the Pentateuch or Law of Moses; and sometimes specifically to the moral law. It is here to be taken to mean that revelation of the will of God which is designed to bind the conscience and to regulate the conduct of men.

How the Law is revealed.

This law is revealed in the constitution of our nature, and more fully and clearly in the written Word of God. That there is a binding revelation of the law, independently of any supernatural external revelation, is expressly taught in the Bible. Paul says of the heathen that they are a law unto themselves. They have the law written on their hearts. This is proved, he tells us, because they do, phusei, by nature, i.e., in virtue of the constitution of their nature, the things of the law. The same moral acts which the written law prescribes, the conduct of the heathen shows that they know to be obligatory. Hence their conscience approves or disapproves, as they obey or disobey this inwardly revealed law. What is thus taught in Scripture is confirmed by consciousness and experience. Every man is conscious of a knowledge of right and wrong, and of a sense of obligation, which are independent of all external revelation. He may be unable to determine whence that knowledge comes. He knows, however, that it has been in him coeval with the dawn of reason, and has enlarged and strengthened just as his reason unfolded. His consciousness tells him that the rule is within, and would be there though no positive or external revelation of duty existed. In other words, we do not refer the sense of moral obligation to an externally revealed law, as its source, but to the constitution of our nature. This is not the experience of any class of men exclusively, but the common experience of the race. Wherever there are men, there is the sense of moral obligation, and a knowledge of right

and wrong.

It is frequently objected to this doctrine that men differ widely in their moral judgments. What men of one age or country regard as virtues, men of other ages or countries denounce as crimes. But this very diversity proves the existence of the moral sense. Men could not differ in judgments about beauty, if the æsthetic element did not belong to their nature. Neither could they differ on questions of morality unless the sense of right and wrong were innate and universal. The diversity in question is not greater than in regard to rational truths. That men differ in their judgments as to what is true, is no proof that reason is not a natural and essential element of their constitution. As there are certain truths of the reason which are intuitive and perceived by all men, so there are moral truths so simple that they are universally recognized. As beyond these narrow limits there is diversity of knowledge, so there must be diversity of judgment. But this is not inconsistent with the Scriptural doctrine that even the most degraded heathen are a law unto themselves, and show the work of the law written on their hearts. As the revelation which God has made of his eternal power and Godhead in his works is true and trustworthy, and sufficient to render ignorance or denial of his existence inexcusable, while it does not supersede the necessity of a clearer revelation in his word; so there is an imperfect revelation of the law made in the very constitution of our nature, by which those who have no other revelation are to be judged, but which does not render unnecessary the clearer teachings of the Scriptures.

Different Kinds of Laws.

In looking into the Bible as containing a revelation of the will of God, the first thing which arrests attention is the great diversity of precepts therein contained. This difference concerns the nature of the

precepts, and the ground on which they rest, or the reason why they are obligatory.

1. There are laws which are founded on the nature of God. To this class belong the command to love God supremely, to be just, merciful, and kind. Love must everywhere and always be obligatory. Pride, envy, and malice must everywhere and always be evil. Such laws bind all rational creatures, angels as well as men. The criterion of these laws is that they are absolutely immutable and indispensable. Any change in them would imply, not merely a change in the relations of men, but in the very nature of God.

2. A second class of laws includes those which are founded on the permanent relations of men in their present state of existence. Such are the moral, as opposed to mere statute laws, concerning property, marriage, and the duties of parents and children, or superiors and inferiors. Such laws concern men only in their present state of being. They are, however, permanent so long as the relations which they contemplate continue. Some of these laws bind men as men; others husbands as husbands, wives as wives, and parents and children as such, and consequently they bind all men who sustain these several relations. They are founded on the nature of things, as it is called; that is, upon the institution which God has seen fit to ordain. This constitution might have been different, and then these laws would have had no place. The right of property need not have existed. God might have made all things as common as sun-light or air. Men might have been as angels, neither marrying nor giving in marriage. Under such a constitution there would be no room for a multitude of laws which are now of universal and necessary obligation.

3. A third class of laws have their foundation in certain temporary relations of men, or conditions of society, and are enforced by the

authority of God. To this class belong many of the judicial or civil laws of the ancient theocracy; laws regulating the distribution of property, the duties of husbands and wives, the punishment of crimes, etc. These laws were the application of general principles of justice and right to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew people. Such enactments bind only those who are in the circumstances contemplated, and cease to be obligatory when those circumstances change. It is always and everywhere right that crime should be punished, but the kind or degree of punishment may vary with the varying condition of society. It is always right that the poor should be supported, but one mode of discharging that duty may be proper in one age and country, and another preferable in other times and places. All those laws, therefore, in the Old Testament, which had their foundation in the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrews, ceased to be binding when the old dispensation passed away.

It is often difficult to determine to which of the last two classes certain laws of the Old Testament belong; and therefore, to decide whether they are still obligatory or not. Deplorable evils have flowed from mistakes as to this point. The theories of the union of Church and State, of the right of the magistrate to interfere authoritatively in matters of religion, and of the duty of persecution, so far as Scriptural authority is concerned, rest on the transfer of laws founded on the temporary relations of the Hebrews to the altered relations of Christians. Because the Hebrew kings were the guardians of both tables of the Law, and were required to suppress idolatry and all false religion, it was inferred that such is still the duty of the Christian magistrate. Because Samuel hewed Agag to pieces, it was inferred to be right to deal in like manner with heretics. No one can read the history of the Church without being impressed with the dreadful evils which

have flowed from this mistake. On the other hand, there are some of the judicial laws of the Old Testament which were really founded on the permanent relations of men, and therefore, were intended to be of perpetual obligation, which many have repudiated as peculiar to the old dispensation. Such are some of the laws relating to marriage, and to the infliction of capital punishment for the crime of murder. If it be asked, How are we to determine whether any judicial law of the Old Testament is still in force? the answer is first, When the continued authority of such law is recognized in the New Testament. That for Christians is decisive. And secondly, If the reason or ground for a given law is permanent, the law itself is permanent.

4. The fourth class of laws are those called positive, which derive all their authority from the explicit command of God. Such are external rites and ceremonies, as circumcision, sacrifices, and the distinction between clean and unclean meats, and between months, days, and years. The criterion of such laws is that they would not be binding unless positively enacted; and that they bind those only to whom they are given, and only so long as they continue in force by the appointment of God. Such laws may have answered important ends, and valid reasons doubtless existed why they were imposed; still they are specifically different from those commands which are in their own nature morally obligatory. The obligation to obey such laws does not arise from their fitness for the end for which they have been given, but solely from the divine command.

How far may the Laws contained in the Bible be dispensed with?

This is a question much discussed between Protestants and Romanists. Protestants contended that the Church had not the power claimed by Romanists, to relieve men from the obligation of an oath, and to render marriages lawful which without the sanction of the Church would be

invalid. The Church has neither the authority to set aside any law of God, nor to decide the circumstances under which a divine law ceases to be obligatory, so that it continues in force until the Church declares the parties free frum its obligation. On this subject it is plain, (1.) That none but God can free men from the obligation of any divine law, which He has imposed upon them. (2.) That with regard to the positive laws of the Old Testament, and such judicial enactments as were designed exclusively for the Hebrews living under the theocracy, they were all abolished by the introduction of the new dispensation. We are no longer under obligation to circumcise our children, to keep the Passover, or feast of tabernacles or to go up three times in the year to Jerusalem, or to exact an eye for an eye, or a tooth for a tooth. (3.) With regard to those laws which are founded on the permanent relations of men, such as the laws of property, of marriage, and of obedience to parents, they can be set aside by the authority of God. It was not wrong for the Hebrews to spoil the Egyptians or to dispossess the Canaanites, because He whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, authorized those acts. He had a right to take the property of one people and give it to another. The extermination of the idolatrous inhabitants of the promised land at the command of Joshua, was as much an act of God as though it had been effected by pestilence or famine. It was a judicial execution by the Supreme Ruler. In like manner, although marriage as instituted by God was and is an indissoluble covenant between one man and one woman, yet He saw fit to allow, under the Mosaic Law, within certain limitations, both polygamy and divorce. While that permission continued, those things were lawful; when it was withdrawn, they ceased to be allowable.

When one Divine Law is superseded by another.

The above classification of the divine laws, which is the one usually

adopted, shows that they differ in their relative dignity and importance. Hence when they come into conflict the lower must yield to the higher. This we are taught when God says, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." And our Lord also says, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," and, therefore, the Sabbath might be violated when the duties of mercy rendered it necessary. Throughout the Scriptures we find positive laws subordinated to those of moral obligation. Christ approved of the lawyer who said that to love God with all the heart, and our neighbour as ourselves, "is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices."

Perfection of the Law.

The perfection of the moral law as revealed in the Scriptures, includes the points already considered, -- (1.) That everything that the Bible pronounces to be wrong, is wrong; that everything which it declares to be right, is right. (2.) That nothing is sinful which the Bible does not condemn; and nothing is obligatory on the conscience which it does not enjoin. (3.) That the Scriptures are a complete rule of duty, not only in the sense just stated, but also in the sense that there is and can be no higher standard of moral excellence. Romanists, on the contrary, teach that a man can do more than the law requires. There are certain things which are commanded, and therefore absolutely obligatory; and others which are recommended, but not enjoined, such as voluntary poverty, celibacy, and monastic obedience. These are held to be virtues of a higher grade than obedience to explicit commands. This doctrine is founded on the erroneous views of the Church of Rome on the nature of sin, and the grounds of moral obligation. If nothing is sinful but voluntary, i.e., deliberate transgression of known law; and if the law is satisfied by voluntary action in this sense of the terms, then it is conceivable that a man may in this life render perfect

obedience to the law, and even go beyond its demands. This is also connected with the distinction which Romanists make between mortal and venial sins. The former are those which forfeit baptismal grace, and reduce the soul to its original state of spiritual death and condemnation. The latter are sins which have not this deadly effect, but can be fully atoned for by confession and penance. But if the law of God be spiritual, extending to the thoughts and feelings whether impulsive or cherished; and if it demands all kinds and degrees of moral excellence, or complete congeniality with God, and conformity to his image, then there is no room for these distinctions, and no higher rule of moral conduct. The law of the Lord, therefore, is perfect in every sense of the word.

The Decalogue.

The question whether the decalogue is a perfect rule of duty is, in one sense, to be answered in the affirmative. (1.) Because it enjoins love to God and man, which, our Saviour teaches, includes every other duty. (2.) Because our Lord held it up as a perfect code, when he said to the young man in the Gospel, "This do and thou shalt live." (3.) Every specific command elsewhere recorded may be referred to some one of its several commands. So that perfect obedience to the decalogue in its spirit, would be perfect obedience to the law. Nevertheless, there are many things obligatory on us, which without a further revelation of the will of God than is contained in the decalogue, we never should have known to be obligatory. The great duty of men under the Gospel, is faith in Christ. This our Lord teaches when He says, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath went." This comprehends or produces all that is required of us either as to faith or practice.

Hence he that believeth shall be saved.

Rules of Interpretation.

Theologians are accustomed to lay down numerous rules for the proper interpretation of the divine law, such as that negative precepts are to be understood as including positive, and positive, negative; that, in forbidding an act, everything which naturally leads to it is comprehended; that, in condemning one offence, all others of a like kind are forbidden, and the like. All such rules resolve themselves into one. The decalogue is not to be interpreted as the laws of men, which take cognizance only of external acts, but as the law of God, which extends to the thoughts and intents of the heart. In all cases it will be found that the several commandments contain some comprehensive principle of duty, under which a multitude of subordinate specific duties are included.

---

[253] Die Philosophie des Rechts, von Friedrich Jullus Stahl; Rechts und Staatslehre, I. i. 1, § 1; 4th edit. Heidelberg, 1870, vol. ii. part 1, p. 7.

[254] Einleitung, § 5, ut supra, p. 4.

[255] Stahl, ut supra, I. ii. 1, § 24; Ibid. p. 71.

[256] Ibid. pp. 73, 74.

[257] Ibid. I. ii. 2, § 29; Ibid. pp. 84, 85.

[258] Stahl, ut supra, p. 87.

---

§ 2. Division of the Contents of the Decalogue.

As the law given on Sinai and written on two tables of stone, is repeatedly called in the Scriptures "The Ten Words," or, as it is in the English version of Exodus xxxiv. 28, "The Ten Commandments," there is no doubt that the contents of that law are to be divided into ten distinct precepts. (See Deut. iv. 13, and x. 4.) This summary of moral duties is also called in Scripture "The Covenant," as containing the

fundamental principles of the solemn contract between God and his chosen people. Still more frequently it is called "The Testimony," as the attestation of the will of God concerning human character and conduct.

The decalogue appears in two forms which differ slightly from each other. The original form is found in Exodus the twentieth chapter; the other in Deuteronomy v. 6-21. The principal differences between them are, first, that the command respecting the Sabbath is in Exodus enforced by a reference to God's resting on the seventh day, after the work of creation; whereas in Deuteronomy it is enforced by a reference to God's delivering his people out of Egypt. Secondly, in the command respecting coveting, in Exodus, it is said, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour' s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," etc. In both clauses the word is chmd. In Deuteronomy it is, "Neither shalt thou desire (chmd) thy neighbour's wife; neither shalt thou covet ('vh) thy neighbour's house," etc. This latter difference has been magnified into a matter of importance.

The Scriptures themselves determine the number of the commandments, but not in all cases what they are. They are not numbered off as first, second, third, etc. The consequence is that different modes of division have been adopted. The Jews from an early period adopted the arrangement which is still recognized by them. They regard the words in Exodus xx. 2, as constituting the first commandment, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." The command is that the people should recognize Jehovah as their God; and the special ground of this recognition is made to be, that He delivered them from the tyranny of the Egyptians. These words, however, are not in the form of a command. They constitute the preface or introduction to the solemn injunctions which follow. In making the

preface one of the commandments it became necessary to preserve the number ten, by uniting the first and second, as they are commonly arranged. The command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," being regarded as substantially the same; the latter being merely an amplification of the former. An idol was a false god; worshipping idols was therefore having other gods than Jehovah.

Augustine, and after him the Latin and Lutheran churches, agreed with the Jews in uniting the first and second commandments; but differed from them in dividing the tenth. There is, however, a difference as to the mode of division. Augustine followed the text as given in Deuteronomy, and made the words, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife;" the ninth, and the words, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," etc., the tenth commandment. This division was necessitated by the union of the first and second, and justified by Augustine on the ground that the "cupido impuræ voluptatis" is a distinct offence from the "cupido impuri lucri." The Romish Church, however, adheres to the text as given in Exodus, and makes the clause, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," the ninth, and what follows, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant," etc., the tenth commandment.

The third method of arrangement is that adopted by Josephus, Philo, and Origen, and accepted by the Greek Church, and also by the Latin until the time of Augustine. At the Reformation it was adopted by the Reformed, and has the sanction of almost all modern theologians. According to this arrangement, the first commandment forbids the worship of false gods; the second, the use of idols in divine worship. The command, "Thou shalt not covet," is taken as one commandment. It is universally admitted that there are two tables of the decalogue;

the one containing the precepts concerning our duties to God, and the other those which concern our duties to our fellowmen. Philo referred five commands to each table, as he regarded reverence to parents, enjoined in the fifth, as a religious rather than a moral duty. Those who unite the first and second, and divide the tenth, refer three commandments to the first table and seven to the second. According to the third arrangement mentioned above, there are four in the first, and six in the second. The only objection urged against this is founded on the symbolism of numbers. Three and seven among the Jews are sacred end significant; four and six are not.

Arguments for the Arrangement adopted by the Reformed.

There are two questions to be determined. First, should the commandments concerning idolatry be united or separated? In favour of considering them two distinct commandments, it may be urged, (1.) That all the way through the decalogue, a new command is introduced by a positive injunction or prohibition "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Thou shalt not steal;" "Thou shalt not kill," etc. This is the way in which new commands are introduced. The fact, therefore, that the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods," is distinguished by the repetition of the injunction, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," is an indication that they were intended as different commands. The tenth commandment is indeed an exception to this rule, but the principle holds good in every other case. (2.) The things forbidden are in their nature distinct. Worshipping false gods is one thing; using images in divine worship is another. They therefore called for separate prohibitions. (3.) These offences are not only different in their own nature, but they differed also in the apprehension of the Jews. The Jews regarded worshipping false gods, and using images in the worship of the true God, as very different things.

They were severely punished for both offences. Both external and internal considerations, therefore, are in favour of retaining the division which has been so long and so extensively adopted in the Church.

The second question concerns the division of the tenth commandment. It is admitted that there are ten commandments. If, therefore, the two commands, "Thou shalt have no other gods," and "Thou shalt not make any graven image," are distinct, there is no room for the question whether the command against coveting should he divided. There is, moreover, no pretext for such division, unless we follow the order given in Deuteronomy, which puts the words, "Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife," before the words, "Neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, his field," etc., etc. As coveting a man's wife is a different offence, or at least a different form of a general offence, from coveting his house or land, if the order given in Deuteronomy be considered authoritative, there might be some reason for the separation. But if the order given in Exodus be adhered to, no such reason exists. The thing forbidden is cupidity, whatever be its object. That the order given in Exodus is authoritative may be argued, (1.) Because the law as there given was not only the first chronologically, but also was solemnly announced from Mount Sinai. (2.) The recension given in Deuteronomy differs from the other in many unimportant particulars. If the order in which the objects of cupidity are mentioned be a matter of indifference, then the diversity is a matter of no consequence. But if it be made a matter of importance, controlling the order and interpretation of the commandments, then it is hard to account for it. There is, therefore, every reason for regarding it as one of those diversities which were not intended to be significant. (3.) The distinction is nowhere else recognized in

Scripture. On the contrary, the command, "Thou shalt not covet," is elsewhere given as one command. Paul, in Romans vii. 7, says: "I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." And in Romans xiii. 9, in enumerating the laws forbidding sins against our neighbour, Paul gives as one command, "Thou shalt not covet." (4.) Our Lord refers the sin of "coveting a man's wife" to the seventh commandment. If included under that, it would be incongruous and out of harmony with the context, to make it a distinct commandment by itself.

---

§ 3. Preface to the Ten Commandments.

"I am Jehovah thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Theism and Monotheism, the foundation of all religion, are taught in these words. The first clause is the preface or introduction to the decalogue. It presents the ground of obligation and the special motive by which obedience is enforced. It is because the commandments which follow are the words of God that they bind the conscience of all those to whom they are addressed. It is because they are the words of the covenant God and Redeemer of his people that we are specially bound to render them obedience.

History seems to prove that the question whether the Infinite is a person cannot be satisfactorily answered by the unassisted reason of man. The historical fact is, that the great majority of those who have sought the solution of that question on philosophical principles have answered it in the negative. It is impossible, therefore, duly to estimate the importance of the truth involved in the use of the pronoun "I" in these words. It is a person who is here presented. Of that person it is affirmed, first, that He is Jehovah; and secondly, that He

is the covenant God of his people.

In the first place, in calling himself Jehovah, God reveals that He is the person known to his people by that name, and that He is in his nature all that that name imports. The etymology and signification of the name Jehovah seem to be given by God Himself in Exodus iii. 13, 14, where it is written, "Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them, and God said unto Moses, I am that I am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you."

Jehovah, therefore, is the I am; a person always existing and always the same. Self-existence, eternity, and immutability are included in the signification of the word. This being the case, the name Jehovah is presented as the ground of confidence to the people of God; as in Deuteronomy xxxii. 40, and Isaiah xl. 28, "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding." These natural attributes, however, would be no ground of confidence if not associated with moral excellence. He who as Jehovah is declared to be infinite, eternal, and immutable in his being, no less infinite, eternal, and immutable in his knowledge, wisdom, holiness, goodness, and truth. Such is the Person whose commands are recorded in the decalogue.

In the second place, it is not only the nature of the Being who speaks, but the relation in which He stands to his people that is here revealed. "I am Jehovah thy God." The word God has a definite meaning from which we are not at liberty to depart. We may not substitute for the idea which the word in Scripture and in ordinary language is

intended to express, any arbitrary philosophical notion of our own. God is the Being, who, because He is all that the word Jehovah implies, is the proper object of worship, that is, of all the religious affections, and of their appropriate expression. He is, therefore, the only appropriate object of supreme love, adoration, gratitude, confidence, and submission. Him we are bound to trust and to obey.

Jehovah is not only God, but He says to his people collectively and individually, "I am thy God." That is, not only the God whom his people are to acknowledge and worship, but who has entered into covenant with them; promising to be their God, to be all that God can be to his creatures and children, on condition that they consent to be his people. The special covenant which God formed with Abraham, and which was solemnly renewed at Mount Sinai, was that He would give to the children of Abraham the land of Palestine as their possession and bless them in that inheritance on condition that they kept the laws delivered to them by his servant Moses. And the covenant which He has made with the spiritual children of Abraham, is that He will be their God for time and eternity on condition that they acknowledge, receive, and trust his only begotten Son, the promised seed of Abraham, in whom all the nations of the earth are to be blessed. And as in this passage the redemption of the Hebrews from their bondage in Egypt is referred to as the pledge of God's fidelity to his promise to Abraham, and the special ground of the obligation of the Hebrews to acknowledge Jehovah as their God; so the mission of the Eternal Son for the redemption of the world is at once the pledge of God's fidelity to the promise made to our first parents after their fall, and the special ground of our allegiance to our covenant God and Father.

---

§ 4. The First Commandment.

The first commandment is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." I, that is, the person whose name, and nature, and whose relation to his people are given in the preceding words, sad I only, shall be recognized by you as God.

This command, therefore, includes, first, the injunction to recognize Jehovah as the true God. As this recognition must be intelligent and sincere, it includes, --

1. Knowledge. We must know who, or what Jehovah is. This implies a knowledge of his attributes, of his relation to the world as its creator, preserver, and governor, and especially his relation to his rational creatures and to his own chosen people. This of course involves a knowledge of our relation to Him as dependent and responsible creatures and as the objects of his redeeming love.

2. Faith. We must believe that God is, and that He is what He declares Himself to be; and that we are his creatures and his children.

3. Confession. It is not enough that we secretly in our hearts recognize Jehovah as the true God; we must openly and under all circumstances and despite of all opposition, whether from magistrates or from philosophers, avow our faith in Him as the only living and true God. This confession must be made, not only by the avowal of the lips as when we repeat the Creed, but by all appropriate acts of worship in public and private, by praise, prayer, and thanksgiving.

4. As the law is spiritual, not only as bearing the impress of the Spirit, and, therefore, holy, just, and good, but also as taking cognizance of the inward as well as of the outward life, of the thoughts and feelings as well as of external acts, this recognition of Jehovah as our God includes the exercise towards Him of all the religious affections; of love, fear, reverence, gratitude, submission, and devotion. And as this is not an occasional duty to be performed at

certain times and places, but one of perpetual obligation, a habitual state of mind is the thing required. The recognition of Jehovah as our God involves a constant sense of his presence, of his majesty, of his goodness, and of his providence, and of our dependence, responsibility, and obligation. We are to have God always before our eyes; to walk and live with Him, having a constant reference to his will in the conduct of our inward and outward life; recognizing continually his hand in everything that befalls us, submitting to all his chastisements and grateful for all his mercies.

The second or negative aspect of the command is the condemnation of the failure to recognize Jehovah as the true God; failing to believe in his existence and attributes, in his government and authority; failing to confess him before men; and failing to render him the inward reverence and the outward homage which are his due, that is, the first commandment forbids Atheism whether theoretical or practical. It moreover forbids the recognition of any other than Jehovah as God. This includes the prohibition of ascribing to any other being divine attributes rendering to any creature the homage or obedience due to God alone; or exercising towards any other person or object those feelings of love, confidence, and submission which belong of right only to God. It is, therefore, a violation of this commandment either to fail in the full and sincere recognition of God as God, or to give to any creature the place in our confidence and love due to God alone.

This the Chief of all the Commandments.

The duty enjoined in this commandment is the highest duty of man. It is proved to be so in the estimation of God by the express declaration of Christ. When asked, "Which is the great commandment in the law," He answered, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great

commandment." (Matt. xxii. 37, 38.) It is so also in the sight of reason. That infinite excellence should be reverenced; that He who is the author of our being and giver of all our mercies; on whom we are absolutely dependent; to whom we are responsible; who is the rightful possessor of our souls and bodies; and whose will is the highest rule of duty, should be duly recognized by his creatures, from the nature of the case must be the highest duty of all rational beings. It is, moreover, the first and greatest of the commandments if measured by the influence which obedience to its injunction has upon the soul itself. It places the creature in its proper relation to its Creator on which its own excellence and well-being depend. It purifies, ennobles, and exalts the soul. It calls into exercise all the higher and nobler attributes of our nature; and assimilates man to the angels who surround the throne of God in heaven. The preeminence of this commandment is further evident from the fact that religion, or the duty we owe to God, is the foundation of morality. Without the former, the latter cannot exist. This is plain, (1.) From the nature of the case. Morality is the conformity of an agent's character and conduct to the moral law. But the moral law is the revealed will of God. If there be no God, there is no moral law; and if a man does not acknowledge or recognize God, there is no higher law than his own reason to which he can feel any obligation to be conformed. (2.) It is a principle of our nature that if a man disregard a higher obligation, he will not be controlled by a lower. This principle was recognized by our Lord when He said, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much." (Luke xvi. 10.) This involves the converse: He that is unfaithful in much, is unfaithful in that which is least. (3.) It is the testimony of experience that where religion has lost its hold on the minds of the

people, there the moral law is trampled under foot. The criminal and dangerous class in every community consists of those who have no fear of God before their eyes. (4.) It is the secret conviction of every man that his duty to God is his highest duty, as is evinced by the fact that the charge of atheism is one from which the human soul instinctively recoils. It is felt to be a charge of the utter degradation, or of the deadness of all that is highest and noblest in the nature of man. (5.) The most decisive and solemn evidence of this truth, however, is to be found in the revealed purpose of God to forsake those who forsake Him; to give up to the unconstrained control of their evil passions, those who cast off their allegiance to Him. The Apostle says of the heathen world that it was "Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, ... God gave them up unto vile affections." (Rom. i. 21, 26.) And again in ver. 28, "As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." Such are the natural, the actual, the inevitable, and the judicially ordained effects of men's refusing to retain God in their knowledge.

Notwithstanding all this we see multitudes of men of whom it may be said that God is not in all their thoughts. They never think of Him. They do not recognize his providence. They do not refer to his will as a rule of conduct. They do not feel their responsibility to Him for what they think or do. They do not worship Him, nor thank Him for their

mercies. They are without God in the world. Yet they think well of themselves. They are not aware of the dreadful guilt involved in thus forgetting God, in habitually failing to discharge the first and highest duty that rests on rational creatures. Self-respect or regard to public opinion often renders such men decorous in their lives. But they are really dead while they live; and they have no security against the powers of darkness. It is painful also to see that scientific men and philosophers so often endeavour to invalidate the arguments for the existence of God, and advance opinions inconsistent with Theism; arguing, as they in many cases do, to prove either that there is no evidence of the existence of any power in the universe other than of physical force, or that no knowledge, consciousness, or voluntary action can be predicated of an infinite Being. This is done in apparent unconsciousness that they are undermining the foundations of all religion and morality; or that they are exhibiting a state of mind which the Scriptures pronounce worthy of reprobation.

---

§ 5. The Invocation of Saints and Angels.

Saints and angels, and especially the Virgin Mary, are confessedly objects of worship in the Romish Church. The word "worship," however, means properly to respect or honour. It is used to express both the inward sentiment and its outward manifestation. This old sense of the word is still retained in courts of law in which the judge is addressed as "Your Worship," or as "worshipful." The Hebrew word hshchvh and the Greek proskuneo often translated in the English version by the word "worship," mean simply to bow down, or prostrate one's self. They are used whether the person to whom the homage is rendered be an equal, an earthly superior, or God Himself. It is not, therefore, from the use of any of these words that the nature of the homage rendered can be

determined. Romanists are accustomed to distinguish between the cultus civilis due to earthly superiors, douleia due to saints and angels; huperdouleia due to the Virgin Mary; and latreia due to God alone. These distinctions, however, are of little use. They afford no criterion by which to distinguish between douleia and huperdouleia and between huperdouleia and latreia. The important principle is this: Any homage, internal or external, which involves the ascription of divine attributes to its object, if that object be a creature, is idolatrous. Whether the homage paid by Romanists to saints and angels be idolatrous is a question of fact rather than of theory; that is, it is to be determined by the homage actually rendered, and not by that which is prescribed. It is easy to say that the saints are not to be honoured as God is honoured; that He is to be regarded as the original source and giver of all good, and they as mere intercessors, and as channels of divine communications; but this does not alter the case if the homage rendered them assumes that they possess the attributes of God; and if they are to the people the objects of religious affection and confidence.

What the Church of Rome teaches on this subject may be learned from the following passages, from the decisions of the Council of Trent, from the Roman Catechism, and from the writings of the leading theologians of that Church: [259] "Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis . . . . ut . . . . fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, sanctos, una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum, atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesus Christum, Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere: illos vero, qui negant sanctos, æterna felicitate in coelo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus

non orare; vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idolatriam; vel pugnare cum verbo Dei; adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse in coelo regnantibus voce, vel mente supplicare; impie sentire." "Et quamvis in honorem et memoriam sanctorum nonnullas interdum missas ecclesia celebrare consueverit; non tamen illis sacrificium offerri docet, sed Deo soli, qui illos coronavit; unde nec sacerdos dicere solet, offero tibi sacrificium Petre, vel Paule; sed Deo de illorum victoriis gratias agens, eorum patrocinia implorat, ut ipsi pro nobis intercedere dignentur in coelis, quorum memoriam facimus in terris." [260]

The Roman Catechism [261] teaches the same doctrine.

"Invocandi sunt [angeli eorum]; quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur et patrocinium salutis nostræ, sibi delatum, libentissime suscipiunt."

This invocation, it says, does not conflict with the law "de uno Deo colendo."

Thomas Aquinas says: "Quanquam solus Deus sit orandus, ut vel gratiam vel gloriam nobis donet; sanctos nihilominus viros orare expedit, ut illorum precibus et meritis, nostræ orationes sortiantur effectum." [262]

On this subject Bellarmin lays down the following propositions, (1.) "Non licet a sanctis petere, ut nobis tanquam auctores divinorum beneficiorum, gloriam, vel gratiam aliaque ad beatitudinem media concedunt." This, however, he virtually nullifies, when he adds, "Est tamen notandum, cum dicimus, non debere peti à sanctis, nisi ut orent pro nobis, nos non agere de verbis, sed de sensu verborum; nam quantum ad verba, licet dicere, S. Petre miserere mihi, salva me, aperi mihi aditum coeli: item, da mihi sanitatem corporis, da patientiam, da mihi fortitudinem." (2.) "Sancti non sunt immediati intercessores nostri apud Deum, sed quidquid a Deo nobis impetrant, per Christum impetrant."

(3.) "Sancti orant pro nobis saltem in genere, secundum Scripturas."
(4) "Sancti qui regnant cum Christo, pro nobis orant, non solum in genere, sed etiam in particulari.quot; [263] As to the question, How the saints in heaven can know what men on earth desire of them, he says four answers are given. First, some say that the angels, who are constantly ascending to heaven and thence descending to us, communicate to the saints the prayers of the people. Secondly, others say, "Sanctorum animas, sicut etiam angelos, mira quadam celeritate naturæ, quodammodo esse ubique; et per se audire preces supplicantium." Thirdly, others again say, "Sanctos videre in Deo omnia a principio suæ beatitudinis, quæ ad ipsos aliquo modo pertinent, et proinde etiam orationes nostras ad se directas." Fourthly, others say that God reveals to them the prayers of the people. As on earth God revealed the future to the prophets and gives to men at times the power to read the thoughts of others, so He can reveal to the saints in heaven the wants and prayers of those who call upon them. This last solution of the difficulty Bellarmin himself prefers. [264]

The objections which Protestants are accustomed to urge against this invocation of saints are, --

1. That it is, to say the least, superstitious. It requires faith without evidence. It assumes not only that the dead are in a conscious state of existence in another world; and that departed believers belong to the same living mystical body of Christ, or which their brethren still on earth are members, both of which Protestants, on the authority of God's word, cheerfully admit, but it assumes, without any evidence from Scripture or experience, that the spirits of the dead are accessible to those who are still in the flesh; that they are near us, capable of hearing our prayers, knowing our thoughts, and answering our requests. The Church or the soul is launched on an ocean of fantasies

and follies, without a compass, if either suffers itself to believe without evidence then there is nothing in astrology, alchemy, or demonology which may not be received as true, to perplex, to pervert, or to torment.

2. The whole thing is a deceit and illusion. If in fact departed saints are not authorized and not enabled to hear and answer the prayers of suppliants on earth, then the people are in the condition of those who trust in gods who cannot save, who have eyes that see not, and ears that cannot hear. That the saints have no such office as the theory and practice of invocation supposs is plain, because the fact if true cannot be known except by divine revelation. But no such revelation exists. It is a purely superstitious belief, without the support of either Scripture or reason. The conjectural methods suggested by Bellarmin of explaining how the saints may be cognizant of the wants and wishes of men, is a confession that nothing is known or can be known on the subject; and, therefore, that the invocation of the saints has no Scriptural or rational foundation. If this be so, then how dreadfully are the people deluded! How fearful the consequences of turning their eyes and hearts from the one divine mediator between God and man, who ever lives to make intercession for us, and whom the Father heareth always, and causing them to direct their prayers to ears which never hear, and to place their hopes in arms which never save. It is turning from the fountain of living waters, to cisterns which can hold no water.

3. The invocation of saints as practised in the Church of Rome is idolatrous. Even if it be conceded that the theory as expounded by theologians is free from this charge, it remains true that the practice involves all the elements of idolatry. Blessings are sought from the saints which God only can bestow; and attributes are assumed to belong

to them which belong to God alone. Every kind of blessing, temporal and spiritual, is sought at their hands, and sought directly from them as the givers. This Bellarmin admits so far as the words employed are concerned. He says it is right to say: "Holy Peter, save me; open to me the gates of heaven; give me repentance, courage," etc. God alone can grant these blessings; the people are told to seek them at the hands of creatures. This is idolatry. Practically it is taken for granted that the saints are everywhere present, that they can hear prayers addressed to them from all parts of the earth at the same time; that they know our thoughts and unexpressed desires. This is to assume that they possess divine attributes. In fact. therefore, the saints are the gods whom the people worship, whom they trust, and who are the objects of the religious affections.

The polytheism of the Church of Rome is in many respects analogous to that of heathen Rome. In both cases we find gods many and lords many. In both cases either imaginary beings are the objects of worship, or imaginary powers and attributes are ascribed to them. In both cases, also, the homage rendered, the blessings sought, the prerogatives attributed to the objects of worship and the affections exercised toward them, involve the assumption that they are truly divine. In both cases the hearts of the people, their confidence and hopes, are turned from the Creator to the creature. There is indeed, however, this great difference between the two cases. The objects of heathen worship were unholy; the objects of worship in the Church of Rome are regarded as ideals of holiness. This, in one view, makes an immense difference. But the idolatry is in either case the same. For idolatry consists in paying creatures the homage due to God.

Mariolatry.

The mother of our Lord is regarded by all Christians as "blessed," as

"the most highly favoured of women." No member of the fallen family of man has had such an honour as she received in being the mother of the Saviour of the world. The reverence due to her as one thus highly favoured of God, and as one whose heart was pierced through with many sorrows, led the way to her being regarded as the ideal of all female grace and excellence, and gradually to her being made the object of divine honours, as the Church lost more and more of its spirituality. The deification of the Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome was a slow process. The first step was the assertion of her perpetual virginity. This was early taken and generally conceded. The second step was the assertion that the birth, as well as the conception of our Lord, was supernatural. The third was the solemn, authoritative decision by the ecumenical council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, that the Virgin Mary was the "Mother of God. On this decision it may be remarked, (a.) That it was rendered rather as a vindication of the divinity of Christ, than as an exaltation of the glory of the Blessed Virgin. It had its origin in the Nestorian controversy. Nestorius was accused of teaching that the Logos only inhabited the man Jesus, whence it was inferred that he held that the person born of the Virgin was simply human. It was to emphasize the assertion that the "person" thus born was truly divine that the orthodox insisted that the Virgin should be called the Mother of God. (b.) There is a sense in which the designation is proper and according to the analogy of Scripture. The Virgin was the Mother of Christ. Christ is God manifest in the flesh: therefore she was the Mother of God. The infant Saviour was a divine person. Christians do not hesitate to say that God purchased his Church with his own blood. According to the usage of Scripture, the person of Christ may be designated from one nature, when the predicate belongs to the other. He may be called the Son of man when we speak of his filling immensity; and He may be called

God when we speak of his being born. (c.) Nevertheless, although the designation be in itself justifiable, in the state of feeling which then pervaded the Church, the decision of the Council tended to increase the superstitious reverence for the Virgin. It was considered by the common people as tantamount to a declaration of divinity. The members of the Council were escorted from their place of meeting by a multitude bearing torches, preceded by women bearing censers filled with burning incense. In combating the assumed Nestorian doctrine of two persons in Christ, there was a strong tendency to the opposite, to the doctrine of Eutyches, who held that there was in our Lord but one nature. According to this view the Virgin might be regarded as the Mother of God in the same sense that any ordinary mother is the parent of her child. However it may be accounted for, the fact is that the decision of the Council of Ephesus marks a distinct epoch in the progress of the deification of the Virgin.

The fourth step soon followed in the dedication to her honour of numerous churches, shrines, and festivals; and in the introduction of solemn offices designed for public and private worship in which she was solemnly invoked. No limit was placed to the titles of honour by which she was addressed or to the prerogatives and powers which were attributed to her. She was declared to be deificata. She was called the Queen of heaven, Queen of queens. said to be exalted above all principalities and powers; to be seated at the right hand of Christ, to share with Him in the universal and absolute power committed to his hands. All the blessings of salvation were sought at her hands, as well as protection from all enemies, and deliverance from all evils.

Prayers, hymns, and doxologies were allowed and prescribed to be addressed to her. The whole Psalter has been transformed into a book of praise and confession to the Mother of Christ. What in the Bible is

said to God and of God, is in this book addressed to the Virgin. In the First Psalm, for example, it is said, "Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly," etc. In the Psalter of the Virgin it reads, "Blessed is the man who loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary; thy grace shall comfort his soul. As a tree irrigated by fountains of water, he shall bring forth the richest fruits of righteousness." In the second Psalm the prayer is directed to the Virgin: "Protect us with thy right hand, O Mother of God," etc. Ps. ix., "I will confess to Thee, O Lady (Domina); I will declare among the people thy praise and glory. To thee belong glory, thanksgiving, and the voice of praise." Ps. xv., "Preserve me, O Lady, for I have hoped in thee." Ps. xvii., "I will love thee O Queen of heaven and earth, and will glorify thy name among the Gentiles." Ps. xviii., "The heavens declare thy glory, O Virgin Mary; the fragrance of thy ointments is dispersed among all nations." Ps. xli., "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul for thy love, O Holy Virgin." And so on to the end. The Virgin is throughout addressed as the Psalmist addressed God; and the blessings which he sought from God, the Romanist is taught to seek from her. [265]

In like manner the most holy offices of the Church are parodied. The Te Deum, For example, is turned into an address to the Virgin. "We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the eternal Father. All the angels and archangels, all thrones and powers, do faithfully serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a never-ceasing voice, Holy, Holy, Holy, Mary, Mother of God. . . . . The whole court of heaven doth honour thee as queen. The holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, the mother of divine majesty. . . . . Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father. . . . . In thee, sweet Mary,

is our hope; defend us for evermore. Praise be cometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee for ever and ever." [266] It is hardly necessary to refer to the Litanies of the Virgin Mary in further proof of the idolatrous worship of which she is the object. Those litanies are prepared in the form usually adopted in the worship of the Holy Trinity; containing invocations, deprecations, intercessions, and supplications. They contain such prayers as the following: "Peccatores, te rogamus audi nos; Ut sanctam Ecclesiam piissima conservare digneris, Ut justis gloriam, peccatoribus gratiam impetrare digneris, Ut navigantibus portum, infirmantibus sanitatem, tribulatis consolationem, captivis liberationem, impetrare digneris, Ut famulos et famulas tuas tibi devote servientes, consolare digneris, Ut cunctum populum Christianum filii tui pretioso sanguine redemptum, conservare digneris, Ut cunctis fidelibus defunctis, eternam requiem impetrare digneris, Ut nos exaudire digneris, Mater Dei, Filia Dei, Sponsa Dei, Mater carissima, Domina nostra, miserere, et dona nobis perpetuam pacem." More than this cannot be sought at the hands of God or Christ. The Virgin Mary is to her worshippers what Christ is to us. She is the object of all religious affections; the ground of confidence; and the source whence all the blessings of salvation are expected and sought.

There was, however, always an undercurrent of opposition to this deification of the mother of our Lord. This became more apparent in the controversy on the question of her immaculate conception. This idea was never broached in the early Church. The first form in which the doctrine appeared was, that from the fact that God says of Jeremiah, "Before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee" (Jer. i. 5), it was maintained that the same might be said of the Virgin Mary. Jeremiah indeed was sanctified before birth, in the sense that he was

consecrated or set apart in the purpose of God to the prophetic office; whereas Mary, it was held, was thus sanctified in the sense of being made holy. All the great lights of the Latin Church, Augustine, Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Thomas Aquinas, held that if the Virgin Mary were not a partaker of the sin and apostasy of man, she could not be a partaker of redemption. As Thomas Aquinas, and after him the Dominicans, took the one side in this controversy, Duns Scotus and the Franciscans took the other. The public feeling was in favour of the Franciscan doctrine of the immaculate conception. Even John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, distinguished not only for his learning but also for his zeal in reforming abuses, in 1401 came out publicly in support of that view. He was, however, candid enough to admit that it had not hitherto been the doctrine of the Church. But he held that God communicated the truth gradually to the Church, hence Moses knew more than Abraham, the prophets more than Moses, the Apostles more than the prophets; in like manner, the Church has received from the Spirit of God many truths not known to the Apostles. This of course implies the rejection of the doctrine of tradition. That doctrine is, that a plenary revelation of all Christian doctrine was made by Christ to the Apostles and by them communicated to the Church, partly in their writings and partly by oral instructions. To prove that any doctrine is of divine authority, it must be proved that it was taught by the Apostles, and to prove that they taught it, it must be proved that it has been always and everywhere held by the Church. But according to Gerson the Church of today may hold what the Apostles never held, and even the very reverse of what was held by them and by the Church for ages to be true. He teaches that the Church before his time taught that the Virgin Mary, in common with all other members of the human race, was born with die infection of original sin; but that

the Church of his day, under the inspiration of the Spirit, believed in her immaculate conception. This resolves tradition into, or rather substitutes for it, the sensus communis ecclesiæ of any given time. It has already been shown [267] that Moehler in his "Symbolik" teaches substantially the same doctrine.

This question was undecided at the time of the meeting of the Council of Trent, and gave the fathers there assembled a great deal of trouble. The Dominicans and Franciscans, of nearly equal influence in the Council, each urged that their peculiar views should be sanctioned. The legates in their perplexity referred to Rome for instructions, and were directed for fear of schism to prevent any further controversy on the subject, and so to frame the decision as to satisfy both parties. This could only be done by leaving the question undecided. This was substantially the course which the Council adopted. After affirming that all man kind sinned in Adam and derive from him a corrupt nature, it adds: "Declarat tamen hæc ipsa Sancta Synodus, non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam, et immaculatam Viriginem Mariam, Dei genetricem; sed observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Xysti papæ IV., sub poenis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat." [268] This last clause refers to the Bull of Sixtus IV., issued in 1483, threatening both parties in this controversy with the pains of excommunication if either pronounced the other guilty of heresy or mortal sin.

The controversy went on, therefore, after the Council of Trent very much as it had done before, until the present Pope, himself a devoted worshipper of the Virgin, announced his purpose to have the immaculate conception of the Mother of our Lord declared. This purpose he carried into effect, and on the eighth of December, 1854, he went in great pomp

to St. Peter's in Rome, and pronounced the decree that the "Virgin Mary, from the first moment of conception by the special grace of almighty God in view of the merits of Christ, was preserved from all stain of original sin." She was thus placed, as to complete sinlessness, on an equality with her adorable Son, Jesus Christ, whose place she occupies in the confidence and love of so large a part of the Roman Catholic world.

---

[259] Concilii Tridentini, sess. XXV.

[260] Ibid. sess. XXII. caput. iii.

[261] III. ii. qu. 4 [xix. 10]. See Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, pp. 93, 78, 79, 479.

[262] Summa, II. ii. quæst. 83, art. 4, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 153, a, of third set.

[263] De Ecclesia Triumphante, lib. I., De Sanctorum Beatitudine, cap. xvii, xviii., Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. ii. pp 718-721.

[264] Ut supra, cap. XX. p. 735.

[265] This Psalter is published under the title Psalterium Virginis Mariæ, a Devoto Doctore Sancto Bonaventura compilatum. It is given at length by Chemnitz in his Examen Concilii Tridentini, edit. Frankfort, 1574, part iii. pp. 166-179. Chemnitz does not refer its authorship to Bonaventura; but gives it as a document sanctioned and used in the Church of Rome.

[266] See A Church Dictionary. B. Walter Farquhar Hook, D. D., Vicar of Leeds. Sixth edition. Philadelphia, 1854, article Mariolatry. Dr. Hook quotes the so-called "Psalter of Bonaventura;" and refers to Sancti Bonaventuræ Opera, tom. vi. part. ii. from p. 466 to 473. Fol. Moguntiæ, 1609.

[267] Vol. i. p. 114.

[268] This is from Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, p. 20. A foot-note says, "Totum hanc periodum. Declarat-innovat,' omnes fere editiones ante Romanas omittunt."

---

§ 6. The Second Commandment.

The two fundamental principles of the religion of the Bible are first, that there is one only the living and true God, the maker of heaven and earth, who has revealed Himself under the name Jehovah; secondly, that this God is a Spirit, and, therefore, incapable of being conceived of or represented under a visible form. The first commandment, therefore, forbids the worship of any other being than Jehovah; and the second, the worship of any visible object whatever. This includes the prohibition, not only of inward homage, but of all external acts which are the natural or conventional expression of such inward reverence. That the second commandment does not forbid pictorial or sculptured representations of ideal or visible objects, is plain because the whole command has reference to religious worship, and because Moses, at the command of God himself, made many such images and representations. The curtains of the tabernacle and especially the veil separating between the Holy and Most Holy places, were adorned with embroidered figures representing cherubim; cherubim overshadowed the Ark of the Covenant with their wings; the Golden Candlestick was in the form of a tree "with branches, knops, and flowers;" the hem of the high priest's robe was adorned with alternate bells and pomegranates. When Solomon built the temple, "he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubim, and palm-trees, and open flowers, within and without." (1 Kings vi. 29.) The "molten sea" stood upon twelve oxen. Of this house thus adorned God said, "I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there forever; and mine eyes and

mine heart shall be there perpetually." (1 Kings ix. 3.) There can therefore be no doubt that the second commandment was intended only to forbid the making or using the likeness of anything in heaven or earth as objects of worship. [269]

The Worship of Images forbidden.

It is equally clear that the second commandment does forbid the use of images in divine worship. In other words, idolatry consists not only in the worship of false gods, but also in the worship of the true God by images. This is clear, --

1. From the literal meaning of the words. The precise thing forbidden is, bowing down to them, or serving them, i.e., rendering them any kind of external homage. This, however, is exactly what is done by all those who employ images as the objects, or aids of religious worship.

2. This is still further plain because the Hebrews were solemnly enjoined not to make any visible representation of the unseen God, or to adopt anything external as the symbol of the invisible and make such symbol the object of worship; i.e., they were not to bow down before these images or symbols or serve them. The Hebrew word tsvr, rendered "to serve," includes all kinds of external homage, burning incense, making oblations, and kissing in token of subjection. The Hebrews were surrounded by idolaters. The nations, having forgotten God, or refusing to acknowledge Him, had given themselves up to false gods. It was nature's invisible force, of which they saw constant, and often fearful manifestations around them, that was the great object of their reverence and fear. But nature, force, the invisible, could no more satisfy them, than the invisible Jehovah. They symbolized not the unknown, but the real, first in one way and then in another. Light and darkness were the two most obvious symbols of good and evil; light, therefore, the sun, moon, and stars, the host of heaven, were among the

earlier objects of reverence. But anything external and visible, living or dead, might be made to the people, by association or arbitrary appointment, the representative of the great unknown power by which all things were controlled. Most naturally, men distinguished by force of character and by their exploits would be regarded as manifestations of the unknown. Thus nature-worship and hero-worship, the two great forms of heathenism, are seen to be radically the same. It was in view of this state of the Gentile world, all nations being given to the worship of the visible as the symbol of the invisible, that Moses delivered the solemn address to the chosen people recorded in the fourth chapter of Deuteronomy. "Only take heed to thyself," said the prophet, "and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them thy sons, and thy sons sons." What is it that he thus earnestly called on them to remember? It was that in all the wonderful display of the divine presence and majesty upon Sinai, they had seen "no similitude," but only heard a voice, "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire,) lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness of anything that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth: and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them [literally, "to prostrate thyself before them"], and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven. . . . . Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the

covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you, and make you a graven image, the likeness of anything which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee. For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God." The thing thus repeatedly and solemnly forbidden as a violation of the covenant between God and the people, was the bowing down to, or using anything visible, whether a natural object as the sun or moon, or a work of art and man s device, as an object or mode of divine worship. And in this sense the command has been understood by the people to whom it was given, from the time of Moses until now. The worship of the true God by images, in the eyes of the Hebrews, has ever been considered as much an act of idolatry as the worship of false gods.

3. A third argument on this subject is, that the worship of Jehovah by the use of images is denounced and punished as an act of apostasy from God. When the Hebrews in the wilderness said to Aaron, "Make us gods which shall go before us," neither they nor Aaron intended to renounce Jehovah as their God; but they desired a visible symbol of God, as the heathen had of their gods. This is plain, because Aaron, when he fashioned the golden calf and built an altar before it, made proclamation, and said, "To-morrow is a feast to Jehovah." "Their sin then lay, not in their adopting another god, but in their pretending to worship a visible symbol of Him whom no symbol could represent." [270] In like manner, when the ten tribes separated from Judah and were erected into a separate kingdom under Jeroboam, the worship of God by idols was regarded as an apostasy from the true God. It is evident from the whole narrative that Jeroboam did not intend to introduce the worship of any other god than Jehovah. It was the place and mode of worship which he sought to change. He feared that if the people continued to go up to Jerusalem and worship in the temple there

established, they would soon return to their allegiance to the house of David. To prevent this, he made two golden calves, as Aaron had done, symbols of the God who had brought his people out of Egypt, and placed one in Dan and the other in Bethel, and commanded the people to resort to those places for worship. Thus also Jehu, who boasted of his "zeal for Jehovah," and exterminated the priests and worshippers of Baal, retained the service of the golden calves, because, as Winer expresses it, "that had become the established form of the Jehovah-worship in Israel." "Er [Jehu] behielt den Kälberdienst in Dan und Bethel, als in Israel einheimisch gewordenen Jehovahdienst." [271] In Leviticus xxvi. 1, it is said: "Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I am the Lord your God." And Moses commanded that when the people had gained possession of the promised land, six of the tribes should be gathered on Mount Gerizim to bless, and six upon Mount Ebal to curse: "And the Levites shall speak and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice, cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place. And all the people shall answer and say, Amen." (Deut. xxvii. 15.)

The specific thing thus frequently and solemnly forbidden is the bowing down to images, or rendering them any religious service. In this sense these commands were understood by the ancient people of God to whom they were originally given, and by the whole Christian Church until the sudden influx of nominally converted heathen into the Church after the time of Constantine, who brought with them heathenish ideas and insisted on heathen modes of worship.

The simple obvious facts with regard to the religion of the gentile

world are, (1.) That the gods of the nations were imaginary beings; that is, they either had no existence except in the imaginations of their worshippers, or they did not possess the attributes which were ascribed to them. Therefore they are called in Scripture vanity, lies, nonentities. (2.) Of these imaginary beings symbols were selected or images formed, to which all the homage supposed to be due to the gods themselves was paid. This was not done on the assumption that the symbols or images were really gods. The Greeks did not think that Jupiter was a block of marble. Neither did the heathen mentioned in the Bible believe that the sun was Baal. Nevertheless some connection was supposed to exist between the image and the divinity which it was intended to represent. With some this connection was simply that between the sign and the thing signified; with others it was more mystical, or what in these days we should call sacramental. In either case it was such that the homage due to the divinity was paid to his image; and any indignity offered to the latter was resented as offered to the former.

As, therefore, the heathen gods were no gods, and as the homage due to God was paid to the idols, the sacred writers denounced the heathen as the worshippers of stocks and stones, and condemned them for the folly of making gods out of wood or metal "graven by art and man's device." They made little or no difference between the worshipping of images and the worshipping false gods. The two things were, in their view, identical. Hence in the Bible the worship of images is denounced as idolatry, without regard to the divinity, whether true or false, to whom the image was dedicated.

The Reasons annexed to this Commandment.

The relation between the soul and God is far more intimate than that between the soul and any creature. Our life, spiritual and eternal,

depends on our relation to our Maker. Hence our highest duty is to Him. The greatest sin a man can commit is to refuse to render to God the admiration and obedience which are his due, or to transfer to the creature the allegiance and service which belong to him. Hence no sin is so frequently or so severely denounced in the Scriptures.

The most intimate relation which can subsist among men is that of marriage. No injury which can be rendered by one man against another is greater than the violation of that relation; and no sin which a wife can commit is more heinous and degrading than infidelity to her marriage vows.

This being the case, it is natural that the relation between God and his people should be, as it is, in the Bible so often illustrated by a reference to the marriage relation. A people who refuse to recognize, or an individual man who refuses to recognize Jehovah as his God, who transfers the allegiance and obedience due to God alone to any other object, is compared to an unfaithful wife. And as jealousy is the strongest of human passions, the relation of God to those who thus forsake Him is illustrated by a reference to the feelings of an injured and forsaken husband. It is in this way that the Scriptures teach that the severest displeasure of God, and the most dreadful manifestations of his wrath, are the certain consequences of the sin of idolatry; that is, of the sin of having any other God than Jehovah, or of giving to images, to stocks and stones, the external homage due to Him who is a spirit, and who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

The Lord, therefore, in this commandment, declares Himself to be "a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation; and showing mercy unto thousands (unto the thousandth generation) of them that love me, and keep my commandments." The evil consequences of apostasy from God are not

confined to the original apostates. They are continued from generation to generation. They seem indeed, and, humanly speaking, in fact are remediless. The degradation and untold miseries of the whole heathen world are the natural and inevitable consequence of their forefathers having turned the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator. These natural consequences, however, are designed, ordained, and judicial. They are not mere calamities. They are judgments, and therefore are not to be counteracted or evaded. Consequently those who teach atheism, or who undermine religion, or who corrupt and degrade the worship of God by associating with it the worship of creatures; or who teach that we may make graven images and bow down to them and serve them, are bringing down upon themselves and upon coming generations the most direful calamities that can degrade and afflict the children of men. Such must be the issue unless they not only can counteract the operation of natural causes, but also can thwart the purpose of Jehovah.

It is a great cause for thankfulness, and adapted to fill the hearts of God's faithful people with joy and confidence, to know that He will bless their children to the thousandth generation.

The Doctrine and Usage of the Romish Church as to Images.

Salvation, our Lord said, is of the Jews. The founders of the Christian Church were Jews. The religion of the Old Testament in which they had been educated forbade the use of images in divine worship. All the heathen were worshippers of idols. Idol-worship, therefore, was an abomination to the Jews. With the Old Testament authority against the use of images and with this strong national prejudice against their use, it is absolutely incredible that they should be admitted in the more spiritual worship of the Christian Church. It was not until three centuries after the introduction of Christianity, that the influence of

the heathen element introduced into the Church was strong enough to overcome the natural opposition to their use in the service of the sanctuary. Three parties soon developed themselves in connection with this subject. The first adhered to the teachings of the Old Testament and the usage of the Apostolic Churches, and repudiated the religious use of images in any form. The second allowed the use of images and pictures for the purpose of instruction, but not for worship. The common people could not read, and therefore it was argued that visible representations of Scriptural persons and incidents were allowable for their benefit. The third contended for their use not only as a means of instruction, but also for worship.

As early as A.D. 305, the Council of Elvira in Spain condemned the use of pictures in the Church. [272] In the thirty-sixth Canon the Council says, [273] "Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere; ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur." Augustine complained of the superstitious use of images; Eusebins of Cæsarea, and Epiphanius of Salamis, protested against their being made objects of worship; and Gregory the Great allowed their use only as means of instruction. [274] In A.D. 726 the Emperor Leo III. issued an ordinance forbidding the use of images in churches as heathenish and heretical. To support his action a council was called, which met in Constantinople A.D. 754, and which gave ecclesiastical sanction to this condemnation. In A.D. 787, however, the Empress Irene, under Roman influence, called a council, which Romanists of the Italian school consider ecumenical, at Nice, by which image-worship was fully sanctioned. This Council first met in Constantinople, but there the opposition to the use of images was so strong that it was disbanded and called to meet the following year at Nice. Here the face of things had changed; enemies had been converted; opponents became advocates; even Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, who had been a

zealous supporter of the policy of Leo III. and of his son Constantine Copronymus, was brought to say, "Si omnes consentiunt, ego non dissentio." Few could withstand the promises and threats of those in power, and the cogency of the argument for image worship drawn from the numerous miracles adduced in favour of their worship. This Council, therefore, declared the previous Council, called by Leo III., heretical, and ordained the worship of pictures in the churches; not indeed with latreia, or the reverence due to God, but with aspasmos kai timetike proskunesis (with salutations and reverent prostrations). The Council announced the principle on which image-worship, whether among the heathen or Christians, has generally been defended, i.e., that the worship paid the image terminates on the object which it represents. He tes eikonos time epi to prototupon diabainei kai ho proskunon ten eikona proskunei en aute tou engraphomenou ten hupostasin.

The decisions of this Council, although sanctioned by the Pope, gave offence to the Western Churches. The Emperor Charlemagne not only caused a book to be written (entitled "Libri Carolini") to refute the doctrines inculcated, but also summoned a council to meet at Frankfort on the Main A.D. 794, at which delegates from Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and even two legates from the Bishop of Rome, were present; where the decrees of the so-called General Council of Nice were "rejected," "despised," and "condemned." All worshipping of pictures and images was forbidden, but their presence in the churches for instruction and ornament was allowed.

The friends of image-worship, however, rapidly gained the ascendancy, so that Thomas Aquinas, one of the best as well as the greatest of the Romish theologians in the thirteenth century, held the extreme doctrine on this subject. He taught that images were to be used in the churches for three purposes, first, for the instruction of the masses who could

not read; secondly, that the mystery of the incarnation and the examples of the saints may be the better remembered; and thirdly, that pious feelings may be excited, as men are more easily moved by what they see than by what they hear. He taught that to the image in itself and for itself no reverence is due, but that if it represents Christ, the reverence due to Christ is due to the image. "Sic ergo dicendum est, quod imagini Christi in quantum est res quædam (puta lignum vel pictum) nulla reverentia exhibetur; quia reverentia nonnisi rationali naturæ debetur. Relinquitur ergo quod exhibeatur ei reverentia solum, in quantum est imago: et sic sequitur, quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda." [275]

Tridentine Doctrine.

The Council of Trent acted with reference to the worship of images with its usual caution. It decreed that to the images of Christ and the saints "due reverence" should be paid, without defining what that reverence is. The council decided: "Imagines porro Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum, in templis præsertim habendas, et retinendas; eisque debitum honorem, et venerationem impertiendam; non quod credatur inesse aliqua in eis divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda; veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ representant: ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus, et procumbimus, Christum adoremus; et sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt, veneremur."

In the same session it was decreed concerning relics: "Sanctorum quoque martyrum, et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quæ viva

membra fuerunt Christi, et templum Spiritus Sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda, et glorificanda, a fideibus veneranda esse; per quæ multa beneficia a Deo hominibus præstantar: ita ut affirmantes, sanctorum reliquiis venerationem, atque honorem non deberi; vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari; atque eorum opis impetrandæ causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari; omnino damnandos esse; prout jampridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia." [276]

On relic-worship the Roman Catechism, says, "Cui fidem non faciant et honoris, qui sanctis debetur, et patrocinii, quod nostri suscipiunt, mirabiles effectæ res ad eorum sepulcra, et oculis, et manibus membrisque omnibus captis, in pristinum statum restitutis, mortuis ad vitam revocatis, ex corporibus hominum ejectis demoniis? quæ non audisse, ut multi, non legisse, ut plurimi gravissimi viri, sed vidisse, testes locupletissimi sancti Ambrosius et Augustinus litteris prodiderunt. Quid multa? si vestes, sudaria, si umbra sanctorum, priusquam e vita migrarent, depulit morbos, viresque restituit, quis tandem negare audeat, Deum per sacros cineres, ossa, ceterasque sanctorum reliquias eadem mirabiliter efficere? Declaravit id cadaver illud, quod forte illatum in sepulcrum Elisei, ejus tacto corpore, subito revixit." [277]

Bellarmin.

The whole of the Liber Secundus of Bellarmin's Disputation "De Ecclesia Triumphante" in the second volume of his works, is devoted to the discussion of the question of the worship of the relics and images of the saints. As to the worship of images he says there are three opinions among Romanists themselves: "Prima, quod imago non sit ullo modo in se colenda, sed solum coram imagine colendum exemplar." "Secunda opinio est, quod idem honor debeatur imagini ut exemplari, et

proinde Christi imago sit adoranda cultu latriæ, Beatæ Mariæ cultu hyperduliæ, sanctorum aliorum, cultu duliæ." "Tertia opinio versatur in medio, estque eorum, qui dicunt, ipsas imagines in se, et proprie honorari debere, sed honore minori, quam ipsum exemplar, et proinde nullam imaginem adorandam esse cultu latriæ." [278] His own opinion is given in the following propositions: "Prima sententia, sive propositio. Imagines Christi, et sanctorum venerandæ sunt, non solum per accidens, vel improprie, sed etiam per se proprie, ita ut ipsæ terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris." "Secunda propositio. Quantum ad modum loquendi præsertim in concione ad populum, non est dicendum imagines ullas adorari debere latria, sed e contrario non debere sic adorari." "Tertia propositio. Si de re ipsa agatur, admitti potest, imagines posse coli improprie, vel per accidens, eodem genere cultus, quo exemplar ipsum colitur." "Quarta propositio. Imago per se, et proprie non est adoranda eodem cultu, quo ipsum exemplar, et proinde nulla imago est adoranda cultu latriæ per se, et proprie." "Quinta conclusio, Cultus, qui per se, proprie debetur imaginibus, est cultus quidam imperfectus, qui analogice et reductive pertinet ad speciem ejus cultus, qui debetur exemplari." [279]

Relics.

Bellarmin in his defence of the "cultus reliquiarum" begins with an attempted refutation of Calvin's five arguments against such worship. He then presents his own in favour of it. [280] They are such as these: First, from Scriptural examples: (a.) Moses carried the bones "sancti Josephi" with him when he left Egypt; (b.) God honoured the remains of Moses by burying them with his own hands; (c.) A dead man was restored to life by contact with the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21); (d.) Isaiah predicted that the sepulchre of the Messiah should be glorious. The Vulgate renders Isaiah xi. 10, "Et erit sepulcrum ejus gloriosum;"

which Bellarmin understands as foretelling "ut sepulcrum Domini, ab omnibus honoraretur." And adds, "Ex quo refellitur Lutheri blasphemia, qui in libro de abolenda Missa dicit, Deo non majorem curam esse de sepulcro Domini, quam de bobus." (e.) The woman mentioned in the Gospel was healed by touching Christ's garment; the sick, according to Acts v. 15, were placed in the streets "that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them"; again, in Acts xix. 11, 12, it is said: "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul: so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." If, says Bellarmin, Christ were now on earth, and we should kiss his garment, the Protestants would call us idolaters.

His second argument is from the decisions of councils; the third from the testimony of the fathers; the fourth and fifth from the miracles wrought by and in the relics of the saints, of which he cites numerous examples; the sixth from the miraculous discovery of the remains of the saints, "Si enim Deo cultus reliquiarum non placeret, cur ipse servis suis corpora sanctorum, quæ latebant, ostenderet?" the seventh, from the translation of relics from one place to another. He also argues from the custom of depositing the remains of the saints under altars, and burning incense and lamps before their tombs. [281]

Remarks.

1. From all this it appears that the Romanists worship images in the same way that the heathen of old did, and pagans of our own day still do. They "bow down to them and serve them." They pay them all the external homage which they render to the persons they are intended to represent.

2. The explanations and defence of such worship are the same in both cases. The heathen recognized the fact that the images made of gold,

silver, wood, or marble were lifeless and insensible in themselves; they admitted that they could not see, or hear, or save. They attributed no inherent virtue or supernatural power to them. They claimed that the homage paid to them terminated on the gods which they represented; that they only worshipped before the images, or at most through them. So far as the Greeks and Romans are concerned, they were less reverential to the mere image, and claimed far less of the supernatural in connection with their use.

3. Both among the heathen and the Romanists, for the uneducated people the images themselves were the objects of worship. It would be hard to find in any heathen author such justification of image-worship as the Romish theologians put forth. What heathen ever said that the same homage was due to the image of Jupiter as to Jupiter himself? This Thomas Aquinas says of the images of Christ and of the saints. Or what heathen ever has said, as Bellarmin says, that although the homage to be paid to the image is not strictly and properly the same as that due to its prototype, it is nevertheless improperly and analogically the same; the same in kind although not in degree? What can the common people know of the difference between proprie and improprie? They are told to worship the image, and they worship it just as the heathen worshipped the images of their gods. As the Bible pronounces and denounces as idolatry not only the worship of false gods, but also the worship of images, the bowing down to them and serving them,' it is clear that the Roman Church is as wholly given to idolatry as was Athens when visited by Paul.

4. The moral and religious effects of image worship are altogether evil. It is enough to prove that it is evil in its consequences that God has forbidden it, and threatened to visit the worshippers of idols with his severe judgments. It degrades the worship of God. It turns off

the minds of the people from the proper object of reverence and confidence, and leads the uneducated masses to put their trust in gods who cannot save.

5. As to the worship of relics, it is enough to say, (a.) That it has no support from Scripture. The outline of Bellarmin's arguments given above, is sufficient to show that the Bible furnishes no apology for this superstitious custom. (b.) What pass for relics, in the great majority of cases, are spurious. There is no end to the deceptions practised on the people in this regard. There are, it is said, enough fragments of the cross exhibited in different sanctuaries, to build a large ship; and there are innumerable nails which are reverenced as the instruments of our Lord's torture. Bones not only of ordinary men, but even of brutes, are set before the people as relics of the saints. [282] In one of the cathedrals of Spain there is a magnificent ostrich feather preserved in a gorgeous casket, which the priests affirm fell from the wing of the angel Gabriel. Romanists themselves are obliged to resort to the doctrine of "economics or pious fraud, to justify these palpable impositions on the credulity of the people. Of such impositions the most flagrant example is the blood of St. Januarius, which is annually liquefied in Naples. (c.) Ascribing miraculous powers to these pretended relics as Romanists do, is to the last degree superstitious and degrading. It is true that a little more than a century ago belief in necromancy and witchcraft was almost universal even among Protestants. But there is the greatest possible difference between superstitious beliefs prevailing for a time among the people, and those beliefs being adopted by the Church and enacted into articles of faith to bind the conscience of the people in all time. The Church of Rome is chained down by the decisions of her popes and councils pronouncing the grossest superstitions to be matters of divine

revelation sanctioned and approved by God. She has rendered it impossible for men entitled to be called rational to believe what she teaches. The great lesson taught by the history of image-worship and the reverencing of relics, is the importance of adhering to the word of God as the only rule of our faith and practice; receiving nothing as true in religion but what the Bible teaches, and admitting nothing into divine worship which the Scriptures do not either sanction or enjoin.

Protestant Doctrine on the Subject.

As the worship of images is expressly forbidden in the Scriptures, Protestants, as well Lutheran as Reformed, condemned their being made the objects of any religious homage. As, however, their use for the purposes of instruction or ornament is not thus expressly forbidden, Luther contended that such use was allowable and even desirable. He, therefore, favoured their being retained in the Churches. The Reformed, however, on account of the great abuse which had attended their introduction, insisted that they should be excluded from all places of worship.

The Lutheran standards do not dilate on this subject. In the Apology for the Augsburg Confession it is said: "Primum quia cum alii mediatores præter Christum quæruntur, collocatur fiducia in alios, obruitur tota notitia Christi, idque res ostendit. Videtur initio mentio sanctorum, qualis est in veteribus orationibus, tolerabili consilio recepta esse. Postea secuta est invocatio, invocationem prodigiosi et plus quam ethnici abusus secuti sunt. Ab invocatione ad imagines ventum est, hæ quoque colebantur, et putabatur eis inesse quædam vis, sicut Magi vim inesse fingunt imaginibus signorum coelestium certo tempore sculptis." [283]

Luther was tolerant of the use of images in the churches. On this subject he says: "If the worship of images be avoided, we may use them

as we do the words of Scripture, which bring things before the mind and cause us to remember them." [284] "Who is so stone blind," he asks, "as not to see that if sacred events may be described in words without sin and to the profit of the hearers, they may with the same propriety, for the benefit of the uneducated, be portrayed or sculptured, not only at home and in our houses, but in the churches." [285] In another place he says that when one reads of the passion of Christ, whether he will or not an image of a man suspended on a cross is formed in his mind just as certainly as his face is reflected when he looks into the water. There is no sin in having such an image in the mind why then should it be sinful to have it before the eyes? [286]

The Reformed went further than this. They condemned not only the worship of images, but also their introduction into places of worship, because they were unnecessary, and because they were so liable to abuse. The Second Helvetic Confession says, "Rejicimus non modo gentium idola, sed et Christianorum simulachra. Tametsi enim Christus humanam assumpserit naturam, non ideo tamen assumpsit, ut typum præferret statuariis atque pictoribus. . . . . Et quando beati spiritus et divi coelites, dum hic viverent, omnem cultum sui averterunt, et statuas oppugnarunt, cui verisimile videatur divis coelestibus et angelis suas placere imagines, ad quas genua flectunt homines, detegunt capita, allisque prosequuntur honoribus?" In another paragraph of the same sententiam, dicentis, Non est dubium, quin religio nulla est, ubicunque simulachrum est." [287]

The Heidelberg Catechism, says, [288] "Is it forbidden to make any images or statues? God cannot and ought not in any way to be depicted, and although it is lawful to make representations of creatures, yet God forbids that they should be worshipped, or He through them. But may not images be tolerated in the churches for the instruction of the

uneducated? By no means; for it does not become us to be wiser than God, who has willed that his Church be instructed, not by dumb images, but by the preaching of his word."

No one who has ever seen any of the masterpieces of Christian art, whether of the pencil or of the chisel, and felt how hard it is to resist the impulse to "bow down to them and serve them," can doubt the wisdom of their exclusion from places of public worship.

---

[269] The later Jews interpreted this commandment more strictly than either Moses or Solomon. Josephus, Ant. 8, 7, 5, pronounced making the figures of oxen to support the brazen laver to be contrary to the law.

One of the most distinguished ministers of our Church objected to the American Sunday School Union, that they published books with pictures. When asked, What he thought of maps, he answered that so far as maps were designed simply to show the relative position of places on the face of the earth, they were allowed but if they had any shading on them to represent mountains, they were forbidden by the second commandment.

[270] The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 1871, vol. i. p. 405.

[271] Biblishces Realwörterbuch. von Dr. Georg Benedict Winer, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1847, art. "Jehu."

[272] The year 305 is usually assigned as the date of this Council, although the precise time of its session is a matter of dispute.

[273] Binius, Concilia Generalia Provincalia, Cologne, 1618, t. i. vol. i. p. 195, b, c.

[274] See Guericke, Kirchengeschichte, II. iii. 2, § 77, 6th edit. Leipzig, 1846, vol. i. p. 350.

[275] Summa, III. quæst. XXV. art. 3, edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 53 of fourth set.

[276] Sess. XXV.; Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, Göttingen, 1846, vol. i. pp. 93, 94.

[277] III. ii. 8 (15, xxx., xxxi.); Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 482.

[278] De Ecclesia Triumphante, lib. II. De Imaginibus Sanctorum, cap. xx.; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, vol. ii. pp. 801, 802.

[279] Ut supra, cap. xxi.-xxv. pp. 802-809.

[280] Ut supra, cap. iii. pp. 746-753.

[281] In the Decreta et Articuli fidei jurandi per Episcopos et alios Prælatos in susceptione muneris consecrationis, publicati Romæ in Consistorio ap. S. Marcum, d. IV. Septbr. a. MDLX., are the following articles: "Virgo Dei genitrix, Angeli, et Sancti religiose coli debent, et invocari, ut eorum meritis, et precibus juvemur. "Crux Christi, et imagines, ac quæcunque attigerunt, adorana sunt, juxta Ecclesiæ catholicæ doctrinam, et fidem. "Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ, angelorum, et sanctorum sunt imagines adorandæ (id est in honore habendæ, as it reads in the margin) tum corpora, et reliquiæ quævis." See Steitwolf, Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, Göttingen, 1846, vol. ii. p. 328. Notwithstanding such authoritative declarations, Bellarmin enumerates it as among the "mendacia" of the Centuriators and of Calvin that they say that the Catholics "Non solum sanctos Christi loco adorant, sed etiam eorum ossa, vestes, calceos, et simulacra;" and asks: "At quis unquam Catholicorum reliquias invocavit? Quis unquam auditus est un precibus, aut litaniis dixisse: Sanctæ reliquiæ, orate pro me?' Et quis easdem unquam divino honore affecit, vel Christi loco adoravit: nos enim reliquias quidem honoramus, et osculamur ut sacra pignora patronorum nostrorum: sed nec adoramus ut Deum nec invocamus ut sanctos, sed minore cultu veneramur, quam sanctorum spiritus, nedum

quam Deum ipsum." De Ecclesia Triumphante, lib. ii., De Reliquiis Sanctorum, cap. ii.; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. ii. pp. 745, e, 746, a.

[282] Luther in the Smalcard Articles says: "Reliquæ sanctorum refertæ multis mendaciis, ineptis et fatuitatibus. Canum et equorum ossa ibi sæpe reperta sunt." In German it reads thus: "Das Heiligthum (reliquiæ sanctorum), darinne so manche öffentliche Lügen und Narrenwerk erfunden, von Hunds- und Rossknochen, das auch um solcher Büberei willen, das der Teufel gelacht hat, längst sollte verdammt worden seyn, wenn gleich etwas Gutes daran wäre, dazu auch ohne Gottes Wort, weder geboten noch gerathen, gänz unnöthig und unnütz Ding ist." Pars. II. art. ii. 22. In the church at Wittenburg there hangs an original portrait of Luther under which it is written, "All his words were thunderbolts."

[283] IX. 34; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 229.

[284] On Micah i. 7; Works, edit. Walch, vol. vi. p. 2747.

[285] Ibid. p. 2740.

[286] Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sacrament, 63, Ibid. vol. xx. p. 213.

[287] Confessio Helvetica Posterior, cap. iv.; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 472.

[288] Quest. 97, 98. Niemeyer, 453, 454.

---

§ 7. The Third Commandment.

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

The literal meaning of this command is doubtful. It may mean, "Thou shalt not utter the name of God in a vain or irreverent manner;" or, "Thou shalt not utter the name of God to a lie," i.e., "Thou shalt not

swear falsely." The Septuagint renders the passage thus; Ou lepse to onoma kuriou tou theou sou epi matio. The Vulgate has, "Non assumes nomen Domini Dei tui in vanum." Luther, as usual, freely ad sensum: "Du sollist den Namen des Herrn, deines Gottes, nicht missbrauchen." Our translators have adopted the same rendering.

The ancient Syriac Version, the Targum of Onkelos, Philo, and many modern commentators and exegetes understand the command as directed against false swearing: "Thou shalt not utter the name of God to a lie." So the elder Michaelis in his annotated Hebrew Bible, explains "ad vanum confirmandum: non frustra, nedum, falso." Gesenius in his Hebrew Lexicon renders the passage, [289] "Du sollst den Namen Jehova's nicht zur Lüge aussprechen; nicht falsch schwören." Rosenmüller [290] renders it: "Nolli enunciare nomen Jova Dei tui ad falsum sc. comprobandum." Knobel [291] reads: "Nicht sollst du erheben den Namen Jehova's zur Nichtigkeit;" and adds, "The prohibition is directed specially against false swearing."

This interpretation is consistent with the meaning of the words, as asv', here rendered "vanity," or with the preposition, "in vain," elsewhere means "falsehood." (See Ps. xii. 3 (2); xli. 7 (6); Isaiah lix. 4; Hos. x. 4.) To lift up, or pronounce the name of God for a lie, naturally means, to call upon God to confirm a falsehood. The preposition l also has its natural force. Compare Leviticus xix. 12, "Ye shall not swear by my name [lstr to a lie'] falsely." The general import of the command remains the same, whichever interpretation be adopted. The command not to misuse the name of God, includes false swearing, which is the greatest indignity which can be offered to God. And as the command, "Thou shalt do no murder," includes all indulgence of malicious feelings; so the command, "Thou shalt not forswear thy self," includes all lesser forms of irreverence in the use of the name

of God.

It is urged, as an objection to the second interpretation given above, that perjury is an offence against our neighbour, and therefore belongs to the second table of the Law; and that it is in fact included in the ninth commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Bearing false testimony and false swearing are, however, different offences. The first and second commandment forbid the worship of any other being than Jehovah, and worshipping Him in any way not appointed in his word; and the third, supposing it to forbid false swearing, is here in place, as false swearing is a practical denial of the being or perfections of God.

Import of the Command.

The word "name" is used in reference to God in a very comprehensive sense. It often means a personal or individual designation; as when God says, "This is my name," i.e., Jehovah. Frequently the "name of God" is equivalent to God himself. To call on the name of the Lord, and to call on God, are synonymous forms of expression. As names are intended to distinguish one person or thing from another, anything distinguishing or characteristic may be included under the term. The name of God, therefore, includes everything by which He makes Himself known. This commandment, therefore, forbids all irreverence towards God; not only the highest act of irreverence in calling on Him to bear witness to a falsehood, but also all irreverent use of his name; all careless, unnecessary reference to him, or his attributes; all indecorous conduct in his worship; and in short, every indication of the want of that fear, reverence, and awe due to a Being infinite in all his perfections, on whom we are absolutely dependent, and to whom we are accountable for our character and conduct.

The third commandment, therefore, specially forbids not only perjury,

but also all profane, or unnecessary oaths, all careless appeals to God, and all irreverent use of his name. All literature, whether profane or Christian, shows how strong is the tendency in human nature to introduce the name of God even on the most trivial occasions. Not only are those formulas, such as Adieu, Good-bye or God be with you, and God forbid, which may have had a pious origin, constantly used without any recognition of their true import, but even persons professing to fear God often allow themselves to use his name as a mere expression of surprise. God is everywhere present. He hears all we say. He is worthy of the highest reverence; and He will not hold him guiltless who on any occasion uses his name irreverently.

Oaths.

The command not to call upon God to confirm a lie, cannot be considered as forbidding us to call upon Him to confirm the truth. And such is the general nature of an oath. Oaths are of two kinds, assertatory, when we affirm a thing to be true; and promissory, when we bring ourselves under an obligation to do, or to forbear doing certain acts. To this class belong official oaths and oaths of allegiance. In both cases there is an appeal to God as a witness. An oath, therefore, is in its nature an act of worship. It implies, (1.) An acknowledgment of the existence of God. (2.) Of his attributes of omnipresence, omniscience, justice, and power. (3.) Of his moral government over the world; and (4.) Of our accountability to Him as our Sovereign and Judge. Hence "to swear by the name of Jehovah," and to acknowledge Him as God, are the same thing. The former involves the latter.

Such being the case, it is evident that a man who denies the truths above mentioned cannot take an oath. For him the words he utters have no meaning. If he does not believe that there is a God; or suppose that he admits that there is some being or force which may be called God, if

he does not believe that that Being knows what the juror says, or that He will punish the false swearer, the whole service is a mockery. It is a great injustice, tending to loosen all the bonds of society, to allow atheists to give testimony in courts of justice. [292]

The imprecation usually introduced in the formula of an oath, is not essential to its nature. It is indeed involved in the appeal to God to bear witness to the truth of what we say, but its direct assertion is not necessary. Indeed, it is not found in any of the oaths recorded in the Bible. Some strenuously object to its introduction, as involving a renunciation of all hope of the mercy and grace of God, and as an equivalent to an imprecation on one s self of everlasting perdition.

The Lawfulness of Oaths.

The lawfulness of oaths may be inferred, --

1. From their nature. Being acts of worship involving the acknowledgment of the being and attributes of God, and of our responsibility to Him, they are in their nature good. They are not superstitious, founded on wrong ideas of God or of his relation to the world; nor are they irreverent; nor are they useless. They have a real power over the consciences of men; and that power is the greater according as the faith of the juror and of society in the truths of religion, is the more intelligent and the stronger.

2. In the Scriptures, oaths, on proper occasions, are not only permitted, but commanded. "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and shalt swear by his name. (Deut. vi. 13.) "He who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth, shall swear by the God of truth." (Is. lxv. 16.) "It shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, Jehovah liveth; (as they taught my people to swear by Baal;) then shall they be built in the midst of my people." (Jer. xii.

16; iv. 2.) God Himself is represented as swearing. (Psalms cx. 4; Hebrews vii. 21.) "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself." (Heb. vi. 13.) Our blessed Lord also, when put upon his oath by the high priest, did not hesitate to answer. (Matt. xxvi. 63.) The words are, Exorkizo se kata tou Theou tou zontos, which are correctly rendered by our version, "I adjure thee (call on thee to swear) by the living God." Meyer in his comment on this passage says: "An affirmative answer to this formula was an oath in the full meaning of the word." And our Lord's reply, "Thou sayest," is the usual Rabbinical form of direct affirmation. [293] The Hebrew word hsby is rendered in the Septuagint by horkizo and exorkizo, and in the Vulgate by adjuro. See Genesis 1. 5, "My father made me swear, horkise me." Num. v. 19, "The priest shall charge her by an oath, horkiei auten." It appears from this passage as well as from others in the Old Testament, that oaths were on certain occasions enjoined by God himself. (Ex. xxii. 10.) They cannot, therefore, be unlawful.

Seeing, then, that an oath is an act of worship; that it is enjoined on suitable occasions; that our Lord himself submitted to be put upon his oath; and that the Apostles did not hesitate to call God to witness to the truth of what they said; we cannot admit that Christ intended to pronounce all oaths unlawful, when he said, as recorded in Matthew v. 34, "Swear not at all." This would be to suppose that Scripture can contradict Scripture, and that Christ's conduct did not conform to his precepts. Nevertheless, his words are very explicit. They mean in Greek just what our version makes them mean. Our Lord did say, "Swear not at all." But in the sixth commandment it is said, "Thou shalt not kill." That, however, does not mean that we may not kill animals for food; for that is permitted and commanded. It does not forbid homicide in self-defence, for that also is permitted. Neither does it forbid

capital punishment; for that is not only permitted but even commanded. The meaning of this command has never been doubted or disputed, because it is sufficiently explained by the context and occasion, and by the light shed upon it by other parts of Scripture. As, therefore, the command, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids only unlawful killing; so also the command, "Swear not at all," forbids only unlawful swearing.

This conclusion is confirmed by the context. A great part of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount is devoted to the correction of perversions of the law, introduced by the Scribes and Pharisees. They made the sixth commandment to forbid only murder; our Lord said that it forbade all malicious passions. They limited the seventh commandment to the outward act; He extended it to the inward desire. They made the precept to love our neighbour consistent with hating our enemies; Christ says, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you." In like manner, the Scribes taught that the law allowed all kinds of swearing, and swearing on all occasions, provided a man did not forswear himself; but our Lord said, I say unto you, in your communications swear not at all; this is plain from ver. 37, "Let your communications (logos, word, talk) be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil." It is unnecessary, colloquial, irreverent swearing our Lord condemns. This has nothing to do with those solemn acts of worship, permitted and commanded in the word of God. The Jews of that age were especially addicted to colloquial swearing, holding that the law forbade only fake swearing, or swearing by the name of false gods; [294] hence our Lord had the more occasion to rebuke this sin, and show the evil of any such adjurations.

When are Oaths lawful.

1. As an oath involves an act of worship, it is plain that it should not be taken on any trivial occasion, or in an irreverent manner.

2. An oath is lawful when prescribed and administered by duly authorized officers of the State, or of the Church; they are the "ministers of God," acting in his name and by his authority. There are many who do not regard it as proper that an oath should ever be taken, except when thus imposed by those in authority. The Church of England in the thirty-ninth article, says: "As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his Apostle; so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth." The same ground has been taken by many moral philosophers and theologians.

There does not, however, seem to be any sufficient reason for this restriction, either in the nature or design of an oath, or in the teachings of Scripture. The oath being an appeal to God to bear witness to the truth of our declarations, or the sincerity of our promises, there is no reason why this appeal should not be made whenever any important end is to be accomplished by it. There should be a necessity for it; that is, no man should swear lightly or profanely, but only when all the conditions which justify this appeal to God are present. According to the old law those conditions are, "judicium in jurante, justitia in objecto, veracitas in mente." That is, the juror must be competent. He must have a just judgment of the nature and obligation of an oath, so as to understand what he is about to do. Therefore an idiot, a child, or an unbeliever cannot properly be put upon his oath. By "justitia in objecto," is meant that the object concerning which the oath is taken, should be a proper object. If it be a promissory oath, the thing we engage to do must be possible and lawful; if an assertatory oath, the object must have due importance; it must be

within the knowledge of the juror; and there must be an adequate reason why this appeal to God should be made. The "veracitas in mente," includes the sincere purpose of doing what we promise, or of telling the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to the best of our knowledge in the case in which we testify. This excludes all intention to deceive, all mental reservation, and all designed ambiguity of language. All these conditions may be present in private, as well as in judicial or official oaths.

Then again, as the design of an oath is to produce conviction of the truth, to satisfy others of our sincerity and fidelity, and to make an end of controversy, it is evident that circumstances may arise in private life, or in the intercourse of a man with his fellow-men, when an oath may be of the greatest importance. If we risk a great deal on the fidelity or veracity of a man, we have a right to bind him by the solemnity of an oath; or if it is of great importance that others should confide in our veracity or fidelity, it may be right to give them the assurance which an oath is suited and intended to afford.

As to the Scriptural examples, by far the greater number of the oaths recorded in the Bible, and that with the implied approbation of God, are of a non-judicial character. Abraham swore to Abimelech. (Gen. xxi. 23.) Abraham made his servant swear to him. (Gen. xxiv. 3.) Isaac and Abimelech interchanged oaths. (Gen. xxvi. 31.) Jacob caused Joseph to swear not to bury him in Egypt. (xlvii. 31.) Joseph exacted a similar oath from his brethren. So we read of David's swearing to Saul, and to Jonathan, of Jonathan's to David, and of David's to Shimei. Such private oaths seem at times to have been prescribed in the Mosaic law. In Exodus xxii. 19, it is said, if a man deliver any animal to his neighbour for safe-keeping, and it die on his hands, "then shall an oath of the Lord be between them both, that he hath not put his hand

unto his neighbour's goods." In the New Testament we find the Apostle frequently appealing to God to witness to truth of what he said (Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 10); doing this also in the most formal manner, as in 2 Corinthians i. 23, "I call God for a record upon my soul."

Augustine's rule on this subject is good: "Quantum ad me pertinet, juro, sed quantum mihi videtur, magna necessitate compulsus." [295] The multiplicity of oaths is a great evil. The rapid irreverent administration of them is profane.

The Form of an Oath.

Under the Old Testament, in voluntary oaths the usual fona was, "The Lord do so to me, and more also." (Ruth i. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 9, 35; I Kings ii. 23; 2 Kings vi. 31.) Or simply,"As the Lord liveth." (Ruth iii. 13; Judges viii. 19; 2 Sam. ii. 27, Jer. xxxviii. 16); or as it is in Jeremiah xlii. 5. "The Lord be a true and faithful witness." In judicial proceedings the oath consisted in a simple assent to the adjuration, which assent was expressed in Hebrew by 'tv, and in Greek by su eipas. The form is a matter of indifference; any form of words which implies an appeal to God as a witness is an oath. In swearing, the right hand was usually elevated towards heaven. Genesis xiv. 22, "Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth." Hence "to lift up the hand" was to swear. (See Deut. xxxii. 40; Ex. vi. 8 (in the Hebrew); Ezek. xx. 5.) Lifting up the hand was evidently intended to intimate that the juror appealed to the God of heaven. Among Christians it is usual to put the hand upon the Bible, to indicate that the oath is taken in the name of the God of the Bible, and that the judgment invoked in case of perjury is that which the Bible denounces against false swearing. Kissing the Bible, another usual part of the ceremonial

of an oath, is an expression of faith in the Bible as the word of God. There is nothing unseemly or superstitious in this. On the contrary, instead of appealing to the God of nature, it is most appropriate that the Christian should appeal to the God of the Bible, who, through Jesus Christ, is our reconciled God and Father.

Rules which determine the Interpretation and Obligation of an Oath.

An oath must be interpreted according to the plain natural meaning of the words, or the sense in which they are understood by the party to whom the oath is given or by whom it is imposed. This is a plain dictate of honesty. If the juror understands the oath in a sense different from that attached to it by the party to whom it is given, the whole service is a deceit and mockery. The commander of whom Paley speaks, who swore to the garrison of a besieged town that if they surrendered, a drop of their blood should not be shed, and buried them all alive, was guilty, not only of perjury, but also of dastardly and cruel mockery. The animus imponentis, as is universally admitted, must therefore determine the interpretation of an oath. It was the fact that the results inculcated the lawfulness of mental reservation, which more than anything else made them an abomination in the eyes of all Christendom. It was this which furnished the sharpest thong to the scourge with which Pascal drove them out of Europe.

This is a matter about which men who mean to be honest are not always sufficiently careful. Their conscience is satisfied if what they say will bear an interpretation consistent with the truth, although the obvious sense is not true. [296]

No oath is obligatory which binds a man to do what is unlawful or impossible. The sin lies in taking such an oath, not in breaking it.

The reason of this rule is, that no man can bring himself under an obligation to commit a sin. Herod was not bound to keep his oath to the

daughter of Herodias when she demanded the head of John the Baptist. Neither were the forty men, who had bound themselves with "an oath of execration" to kill Paul. But an oath voluntarily taken to do what is lawful and within the power of the juror binds the conscience, (a.) Even when fulfilling it involves injury to the temporal interests of the juror. The Bible pronounces the man blessed who "sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not." (Ps. xv. 4.) (b.) When the oath is obtained by deceit or violence. In the latter case the juror makes a choice of evils. He swears to make a sacrifice to save himself from what he dreads more than the loss of what he promises to relinquish. This may often be a hard case. But such is the solemnity of an oath, and such the importance of its inviolable sanctity being preserved, that it is better to suffer injustice than that an oath should be broken. The case where an oath is obtained by deceit is more difficult, for when such deceit is practised the juror did not intend to assume the obligation which the oath imposes. He might, therefore, plausibly argue that if he did not intend to assume an obligation, it was not assumed. But, on the other hand, the principle involved in the commercial maxim, caveat emptor, applies to oaths. A man is bound to guard against deception; and if deceived he must take the consequences. Besides, those to whom the oath is given trust to it, and act upon it, and, in a certain sense at least, acquire rights under it. The Scriptures, however, in this as in all other cases, are our safest guide. When the Israelites conquered Canaan, the Gibeonites who dwelt in the land, sent delegates to Joshua pretending that they were from a distant country, and "Joshua made peace with them, and made a league with them, to let them live: and the princes of the congregation sware unto them." When the deception was discovered, the people clamoured for their extermination. "But all the princes said unto all the congregation, We have sworn unto them by the

Lord God of Israel: now, therefore, we may not touch them." (Joshua ix. 15, 19.) This oath, as appears from 2 Samuel xxi. 1, was sanctioned by God and the people were punished for violating it.

Romish Doctrine.

The principle on which the authorities of the Roman Church assume the right to free men from the obligation of their oaths, is that no man can bind himself to do what is sinful. It is the prerogative of the Church to decide what is sinful. If therefore the Churoh decide that an oath to obey a sovereign disobedient to the Pope, to preserve inviolate a safe conduct, or to keep faith with heretics or infidels is sinful, the obligation of every such oath ceases as soon as the judgment of the Church is rendered.

In answer to the question, "Cui competit potestas dispensandi super juramento?" the Romish theologians answer: "Principaliter competit summo Pontifici; non tamen nisi ex rationabili causa, quia dispensat in jure alieno: competit etiam jure ordinario Episcopis, non Parochis. Requirit autem hæc dispensatio potestatem jurisdictionis majoris."

[297] The casuists, on this as on all other practical subjects, go into the most minute details and subtle distinctions. Dens, for example, in the section above quoted, gives no less than ten conditions under which the obligation of an oath ceases. To the question: "Quibus modis potest cessare obligatio juramenti promissorii?" he answers: "1. Irritatione. 2. Dispensatione et relaxatione. 3. Commutatione. 4. Materiæ mutatione vel subtracione. 5. Cessante fine totali complete. 6. Ratione conditionis non adimpletæ. 7. Cessante principali obligatione cessat juramentum pure accessorium. 8. Non acceptatione, et condonatione, seu remissione. 9. Si juramentum incipiat vergere in deteriorem exitum, vel in præjudicium boni communis, vel etiam alicujus particularis, v. g. quis juravit occultare furtum alterius, sed inde alter liberius

prolabitur ad alia furta: item cessat juramentum, quando directe est majoris boni impeditivum. 10. Denique cessat obligatio juramenti, licet improprie, per adimpletionem sive totalem solutionem rei juratæ: et e contra dicitur cessare ab initio, quia juramentum fuit nullum, sive quia nullam ab initio obligationem produxit." Number nine opens a very wide door: the last clause especially seems to teach that a promissory oath ceases to bind whenever it is expedient to break it. [298]

The whole Romish system is the masterpiece of the "wisdom of the world." As many promissory oaths are not obligatory, it would seem to be wise, instead of leaving the question of their continued obligation to be decided by the individual juror, who is so liable to be unduly biased, to refer the matter to some competent authority. This would tend to prevent false judgments, to satisfy the conscience of the juror and the public mind. And as the question is a matter of morals and religion, it would seem to be proper that the decision should be referred to the organs of the Church. Rome makes all these seemingly wise arrangements. But as God has exalted no human authority over the individual conscience, as no man can delegate his responsibility to another, but every man must answer to God for himself, it is clear that no such arrangement can be consistent with the divine will. Again, if it were true that the Church were divinely guided so as to be infallible in its judgment, this tremendous power over the consciences of men might be safely intrusted to it; but as in fact the representatives of the Church are men of like passions as other men, and no more infallible than their fellows, Romanism is nothing more than a device to put the prerogatives and power of God into the hands of sinful men. History teaches how this usurped power has been used.

Vows.

Vows are essentially different from oaths, in that they do not involve

any appeal to God as a witness, or any imprecation of his displeasure.

A vow is simply a promise made to God. The conditions of a lawful vow are, first, as to the object, or matter of the vow, (1.) That it be something in itself lawful. (2.) That it be acceptable to God. (3.) That it be within our own power. (4.) That it be for our spiritual edification. Secondly, as to the person making the vow, (1.) That he be competent; that is, that he have sufficient intelligence, and that he be sui juris. A child is not competent to make a vow; neither is one under authority so that he has not liberty of action as to the matter vowed. (2.) That he act with due deliberation and solemnity; for a vow is an act of worship. (3.) That it be made voluntarily, and observed cheerfully.

All these principles are recognized in the Bible. "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform: even a freewill offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth." (Deut. xxiii. 21-23.) In Numbers xxx. 3-5, it is enacted that if a woman in her father's house make a vow, and her father disallow it, it shall not stand, "and the Lord shall forgive her, because her father disallowed her." The same rule is applied to wives and to children, on the obvious principle, that where the rights of others are concerned, we are not at liberty to disregard them.

All the conditions requisite to the lawfulness of a vow, may be included under the old formula, "judicium in vovente, justitia in objecto, veritas in mente." There are two conditions insisted upon by Romanists to which Protestants do not consent. The one is that a vow

must be "de meliore bono," i.e., for a greater good. If a man vows to devote himself to the priesthood, to make a pilgrimage, to found a church, or to become a monk, the thing vowed is not only good in itself, but it is better than its opposite. The other condition is, that the thing vowed must be in itself not obligatory, so that the sphere of duty is enlarged by the vow. These conditions are included in those laid down by Dens. [299] He says: "Quinque ex causis provenire, quod aliquid non sit apta materia voti; 1º. quia est impossibile; 2º. quia est necessarium; 3º. quia est illicitum; 4º. quia est indifferens vel inutile; 5º. quia non est bonum melius." The two conditions just specified no doubt concur in many vows acceptable to God, but they are not essential. A man may vow to do what he is bound to do, as is the case with every man who consecrates himself to God in baptism. Nor is it necessary that the thing vowed should be in its own nature a greater good. A man may bind himself to a work out of gratitude to God, which in its own nature is indifferent. This was the case with many of the particulars included in the vows of the Nazarite. There was no special virtue in abstaining from wine, vinegar, grapes moist or dry, or in letting "the locks of the hair of his head grow." (Num. vi. 3-5.) The Romish doctrine on this subject is connected with the distinction which Papists make between precepts and counsels. The former bind the conscience, the others do not. There is special merit, according to their theory, in doing more than is commanded. No man is commanded to devote himself to a life of obedience, celibacy, and poverty, but if he does, so much the better; he has the greater merit.

As usual, the Romanists connect so many subordinate rules with the general principles laid down that they are explained away, or rendered of little use. Thus the rule that the matter of a vow must be "bonum melius," is explained to mean better in itself considered, and not

better in relation to the person making the vow. Thus it may be very injurious to a man's spiritual interests to be bound by monastic vows; nevertheless, as the monastic life is in itself a "bonum melius," the vows once taken are obligatory. Then as to the condition of possibility; if possible as to the substance, but impossible as to the accidents, the vow is binding. Thus if a man vows to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem on his knees, although going on his knees be impossible, he is bound to go in some way.

Lawfulness of Vows.

On this subject there is little or no diversity of opinion. That they are lawful appears, --

1. From their nature. A vow is simply a promise made to God. It may be an expression of gratitude for some signal favour already given, or a pledge to manifest such gratitude for some blessing desired should God see fit to grant it. Thus Jacob vowed that if God would bring him back in peace to his father's house, he would consecrate to Him the tenth of all that he possessed. The Bible, and especially the Psalms, abound with examples of such vows of thank-offerings to God. Even Calvin, notwithstanding his deep sense of the evils entailed on the Church by the abuse of vows by the Romanists, says, "Ejusmodi vota hodie quoque nobis in usu esse possunt, quoties nos Dominus vel a clade aliqua, vel a morbo difficili, vel ab alio quovis discrimine eripuit. Neque enim a pii hominis officio tunc abhorret, votivam oblationem, velut sollenne recognitionis symbolum, Deo consecrare: ne ingratus erga ejus benignitatem videatur." [300] He also recognized the propriety of vows of abstinence from indulgences which we have found to be injurious; and also of vows the end of which is to render us more mindful of duties which we may be inclined to neglect. In all such vows there is a devout recognition of God, and of our obligations to Him. They, therefore, as

well as oaths, are acts of worship. They are regarded as such in the Symbols of the Reformed Churches. Thus, for example, the "Declaratio Thoruniensis" [301] includes, under acts of worship, "jusjurandum legitimum, quo Deum cordium inspectorem, ut veritatis testem, et falsitatis vindicem appellamus. Denique votum sacrum, quo vel nos ipsos, vel res aut actiones nostras Deo, velut sacrificium quoddam spirituale, consecramus et devovemus."

2. The fact that the Scriptures contain so many examples of vows, and so many injunctions to their faithful observance, is a sufficient proof that in their place, and on proper occasions, they are acceptable in the sight of God.

3. This is further evident from the fact that the baptismal covenant is of the nature of a vow. In that ordinance we solemnly promise to take God the Father to be our Father, Jesus Christ his Son to be our Saviour, the Holy Ghost to be our Sanctifier, and his word to be the rule of our faith and practice. The same is true of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; in that ordinance we consecrate ourselves to Christ as the purchase of his blood, and vow to be faithful to Him to the end. The same thing is true also of the marriage covenant, because the promises therein made are not merely between the parties, but by both parties to the contract, to God.

But while the lawfulness of vows is to be admitted, they should not be unduly multiplied, or made on slight occasions, or allowed to interfere with our Christian liberty. Not only have the violation of these rules been productive of the greatest evils in the Church of Rome, but Protestant Christians also have often reduced themselves to a miserable state of bondage by the multiplication of vows. When such cases occur, it is healthful and right for the Christian to assert his liberty. As a believer cannot rightfully be brought into bondage to men, so neither

can he rightfully make a slave of himself. He should remember that God prefers mercy to sacrifice; that no service is acceptable to Him which is injurious to us; that He does not require us to observe promises which we ought never to have made and that vows about trifles are irreverent, and should neither be made nor regarded, but should be repented of as sins. Even Thomas Aquinas says, "Vota quæ sunt de rebus vanis et inutilibus, sunt magis deridenda, quam servanda." [302]

Monastic Vows.

At the time of the Reformation the doors of all the monasteries in lands in which Protestants had the power, were thrown open, and their inmates declared free in the sight of God and man, from the vows by which they had hitherto been bound. Protestants did not maintain that there was anything intrinsically wrong in a man, or a company of men renouncing the ordinary avocations of life, and devoting himself or themselves to a religious life. Nor did they object to such men living together and conforming to a prescribed rule of discipline; nor did they deny that such institutions under proper regulations, might be, and in fact had been of great and manifold utility. They had been places of security for those who had no taste for the conflicts by which all Christendom was so long agitated. In many cases they were places of education and seats of learning. Their objections to them were, --

1. That they had been perverted from their original design, and had become the sources of evil and not of good, in every part of the Church. Instead of its being free to every one to enter and to leave these institutions at discretion, those once initiated were bound for life by the vows which they had made, and instead of the obligations assumed being rational and Scriptural, they were unreasonable and unscriptural. Instead of the inmates of these institutions supporting

themselves by their own labour, they were allowed to live in idleness, supported by alms or by the revenues of the convents, which had in many cases become enormous. This objection was directed to the very principle on which the monastic institutions of the Romish Church were founded. On this point Calvin says, "Proinde meminerint lectores, fuisse me de monachismo potius quam de monachis loquutum, et ea vitia notasse, non quæ in paucorum vita hærent, sed quæ ab ipso vivendi instituto separari nequeunt." [303]

2. To this, however, was added the argument from experience. Monastic institutions had become the sources of untold evils to the Church. Being in a great measure independent of the ordinary ecclesiastical authorities, they were the cause of conflict and agitation. Each order was an "imperium in imperio," and one order was arrayed against another, as one feudal baron against his fellows. Besides, the corruption of manners within the convents as portrayed by Romanists themselves, rendered them such a scandal and offence as to justify their summary suppression. Much is implied in the answer of Erasmus to Frederick the Wise, "Lutherus peccavit in duobus, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum." [304]

3. Practical evils might be reformed, but Protestants objected that the whole system of monkery was founded on the false principle of the merit of good works. It was only on the assumption that men could work out a righteousness of their own, that they submitted to the self-denial and restraints of the monastic life. If, however, as Protestants believe, there is no merit in the sight of God in anything fallen men can do, and the righteousness of Christ is the sole ground of our acceptance with God, the whole ground on which these institutions were defended is undermined. To enter a monastery, on the theory of the Romish Church, was to renounce the doctrine of salvation by grace. Besides, it was

also taught that celibacy, obedience, and voluntary poverty, being uncommanded, the monastic vow to observe these rules of life, involved special merit. This was a twofold error. First, it is an error to suppose that there can be any work of supererogation. The law of God demanding absolute perfection of heart and life, there can be no such thing as going beyond its requirements. And, secondly, it is an error to assume that there is any virtue at all in celibacy, monastic obedience, or voluntary poverty. These are not "meliora bona" in the Romish sense of the words. In this view, also, monastic vows are antichristian.

4. A fourth reason urged by Protestants for pronouncing monastic vows invalid, was that they were unlawful, not only for the reason just assigued, but also because they were contrary to the law of Christ. No man has the right to swear away his liberty; to reduce himself to a state of absolute subjection to a fellow-mortal. To his own master he must stand or fail. The vow of obedience made by every monk or nun was a violation of the apostolic injunction, "Be not ye the servants of men." The same remark is applicable to the vow of celibacy. No one has a right to take that vow; because celibacy is right or wrong according to circumstances. It may be a sin, and therefore no such vow can bind the conscience.

5. Monastic life, instead of being subservient to holiness of heart, was in the vast majority of cases injurious to the monks themselves. The fearful language of Jerome is full of instruction: "O quoties ego ipso in eremo constitutus in illa vasta solitudine, quæ exusta solis ardoribus, horridum monachis præstat habitaculum, putavi me Romanis interesse deliciis. . . . . Ille igitur ego, qui ob Gehennæ metum tali me carcere ipse damnaveram, scorpiorum tantum socius et ferarum, sæpe choris intereram puellarum. Pallebant ora jejuniis, et mens desideriis

æstuabat in frigido corpore, et ante hominem sua jam in carne præmortuum, sola libidinum incendia bulliebant." [305] In the day when that which is hidden shall be made manifest, there will probably be no such fearful revelation of self-torture as that made by unveiling the secret life of the inmates of monastic institutions. They are in necessary conflict with the laws of nature and with the law of God.

The Protestants adopted the rule announced by Calvin: [306] "Omnia non legitima nec rite concepta, ut apud Deum nihili sunt, sic nobis irrita esse debere." For, he immediately adds, as in human contracts only that continues binding, which he to whom the promise is made wishes us to observe, so it is to be supposed that we are not bound to do what God does not wish us to do, simply because we have promised Him to do it.

On these grounds the Reformers with one accord pronounced all monastic vows to be null and void. Thus the Gospel became a proclamation of liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to those who were bound.

---

[289] Edit. Leipzig, 1857, sub voce, sv'.

[290] Scholia in Vetus Testamentum in Compendium redacta, Leipzig, 1828, vol. i. p. 404.

[291] Kurzgefasstes exegetische Handbuch zum Alten Testament: Exodus und Leviticus, von August Knobel, Leipzig, 1857, p. 205.

[292] In a recent murder trial in one of the courts of New York, a young scientific physician was called to give testimony on what constitutes insanity. He distinctly asserted that thought was a function of the brain; that where there is no brain there can be no thought; and that a disordered brain necessitates disordered mental action. Of course, God having no brain cannot be intelligent; in other words, there can be no God. Such a man may be a good chemist or a good

surgeon; but he is no more competent to be a witness in a court of justice, than he is fit to be a preacher.

[293] See Schoettgen's Hor. Hebr. et Talm., Matt. v. 34; Dresden and Leipzig, 1733, p. 40.

[294] See Meyer on this passage, who refers to Philo, De Spec. Leg.; A. Lightfoot, Horö, and Meuschen, N. T. ex Talm. illustr. See, also, Winer's Realwörterbuch, and Tholuck's Auslegung der Bergpredigt Christi, 3d edit. Hamburg, 1845.

[295] Sermon CLXXX. 10 [ix.]; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1837, vol. v. p. 1250, a.

[296] A gentleman was charged with having written a certain article in a newspaper. He declared that he did not write it. That was true. But he had dictated it.

[297] Theologia Moralis Dogmatica Reverendi et Eruditissimi Domini Petri Dens: de Juramento, x. 177, edit. Dublin, 1832, vol. iv. pp. 214-216.

[298] In conversation with a very intelligent Romish priest who had been educated at Maynooth, the question was asked, What was the effect of a course of "Moral Theology" designed to train priests for the confessional? The prompt answer was, Utterly to destroy the moral sense.

[299] Tractatus de Voto; Theologia, edit. Dublin, 1832, vol. iv. N. 91, p. 111.

[300] Institutio, IV. xiii. 4, edit. Berlin, 1834, par. ii. p. 338.

[301] De Cultu Dei, 5; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 678.

[302] Summa, II. ii. quæst. lxxxviii. 2; edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 164, b, of third set.

[303] Institutio, IV. xiii. 15; edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. ii. p. 345.

[304] Guericke's Kirchengeschichte, VII. 1. ii. § 174, 6th edit. Leipzig, 1846, vol. iii. p. 69.

[305] Epistola xxii; Ad Eustochium, Paulæ Filiam, De Custodia Virginitatis, Opera, ed. Migne, Paris, 1845, vol. i. p. 398. This long epistle is addressed to a young Roman lady of rank and wealth; and is designed to confirm her in her resolution not to marry. It is founded on the assumption that virginity was not only a great virtue, but also that a special reward, a glory not otherwise attainable, was attached to it. He says to her: "Cave, quæso, ne quando de te dicat Deus: Virgo Israel cecidit, et non est qui suscitet eam.' (Amos v. 2). Audenter loquar: Cum omnia possit Deus, suscitare virginem non potest post ruinam. Valet quidem liberare de poena, sed non vult coronare corruptam." Ibid. p. 394. He enjoins upon her all kinds of ascetic observances even while confessing their inefficacy in his own case.

[306] Institutio, IV. xiii. 20; edit. Berlin, 1834, vol. ii. p. 349.

---

§ 8. The Fourth Commandment.

Its Design.

The design of the fourth commandment was, (1.) To commemorate the work of creation. The people were commanded to remember the Sabbath-day and to keep it holy, because in six days God had made the heavens and the earth. (2.) To preserve alive the knowledge of the only living and true God. If heaven and earth, that is, the universe, were created, they must have had a creator; and that creator must be extramundane, existing before, out of, and independently of the world. He must be almighty, and infinite in knowledge, wisdom, and goodness; for all these attributes are necessary to account for the wonders of the heavens and the earth. So long, therefore, as men believe in creation, they must believe in God. This accounts for the fact that so much

stress is laid upon the right observance of the Sabbath. Far more importance is attributed to that observance than to any merely ceremonial institution. (3.) This command was designed to arrest the current of the outward life of the people and to turn their thoughts to the unseen and spiritual. Men are so prone to be engrossed by the things of this world that it was, and is, of the highest importance that there should be one day of frequent recurrence on which they were forbidden to think of the things of the world, and forced to think of the things unseen and eternal. (4.) It was intended to afford time for the instruction of the people, and for the public and special worship of God. (5.) By the prohibition of all servile labour, whether of man or beast, it was designed to secure recuperative rest for those on whom the primeval curse had fallen: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." (6.) As a day of rest and as set apart for intercourse with God, it was designed to be a type of that rest which remains for the people of God, as we learn from Psalms xcv. 11, as expounded by the Apostle in Hebrews iv. 1-10. (7.) As the observance of the Sabbath had died out among the nations, it was solemnly reenacted under the Mosaic dispensation to be a sign of the covenant between God and the children of Israel. They were to be distinguished as the Sabbath-keeping people among all the nations of the earth, and as such were to be the recipients of God's special blessings. Exodus xxxi. 13, "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." And in verses 16, 17, "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." And in Ezekiel xx. 12, it is said, "Moreover, also, I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and

them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."

The Sabbath was instituted from the Beginning, and is of Perpetual Obligation.

1. This may be inferred from the nature and design of the institution.

It is a generally recognized principle, that those commands of the Old Testament which were addressed to the Jews as Jews and were founded on their peculiar circumstances and relations, passed away when the Mosaic economy was abolished; but those founded on the immutable nature of God, or upon the permanent relations of men, are of permanent obligation. There are many such commands which bind men as men; fathers as fathers; children as children; and neighbours as neighbours. It is perfectly apparent that the fourth commandment belongs to this latter class. It is important for all men to know that God created the world, and therefore is an extramundane personal being, infinite in all his perfections. All men need to be arrested in their worldly career, and called upon to pause and to turn their thoughts Godward. It is of incalculable importance that men should have time and opportunity for religious instruction and worship. It is necessary for all men and servile animals to have time to rest and recuperate their strength. The daily nocturnal rest is not sufficient for that purpose, as physiologists assure us, and as experience has demonstrated. Such is obviously the judgment of God.

It appears, therefore, from the nature of this commandment as moral, and not positive or ceremonial, that it is original and universal in its obligation. No man assumes that the commands, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal," were first announced by Moses, and ceased to be obligatory when the old economy passed away. A moral law is one that binds from its own nature. It expresses an obligation arising either out of our relations to God or out of our permanent

relations to our fellow-men. It binds whether formally enacted or not. There are no doubt positive elements in the fourth commandment as it stands in the Bible. It is positive that a seventh, and not a sixth or eighth part of our time should be consecrated to the public service of God. It is positive that the seventh rather than any other day of the week should be thus set apart. But it is moral that there should be a day of rest and cessation from worldly avocations. It is of moral obligation that God and his great works should be statedly remembered. It is a moral duty that the people should assemble for religious instruction and for the united worship of God. All this was obligatory before the time of Moses, and would have been binding had he never existed. All that the fourth commandment did was to put this natural and universal obligation into a definite form.

2. The original and universal obligation of the law of the Sabbath may be inferred from its having found a place in the decalogue. As all the other commandments in that fundamental revelation of the duties of men to God and to their neighbour, are moral and permanent in their obligation, it would be incongruous and unnatural if the fourth should be a solitary exception. This argument is surely not met by the answer given to it by the advocates of the opposite doctrine. The argument they say is valid only on the assumption "that the Mosaic law, because of its divine origin, is of universal and permanent authority." [307] May it not be as well said, If the command, "Thou shalt not steal," be still in force, the whole code of the Mosaic law must be binding? The fourth commandment is read in all Christian churches, whenever the decalogue is read, and the people are taught to say, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law."

3. Another argument is derived from the penalty attached to the violation of this commandment. "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore,

for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death." (Ex. xxxi. 14.) The violation of no merely ceremonial or positive law was visited with this penalty. Even the neglect of circumcision, although it involved the rejection of both the Abrahamic and the Mosaic covenant, and necessarily worked the forfeiture of all the benefits of the theocracy, was not made a capital offence. The law of the Sabbath by being thus distinguished was raised far above the level of mere positive enactments. A character was given to it, not only of primary importance, but also of special sanctity.

4. We accordingly find that in the prophets as well as in the Pentateuch, and the historical books of the Old Testament, the Sabbath is not only spoken of as "a delight," but also its faithful observance is predicted as one of the characteristics of the Messianic period. Thus Isaiah says, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a Delight, the Holy of the Lord, Honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Is. lviii. 13, 14.) Gesenius is very much puzzled at this. The prophets predicted that under the Messiah the true religion was to be extended to the ends of the earth. But the public worship of God was by the Jewish law tied to Jerusalem. That law was neither designed nor adapted for a universal religion. To those, therefore, who believe that the Sabbath was a temporary Mosaic institution to pass away when the old economy was abolished, it is altogether incongruous that a prophet should represent the faithful observance of the Sabbath as one of the chief blessings and glories of the Messiah's reign.

These considerations, apart from historical evidence or the direct assertion of the Scriptures, are enough to create a strong, if not an invincible presumption, that the Sabbath was instituted from the beginning, and was designed to be of universal and permanent obligation. Whatever law had a temporary ground or reason for its enactment, was temporary in its obligation. Where the reason of the law is permanent the law itself is permanent.

The greater number of Christian theologians who deny all this still admit the Sabbath to be a most wise and beneficent institution. Nay, many of them go so far as to represent its violation, as a day of religious rest, as a sin. This, however, is a concession that the reason for the command is permanent, and that if God has not required its observance, the Church or State is bound to do so.

Direct Evidence of the ante-Mosaic institution of the Sabbath.

Presumptive evidence may be strong enough to coerce assent. The advocates of the early institution of the Sabbath, however, are not limited to that kind of evidence. There is direct proof of the fact for which they contend, --

1. In Genesis ii. 3, it is said, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." It is indeed easy to say that this is a prolepsis; that the passage assigns the reason why in the times of Moses, God selected the seventh, rather than any other day of the week to be the Sabbath. This is indeed possible, but it is not probable. It is an unnatural interpretation which no one would adopt except to suit a purpose. The narrative purports to be an account of what God did at the time of the creation. When the earth was prepared for his reception, God created man on the sixth day, and rested from the work of creation on the seventh, and set apart that day as a holy day to be

a perpetual memorial of the great work which He had accomplished. [308] This is the natural sense of the passage, from which only the strongest reasons would authorize us to depart. All collateral reasons, however, are on its side.

In support of this interpretation the authority of the most impartial, as well as the most competent interpreters might be quoted. Grotius did not believe in the perpetuity of the Sabbath, yet he admits that in Genesis ii. 3, it is said that the seventh day was set apart as holy from the creation. He assumes, on the authority, as he says, of many learned Hebrews, that there were two precepts concerning the Sabbath. The one given at the beginning enjoined that every seventh day should be remembered as a memorial of the creation. And in this sense, he says, the Sabbath was doubtless observed by the patriarchs, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, etc. The second precept was given from Mount Sinai when the Sabbath was made a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. This latter law enjoined rest from labour on the Sabbath. The Scriptural argument which he urges in support of this theory, is, that in all the accounts of the journeyings of the patriarchs, we never read of their resting on the seventh day; whereas after the law given from Mount Sinai, this reference to the resting of the people on the Sabbath is of constant occurrence. [309]

Delitzsch says "Hengstenberg understands Genesis ii. 3, as though it were written from the stand-point of the Mosaic law, as if it were said, God for this reason in after times blessed the seventh day; which scarcely needs a refutation. God himself, the Creator, celebrated a Sabbath immediately after the six days work, and because his sabbatismos could become the sabbatismos of his creatures, He made for that purpose the seventh day, by his blessing, to be a perennial fountain of refreshment, and clothed that day by hallowing it with

special glory for all time to come." [310]

Baumgarten in his comment on this verse says the separation of this day from all others was made so that "the return of this blessed and holy day should be to him a memorial, and participation of the divine rest." [311] And Knobel, one of the most pronounced of the rationalistic commentators, says, "That the author of Genesis makes the distinction of the seventh day coeval with the creation, although the carrying out of the purpose thus intimated was deferred to the time of Moses. Nothing is known of any ante-Mosaic celebration of the Sabbath." [312]

2. Apart from the fact that the reason for the Sabbath existed from the beginning, there is direct historical evidence that the hebdomadal division of time prevailed before the deluge. Noah in Genesis viii. 10, 12, is said twice to have rested seven days. And again in the time of Jacob, as appears from Genesis xxix. 27, 28, the division of time into weeks was recognized as an established usage. As seven is not an equal part either of a solar year or of a lunar month, the only satisfactory account of this fact, is to be found in the institution of the Sabbath. This fact moreover proves not only the original institution, but also the continued observance of the seventh day. There must have been something to distinguish that day as the close of one period or the commencement of another. It is altogether unnatural to account for this hebdomadal division by a reference to the worship of the seven planets. There is no evidence that the planets were objects of worship at that early period of the world, or for a long time afterwards, especially among the Shemitic races. Besides, this explanation is inconsistent with the account of the creation. The divine authority of the book of Genesis is here taken for granted. What it asserts, Christians are bound to believe. It is undeniably taught in this book that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh. It

matters not how the word "days" may be explained, we have in the history of the creation this hebdomadal division of time. No earlier cause for the prevalence of that division can be given, and no other is needed, or can reasonably be assumed.

This division of time into weeks, was not confined to the Hebrew race. It was almost universal. This fact proves that it must have had its origin in the very earliest period in the history of the world. [313]

3. That the law of the Sabbath was not first given on Mount Sinai, may also be inferred from the fact that it was referred to as a known and familiar institution, before that law was promulgated. Thus in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus the people were directed to gather on the sixth day of the week manna sufficient for the seventh, as on that day none would be provided. And more particularly in the twenty-third verse, it is said, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you, to be kept until morning." And in the twenty-sixth verse we read, "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." There was therefore a Sabbath before the Mosaic law was given. Again, the language used in the fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," naturally implies that the Sabbath was not a new institution. It was a law given in the beginning, that had doubtless in a good measure, especially during their bondage in Egypt, become obsolete, which the people were henceforth to remember and faithfully observe.

The objection to the pre-Mosaic institution of the Sabbath founded on the silence of Genesis on the subject in the history of the patriarchs, is of little weight. It is to be remembered that the book of Genesis, comprised in some sixty octavo pages, gives us the history of nearly

two thousand years. All details not bearing immediately on the design of the author were of necessity left out. If nothing was done but what is there recorded, the antediluvians and patriarchs lived almost entirely without religious observances.

The Sabbath does not stand alone. It is well known that Moses adopted and incorporated with his extended code many of the ancient usages of the chosen people. This was the case with sacrifices and circumcision, as well as with all the principles of the decalogue. That a particular law, therefore, is found in the Mosaic economy is not sufficient evidence that it had its origin with the Hebrew Lawgiver, or that it ceased to be binding when the old dispensation was abrogated. If the reason for the law remains, the law itself remains; and if given to mankind before the birth of Moses, it binds mankind. On this point even Dr. Paley says: "If the divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed, no doubt, to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it." [314] That the law of the Sabbath was thus given is, as has been shown, the common opinion even of those who deny its perpetual obligation, and therefore its permanence cannot reasonably be questioned by those who admit the principle that what was given to mankind was meant for mankind.

4. It is a strong argument in favour of this conclusion, that the law of the Sabbath was taken up and incorporated in the new dispensation by the Apostles, the infallible founders of the Christian Church. All the Mosaic laws founded on the permanent relations of men either to God or to their fellows, are in like manner adopted in the Christian Code. They are adopted, however, only as to their essential elements. Every law, ceremonial are typical, or designed only for the Jews, is discarded. Men are still bound to worship God, but this is not now to

be done especially at Jerusalem, or by sacrifices, or through the ministration of priests. Marriage is as sacred now as it ever was, but all the special laws regulating its duties, and the penalty for its violation, are abrogated. Homicide is as great a crime now as under the Mosaic economy, but the old laws about the avenger of blood and cities of refuge are no longer in force. The rights of property remain unimpaired under the gospel dispensation, but the Jewish laws regarding its distribution and protection, are no longer binding. The same is true with regard to the Sabbath. We are as much bound to keep one day in seven boly unto the Lord, as were the patriarchs or Israelites. This law binds all men as men, because given to all mankind, and because it is founded upon the nature common to all men, and the relation which all men bear to God. The two essential elements of the command are that the Sabbath should be a day of rest, that is, of cessation from worldly avocations and amusements; and that it should be devoted to the worship of God and the services of religion. All else is circumstantial and variable. It is not necessary that it should be observed with special reference to the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt; nor are the details as to the things to be done or avoided, or as to the penalty for transgression obligatory on us. We are not bound to offer the sacrifices required of the Jews, nor are we bound to abstain from lighting a fire on that day. In like manner the day of the week is not essential. The change from the seventh to the first was circumstantial. If made for sufficient reason and by competent authority, the change is obligatory. The reason for the change is patent. If the deliverance of the Hebrew from the bondage in Egypt should be commemorated, how much more the redemption of the world by the Son of God. If the creation of the material universe should be kept in perpetual remembrance, how much more the new creation secured by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from

the dead. If men wish the knowledge of that event to die out, let them neglect to keep holy the first day of the week; if they desire that event to be everywhere known and remembered, let them consecrate that day to the worship of the risen Saviour. This is God's method for keeping the resurrection of Christ, on which our salvation depends, in perpetual remembrance.

This change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week was made not only for a sufficient reason, but also by competent authority. It is a simple historical fact that the Christians of the apostolic age ceased to observe the seventh, and did observe the first day of the week as the day for religious worship. Thus from the creation, in unbroken succession, the people of God have, in obedience to the original command, devoted one clay in seven to the worship of the only living and true God. It is hard to conceive of a stronger argument than this for the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as a divine institution. It is not worth while to stop to answer the objection, that the record of this uninterrupted observance of the Sabbath is incomplete. History does not record everything. We find the fountain of this river of mercy in paradise; we trace its course from age to age; we see its broad and beneficent flow before our eyes. If here and there, in its course through millenniums, it be lost from view in a morass or cavern, its reappearance proves its identity and the divinity of its origin. The Sabbath is to the nations what the Nile is to Egypt, and you might as well call the one a human device as the other. Nothing but divine authority and divine power can account for the continued observance of this sacred institution from the beginning until now.

5. It is fair to argue the divine origin of the Sabbath from its supreme importance. As to the fact of its importance all Christians are

agreed. They may differ as to the ground on which the obligation to observe it rests, and as to the strictness with which the day should be observed, but that men are bound to observe it, and that its due observance is of essential importance, there is no difference of opinion among the churches of Christendom. But if so essential to the interests of religion, is it conceivable that God has not enjoined it? He has given the world the Church, the Bible, the ministry, the sacraments; these are not human devices. And can it be supposed that the Sabbath, without which all these divine institutions would be measurably inefficient, should be left to the will or wisdom of men? This is not to be supposed. That these divinely appointed means for the illumination and sanctification of men, are in a great measure without effect, where the Sabbath is neglected or profaned, is a matter of experience. It is undeniable that the mass of the people are indebted to the services of the sanctuary on the Lord's Day, for their religious knowledge. Any community or class of men who ignore the Sabbath and absent themselves from the sanctuary, as a general thing, become heathen. They have little more true religious knowledge than pagans. But without such knowledge morality is impossible. Religion is not only the lifeblood of morality, so that without the former the latter cannot be; but God has revealed his purpose that it shall not be. If men refuse to retain Him in their knowledge, He declares that He will give them up to a reprobate mind. (Rom. i. 28.) Men do not know what they are doing, when by their teaching or example they encourage the neglect or profanation of the Lord's Day. We have in the French Communists an illustration and a warning of what a community without a Sabbath, i.e., without religion, must ultimately and inevitably become. Irreligious men of course sneer at religion and deny its importance, but the Bible and experience are against them.

Objections.

The general objections against the doctrine that the law of the sabbath is of universal and perpetual obligation, have already been incidentally considered. Those derived from the New Testament are principally the following: --

1. An objection is drawn from the absence of any express command. No such command was needed. The New Testament has no decalogue. That code having been once announced, and never repealed, remains in force. Its injunctions are not so much categorically repeated, as assumed as still obligatory. We find no such words as, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," or "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." Paul says, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." (Rom. vii. 7.) The law which said "Thou shalt not covet," is in the decalogue. Paul does not reënact the command, he simply takes for granted that the decalogue is now as ever the law of God.

2. It is urged not only that there is no positive command on the subject, but also that there is a total silence in the New Testament respecting any obligation to keep holy one day in seven. Our Lord in his Sermon on the Mount, it is said, while correcting the false interpretations of the Mosaic law given by the Pharisees, and expounding its precepts in their true sense, says nothing of the fourth commandment. The same is true of the council in Jerusalem. That council says nothing about the necessity of the heathen converts observing a Sabbath. But all this may be said of other precepts the obligation of which no man questions. Neither our Lord nor the council say anything about the worshipping of graven images. Besides, our Lord elsewhere does do, with regard to the fourth commandment, precisely what He did in the Sermon on the Mount with regard to other precepts of the decalogue. He reproved the Pharisees for their false interpretation of

that commandment, without the slightest intimation that the law itself was not to remain in force.

3. Appeal is made to such passages as Colossians ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days;" and Romans xiv. 5, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Every one knows, however, that the apostolic churches were greatly troubled by Judaizers, who insisted that the Mosaic law continued in force, and that Christians were bound to conform to its prescriptions with regard to the distinction between clean and unclean meats, and its numerous feast days, on which all labour was to be intermitted. These were the false teachers and this was the false doctrine against which so much of St. Paul's epistles was directed. It is in obvious reference to these men and their doctrines that such passages as those cited above were written. They have no reference to the weekly Sabbath, which had been observed from the creation, and which the Apostles themselves introduced and perpetuated in the Christian Church.

4. It is also frequently said that a weekly Sabbath is out of keeping with the spirit of the Gospel, which requires the consecration of the whole life and of all our time to God. With the Christian, it is said, every day is holy, and one day is not more holy than another. It is not true, however, that the New Testament requires greater consecration to God than the Old. The Gospel has many advantages over the Mosaic dispensation, but that is not one of them. It was of old, even from the beginning, required of all men that they should love God with all the heart, with all the mind, and with all the strength; and their neighbour as themselves. More than this the Gospel demands of no man If it consists with the spirituality of the Church that believers should

not neglect the assembling themselves together; and that they should have a stated ministry, sacramental rites, and the power of excommunication, and all this by Divine appointment; then it is hard to see why the consecration of one day in seven to the service of God, should be inconsistent with its spiritual character. So long as we are in the body, religion cannot be exclusively a matter of the heart. It must have its institutions and ordinances; and any attempt to dispense with these would be as unreasonable and as futile as for the soul, in this our present state of existence, to attempt to do without the body.

5. Another ground is often taken on this subject. The importance of the Sabbath is not denied. The obligation to keep it holy is admitted. It is declared to be sinful to engage in worldly avocations or amusements on that day; but it is denied that this obligation to consecrate the day to God rests upon any divine command. It is denied that the original sanctification of the seventh day at the creation binds all men to keep one day in seven holy to the Lord. It is maintained that the fourth commandment, both as to its essence and as to its accidents is abrogated; and, therefore, that there is no express command of God now in force requiring us to keep holy the Sabbath. The obligation is either self-imposed, or it is imposed by the Church. The Church requires its members to observe the Lord's Day, as it requires them to observe Christmas or Good Friday; and Christians, it is said, are bound to obey the Church, as citizens are bound to obey the state. But Protestants deny that the Church power to make laws to bind the conscience. That is the prerogative of God. If the Church may do it in one case it may another; and we should be made the servants of men. It is by this simple principle, that men are bound to obey the Church, that Rome has effectually despoiled all who acknowledge her authority of the liberty wherewith Christ has made his people free.

Most of the modern evangelical theologians in Germany say that the obligation to observe the Sabbath is self-imposed. That is, that every man, and especially every Christian, is bound to do all he can to promote the interests of religion and the good of society. The consecration of the Lord's Day to the worship of God is eminently conducive to these ends; therefore men are bound to keep it holy. But an obligation self-imposed is limited to self. One man thinks it best to devote Sunday to religion; another that it should be kept as a day of relaxation and amusement. One man's liberty cannot be judged by another man's conscience. Expediency can never be the ground of a universal and permanent obligation. The history of the Church proves that no such views of duty are adequate to coerce the conscience and govern the lives of men. The Sabbath is not in fact consecrated to religion, where its divine authority is denied. The churches may be more or less frequented, but the day is principally devoted to amusement. A German theologian [315] says that the doctrine that the religious observance of the Sabbath rests on an express divine command, "prevails throughout the whole English-speaking part of Christendom," and that in the Evangelical Church in Germany, some either from a too legal view of Christianity, or from servile subjection to the letter of the Bible, or impressed by the solemn stillness of an English Sunday as contrasted with its profanation elsewhere, have ever been inclined to the same views. Although this writer, the representative of a large class, asserts his Christian liberty to observe one day above another, or all days alike, he admits that the religious observance of the Lord's Day is not a matter of indifference; on the contrary, he says that "its profanation (Verleztung) is a sin." To make a thing sinful, however, he says it is not necessary that it should be against an express divine command. A Christian's conscience, "guided by the word,

and enlightened by the Spirit of God," is his rule of conduct. Conscience thus guided and enlightened, may enjoin or forbid much for which no explicit directions can he found in the Scriptures. No man denies all this; but a man's conscience is a guide for himself, and not for other people. If we hold fast the fundamental principle of our Protestant faith and freedom, "that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice," we must be able to plead express divine authority for the religious observance of the Lord's Day, or allow every man so to keep it or not as he sees fit. To his own master he stands or falls; to Him alone is he accountable for the use which he makes of his Christian liberty. But as no man is at liberty to steal or not to steal as he sees fit, so all "English speaking" Christians with one voice say, he is not at liberty to sanctify or profane the Sabbath, as he sees fit. He is bound by the primal and immutable law given at the creation, to keep one day in seven holy to the Lord.

If it be true that it is peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon race to hold this view of the obligation of the Christian Sabbath, then they have special reason for profound gratitude to God. God of old said to the Israelites, "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." That is, it shall be for a sign that you are my people. So long as you keep the Sabbath holy I will bless you; when you neglect and profane it, your blessings shall depart from you. (Jer. xvii. 20-27.) If it be then the distinction of Anglo-Saxon Christians, that they are a sabbath-keeping people, it is one to be highly prized and sedulously guarded; and in this country especially, we should be watchful lest the influx of immigrants of other nationalities deprive us of this great distinction and its blessings.

It is a popular objection against the religious observance of the Lord's Day, that the labouring classes need it as a day of recreation. On this it is obvious to remark, (1.) That there are many grievous evils in our modern civilization, but these are not to be healed by trampling on the laws of God. If men crowd labourers into narrow premises, and overwork them in heated factories six days in the week, they cannot atone for that sin by making the Lord's Day a day for amusement. (2.) So far from Sunday, as generally spent by the labouring class, being a day of refreshment, it is just the reverse. Monday is commonly with them the worst day in the week for labour; it is needed as a day for recovery from the effects of a misspent Sunday (3.) If the labouring classes are provided with healthful places of abode and are not overworked, then the best restorative is entire rest from ordinary occupations, and directing their thoughts and feelings into new channels, by the purifying and elevating offices of religion. This is the divinely appointed method of preserving the bodies and souls of men in a healthful state, a method which no human device is likely to improve.

How is the Sabbath to be Sanctified?

It may be said in general terms to be the opinion of the whole Jewish and Christian Church, that the sanctification required by God, consists not merely in cessation from worldly avocations, but also in the consecration of the day to the offices of religion. That this is the correct view is proved, (1.) Not only by the general consent of the people of God under both dispensations, but also by the constant use of the words to "hallow," to "make" or, "keep holy," and to "sanctify." The uniform use of such expressions, shows that the day was set apart from a common to a sacred use. (2.) From the command to increase the number of sacrifices in the temple service, which proves that the day

was to be religiously observed. (3.) From the design of the institution, which from the beginning was religious; the commemoration of the work of creation, and after the advent, of the resurrection of Christ. (4.) In Leviticus xxiii., a list is given of those lays on which there was to be "a holy convocation" of the people; i.e., on which the people were to be called together for public worship, and the Sabbath is the first given. (5.) The command is constantly repeated that the people should be faithfully instructed out of the law, which was to be read to them on all suitable occasions. To give opportunity for such instruction was evidently one of the principal objects of these "holy convocations." (Deut. vi. 6, 7, 17-19; Josh. i. 8.) This instruction of the people was made the special duty of the Levites (Deut. xxxiii. 10); and of the priests. (Lev. x. 11, comp. Mal. ii. 7.) The reading of the law was doubtless a regular part of the service on all the days on which the people were solemnly called together for religious worship. Thus in Deuteronomy xxxi. 11, 12, we read, "When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law." Such was the design of the convocation of the people. We know from the New Testament that the Scriptures were read every Sabbath in the synagogues; and the synagogues were among the earliest institutions of the chosen people. 2 Kings iv. 23, at least proves that at that period it was customary for the people to resort on the Sabbath to holy men for instruction. In Psalm lxxiv. 8, it is said of the heathen, "They have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land." The word here rendered "synagogues," means "assemblies," but

burning up "assemblies" can only mean places of assembly; as burning up churches, in our mode of expression, can only mean the edifices where churches or congregations are accustomed to assemble. What other places of assembling the Psalmist could refer to, if synagogues did not then exist, it is hard to understand. But admitting that synagogues were not common among the Jews until after the exile, which is a very improbable supposition, the fact that reading the Scriptures on the Sabbath was an established part of the synagogue service, goes far to prove that it was a sabbatical service long before the exile. (6.) The place of the fourth command in the decalogue; the stress laid upon it in the Old Testament; the way in which it is spoken of in the prophets; and the Psalms appointed to be used on that day, as for example the ninety-second, all show that the day was set apart for religious duties from the beginning. (7.) This may also be argued from the whole character of the old dispensation. All its institutions were religious; they were all intended to keep alive the knowledge of the true God, and to prepare the way for the coming of Christ. It would be entirely out of keeping with the spirit of the Mosaic economy to assume that its most important and solemn holy day was purely secular in its design.

[316]

It is admitted that the precepts of the decalogue bind the Church in all ages; while the specific details contained in the books of Moses, designed to point out the way in which the duty they enjoined was then to be performed, are no longer in force. The fifth commandment still binds children to obey their parents, but the Jewish law giving fathers the power of life and death over their children, is no longer in force. The seventh commandment forbids adultery, but the ordeal enjoined for the trial of a woman suspected of that crime, is a thing of the past. The same principle applies to the interpretation of the fourth

commandment. The command itself is still in force; the Mosaic laws respecting the mode of its observance have passed away with the economy to which they belonged. It is unjust therefore to represent the advocates of the continued obligation of the fourth commandment, as Judaizers. They are no more Judaizers than those who hold that the other precepts of the decalogue are still in force.

There are two rules by which we are to be guided in determining how the Sabbath is to be observed, or in deciding what is, and what is not lawful on that holy day. The first is, the design of the commandment. What is consistent with that design is lawful; what is inconsistent with it, is unlawful. The second rule is to be found in the precepts and example of our Lord and of his Apostles. The design of the command is to be learned from the words in which it is conveyed and from other parts of the word of God. From these sources it is plain that the design of the institution, as already remarked, was in the main twofold. First, to secure rest from all worldly cares and avocations; to arrest for a time the current of the worldly life of men, not only lest their minds and bodies should be overworked, but also that opportunity should be afforded for other and higher interests to occupy their thoughts. And secondly, that God should be properly worshipped, his word duly studied and taught, and the soul brought under the influence of the things unseen and eternal. Any man who makes the design of the Sabbath as thus revealed in Scripture his rule of conduct on that day, can hardly fail in its due observance. The day is to be kept holy unto the Lord. In Scriptural usage to hallow or make holy is to set apart to the service of God. Thus the tabernacle, the temple, and all its utensils were made holy. In this sense the Sabbath is holy. It is to be devoted to the duties of religion, and what is inconsistent with such devotion, is contrary to the design of the institution.

It is however to be remembered that the specific object of the Christian Sabbath is the commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. All the exercises of the day, therefore, should have a special reference to Him and to his redeeming work. It is the day in which He is to be worshipped, thanked, and praised; in which men are to be called upon to accept his offers of grace, and to rejoice in the hope of his salvation. It is therefore a day of joy. It is utterly incongruous to make it a day of gloom or fasting. In the early Church men were forbidden to pray on their knees on that day. They were to stand erect, exulting in the accomplishment of the work of God's redeeming love.

The second rule for our guidance is to be found in the precepts and example of our Lord. In the first place, He lays down the principle, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." It is to be remarked that Christ says, "the Sabbath was made for man," not for the Jews, not for the people of any one age or nation, but for man; for man as man, and therefore for all men. Moral duties, however, often conflict, and then the lower must yield to the higher. The life, the health, and the well-being of a man are higher ends in a given case, than the punctilious observance of any external service. This is the rule laid down by the prophet (Hosea vi. 6): "I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offering." This passage our Lord quotes twice in application to the law of the Sabbath, and thus establishes the general principle for our guidance, that it is right to do on the Sabbath whatever mercy or a due regard to the comfort or welfare of ourselves or others requires to be done. Christ, therefore, says expressly, "It is lawful to do well (kalos poiein, that is, as the context shows to confer benefits) on the Sabbath days." (Matt. xii. 12. See also Mark iii. 4.)

Again, we are told by the same authority, that "the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless." (Matt. xii. 5.) The services of the temple were complicated and laborious, and yet were lawful on the Sabbath. On another occasion He said to his accusers, " If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day? Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." (John vii. 23, 24.) From this we learn that whatever is necessary for the due celebration of religious worship, or for attendance thereon, is lawful on the Sabbath. Again in Luke xiv. 1-14, we read, "And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees, to eat bread on the Sabbath day, that they watched him. And, behold, there was a certain man before him, which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering, spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? And they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go. . . . . And he put forth a parable to those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them," etc., etc. This was evidently a large entertainment to which guests were "bidden." Christ, therefore, thought right, in the prosecution of his work, to attend on such entertainments on the Sabbath.

The frequency with which our Lord was accused of Sabbath-breaking by the Pharisees, proves that his mode of observing that lay was very different from theirs, and the way in which He vindicated himself proves that He regarded the Sabbath as a divine institution of perpetual obligation. It had been easy for Him to say that the law of the Sabbath was no longer in force; that He, as Lord of the Sabbath, erased it from the decalogue. It may indeed be said that as the whole of the Mosaic law was in force until the resurrection of Christ, or

until the day of Pentecost, the observance of the Sabbath was as a matter of course then obligatory, and therefore that Christ so regarded it. In answer to this, however, it is obvious to remark, that Christ did not hesitate to abrogate those of the laws of Moses which were in conflict with the spirit of the Gospel. This He did with the laws relating to polygamy and divorce. Under the old dispensation it was lawful for a man to have more than one wife; and also to put away a wife by giving her a bill of divorcement. Both of these things Christ declared should not be allowed under the Gospel. The fact that He dealt with the Sabbath just as He did with the fifth, sixth, and seventh precepts of the decalogue, which the Pharisees had misinterpreted, shows that He regarded the fourth commandment as belonging to the same category as the others. His example affords us a safe guide as to the way in which the day is to be observed.

The Sunday Laws.

It is very common, especially for foreign-born citizens, to object to all laws made by the civil governments in this country to prevent the public violation of the Lord's Day. It is urged that as there is in the United States an entire separation of the Church and State, it is contrary to the genius of our institutions, that the observance of any religious institution should be enforced by civil laws. It is further objected that as all citizens have equal rights irrespective of their religious opinions, it is an infringement of those rights if one class of the people are required to conform their conduct to the religious opinions of another class. Why should Jews, Mohammedans, or infidels be required to respect the Christian Sabbath? Why should any man, who has no faith in the Sabbath as a divine institution, be prevented from doing on that day whatever is lawful on other days? If the State may require the people to respect Sunday as a day of rest, why may it not

require the people to obey any or all other precepts of the Bible?

State of the Question.

It is conceded, (1.) That in every free country every man has equal rights with his fellow-citizens, and stands on the same ground in the eye of the law. (2.) That in the United States no form of religion can be established; that no religious test for the exercise of the elective franchise or for holding of office can be imposed; and that no preference can be given to the members of one religious denomination above those of another. (3.) That no man can be forced to contribute to the support of any church, or of any religious institution. (4.) That every man is at liberty to regulate his conduct and life according to his convictions or conscience, provided he does not violate the law of the land.

On the other hand it is no less true, --

1. That a nation is not a mere conglomeration of individuals. It is an organized body. It has of necessity its national life, its national organs, national principles of action, national character, and national responsibility.

2. In every free country the government must, in its organization and mode of action, be an expression of the mind and will of the people.

3. As men are rational creatures, the government cannot banish all sense and reason from their action, because there may be idiots among the people.

4. As men are moral beings, it is impossible that the government should act as though there were no distinction between right and wrong. It cannot legalize theft and murder. No matter how much it might enrich itself by rapine or by the extermination of other nations, it would deserve and receive universal condemnation and execration, should it thus set at nought the bonds of moral obligation. This necessity of

obedience to the moral law on the part of civil governments, does not arise from the fact that they are instituted for the protection of the lives, rights, and property of the people. Why have our own and other Christian nations pronounced the slave-trade piracy and punishable with death? Not because it interferes with the rights or liberty of their citizens but because it is wicked. Cruelty to animals is visited with civil penalties, not on the principle of profit and loss, but because it is a violation of the moral law. As it is impossible for the individual man to disregard all moral obligations, it is no less impossible on the part of civil governments.

5. Men moreover are religious beings. They can no more ignore that element of their nature than their reason or their conscience. It is no matter what they may say, or may pretend to think, the law which binds them to allegiance to God, is just as inexorable as the law of gravitation. They can no more emancipate themselves from the one than they can from the other. Morality concerns their duty to their fellow-men; religion concerns their duty to God. The latter binds the conscience as much as the former. It attends the man everywhere. It must influence his conduct as an individual, as the head of a family, as a man of business, as a legislator, and as an executive officer. It is absurd to say that civil governments have nothing to do with religion. That is not true even of a fire company, or of a manufactory, or of a banking-house. The religion embraced by the individuals composing these associations must influence their corporate action, as well as their individual conduct. If a man may not blaspheme, a publishing firm may not print and disseminate a blasphemous book. A civil government cannot ignore religion any more than physiology. It was not constituted to teach either the one or the other, but it must, by a like necessity, conform its action to the laws of both. Indeed it

would be far safer for a government to pass an act violating the laws of health, than one violating the religious convictions of its citizens. The one would be unwise, the other would be tyrannical. Men put up with folly, with more patience than they do with injustice. It is vain for the potsherds of the earth to contend with their Maker. They must submit to the laws of their nature not only as sentient, but also as moral and religious beings. And it is time that blatant atheists, whether communists, scientists, or philosophers, should know that they are as much and as justly the objects of pity and contempt, as of indignation to all right-minded men. By right-minded men, is meant men who think, feel, and act according to the laws of their nature. Those laws are ordained, administered, and enforced by God, and there is no escape from their obligation, or from the penalties attached to their violation.

6. The people of this country being rational, moral, and religious beings, the government must be administered on the principles of reason, morality, and religion. By a like necessity of right, the people being Christians and Protestants, the government must be administered according to the principles of Protestant Christianity. By this is not meant that the government should teach Christianity, or make the profession of it a condition of citizenship, or a test for office. Nor does it mean that the government is called upon to punish every violation of Christian principle or precept. It is not called upon to punish every violation of the moral law. But as it cannot violate the moral law in its own action, or require the people to violate it, so neither can it ignore Christianity in its official action. It cannot require the people or any of its own officers to do what Christianity forbids, nor forbid their doing anything which Christianity enjoins. It has no more right to forbid that the Bible

should be taught in the public schools, than it has to enjoin that the Koran should be taught in them. If Christianity requires that one day in seven should be a day of rest from all worldly avocations, the government of a Christian people cannot require any class of the community or its own officers to labour on that day, except in cases of necessity or mercy. Should it, on the ground that it had nothing to do with religion, disregard that day, and direct that the custom-houses, the courts of law, and the legislative halls should be open on the Lord's Day, and public business be transacted as on other days, it would be an act of tyranny, which would justify rebellion. It would be tantamount to enacting that no Christian should hold any office under the government, or have any share in making or administering the laws of the country. The nation would be in complete subjection to a handful of imported atheists and infidels.

Proof that this is a Christian and Protestant Nation.

The proposition that the United States of America are a Christian and Protestant nation, is not so much the assertion of a principle as the statement of a fact. That fact is not simply that the great majority of the people are Christians and Protestants, but that the organic life, the institutions, laws, and official action of the government, whether that action be legislative, judicial, or executive, is, and of right should be, and in fact must be, in accordance with the principles of Protestant Christianity.

1. This is a Christian and Protestant nation in the sense stated in virtue of a universal and necessary law. If you plant an acorn, you get an oak. If you plant a cedar, you get a cedar. If a country be settled by Pagans or Mohammedans, it develops into a Pagan or Mohammedan community. By the same law, if a country be taken possession of and settled by Protestant Christians, the nation which they come to

constitute must be Protestant and Christian. This country was settled by Protestants. For the first hundred years of our history they constituted almost the only element of our population. As a matter of course they were governed by their religion as individuals, in their families, and in all their associations for business, and for municipal, state, and national government. This was just as much a matter of necessity as that they should act morally in all these different relations.

2. It is a historical fact that Protestant Christianity is the law of the land, and has been from the beginning. As the great majority of the early settlers of the country were from Great Britain, they declared that the common law of England should be the law here. But Christianity is the basis of the common law of England, and is therefore of the law of this country; and so our courts have repeatedly decided. It is so not merely because of such decisions. Courts cannot reverse facts. Protestant Christianity has been, is, and must be the law of the land, Whatever Protestant Christianity forbids, the law of the land (within its sphere, i.e., within the sphere in which civil authority may appropriately act) forbids. Christianity forbids polygamy and arbitrary divorce, Se does the civil law. Romanism forbids divorce even on the ground of adultery; Protestantism admits it on that ground. The laws of all the states conform in this matter to the Protestant rule.

Christianity forbids all unnecessary labour, or the transaction of worldly business, on the Lord's Day; that day accordingly is a dies non, throughout the land. No contract is binding, made on that day. No debt can be collected on the Christian Sabbath. If a man hires himself for any service by the month or year, he cannot be required to labour on that day. All public offices are closed, and all official business is suspended. From Maine to Georgia, from ocean to ocean, one day in

the week, by the law of God and by the law of the land, the people rest.

This controlling Influence of Christianity, is Reasonable and Right.

lt is in accordance with analogy. If a man goes to China, he expects to find the government administered according to the religion of the country. If he goes to Turkey, he expects to find the Koran supreme and regulating all public action. If he goes to a Protestant country, he has no right to complain, should he find the Bible in the ascendancy and exerting its benign influence not only on the people, but also on the government.

The principle that the religion of a people rightfully controls the action of the government, has of course its limitation. If the religion itself be evil and require what is morally wrong, then as men cannot have the right to act wickedly, it is plain that it would be wrong for the government to conform to its requirements. If a religion should enjoin infanticide, or the murder of the aged or infirm, neither the people nor the government should conform their conduct to its laws. But where the religion of a people requires nothing unjust or cruel or in any way immoral, then those who come to live where it prevails are bound to submit quietly to its controlling the laws and institutions of the country.

The principle contended for is recognized in all other departments of life. If a number of Christian men associate themselves as a manufacturing or banking company, it would be competent for them to admit unbelievers in Christianity into their association, and to allow them their full share in its management and control. But it would be utterly unreasonable for such unbelievers to set up a cry of religious persecution, or of infringement of their rights and liberty, because all the business of the company was suspended upon the Lord's Day.

These new members knew the character and principles of those with whom they sought to be associated. They knew that Christians would assert their right to act as Christians. To require them to renounce their religion would be simply preposterous.

When Protestant Christians came to this country they possessed and subdued the land. They worshipped God, and his Son Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world, and acknowledged the Scriptures to be the rule of their faith and practice. They introduced their religion into their families, their schools, and their colleges. They abstained from all ordinary business on the Lord's Day, and devoted it to religion. They built churches, erected school-houses, and taught their children to read the Bible and to receive and obey it as the word of God. They formed themselves as Christians into municipal and state organizations. They acknowledged God in their legislative assemblies. They prescribed oaths to be taken in his name. They closed their courts, their places of business, their legislatures, and all places under the public control, on the Lord's Day. They declared Christianity to be part of the common law of the land. In the process of time thousands have come among us, who are neither Protestants nor Christians. Some are papists, some Jews, some infidels, and some atheists. All are welcomed; all are admitted to equal rights and privileges. All are allowed to acquire property, and to vote in every election, made eligible to all offices, and invested with equal influence in all public affairs. All are allowed to worship as they please, or not to worship at all, if they see fit. No man is molested for his religion or for his want of religion. No man is required to profess any form of faiths or to join any religious association. More than this cannot reasonably be demanded. More, however, is demanded. The infidel demands that the government should be conducted on the principle that Christianity is

false. The atheist demands that it should be conducted on the assumption that there is no God, and the positivist on the principle that men are not free agents. The sufficient answer to all this is, that it cannot possibly be done.

The Demands of Infidels are Unjust.

The demands of those who require that religion, and especially Christianity, should be ignored in our national, state, and municipal laws, are not only unreasonable, but they are in the highest degree unjust and tyrannical. It is a condition of service in connection with any railroad which is operated on Sundays, that the employee be not a Christian. If Christianity is not to control the action of our municipal, state, and general governments, then if elections be ordered to be held on the Lord's Day, Christians cannot vote. If all the business of the country is to go on, on that as on other days, no Christian can hold office. We should thus have not a religious, but an anti-religious test-act. Such is the free-thinker's idea of liberty.

[317] But still further, if Christianity is not to control the laws of the country, then as monogamy is a purely Christian institution, we can have no laws against polygamy, arbitrary divorce, or "free love." All this must be yielded to the anti-Christian party; and consistency will demand that we yield to the atheists, the oath and the decalogue; and all the rights of citizenship must be confined to blasphemers. Since the fall of Lucifer, no such tyrant has been made known to men as August Comte, the atheist. If, therefore, any man wishes to antedate perdition, he has nothing to do but to become a free-thinker and join in the shout, "Civil government has nothing to do with religion; and religion has nothing to do with civil government."

Conclusion.

We are bound, therefore, to insist upon the maintenance and faithfu1

execution of the laws enacted for the protection of the Christian Sabbath. Christianity does not teach that men can be made religious by law; nor does it demand that men should be required by the civil authority to profess any particular form of religious doctrine, or to attend upon religious services; but it does enjoin that men should abstain from all unnecessary worldly avocations on the Lord's Day. This civil Sabbath, this cessation from worldly business, is what the civil government in Christian countries is called upon to enforce. (1.) Because it is the right of Christians to be allowed to rest on that day, which they cannot do, without forfeiting their citizenship, unless all public business be arrested on that day. (2.) Because such rest is the command of God; and this command binds the conscience as much as any other command in the decalogue. So far as the point in hand is concerned, it matters not whether such be the command of God or not; so long as the people believe it, it binds their conscience; and this conscientious belief the government is bound to respect, and must act accordingly. (3.) Because the civil Sabbath is necessary for the preservation of our free institutions, and of the good order of society. The indispensable condition of social order is either despotic power in the magistrate, or good morals among the people. Morality without religion is impossible; religion cannot exist without knowledge; knowledge cannot be disseminated among the people, unless there be a class of teachers, and time allotted for their instruction. Christ has made all his ministers, teachers; He has commanded them to teach all nations; He has appointed one day in seven to be set apart for such instruction. It is a historical fact that since the introduction of Christianity, nine tenths of the people have derived the greater part of their religious knowledge from the services of the sanctuary. If the Sabbath, therefore, be abolished, the fountain of

life for the people will be sealed. [318]

Hengstenberg, after referring to the authority of the Church and other grounds, for the observance of the Lord's Day, closes his discussion of the subject with these words: "Thank God these are only the outworks; the real fortress is the command that sounded out from Sinai, with the other divine commands therewith connected, as preparatory, confirmatory, or explanatory. The institution was far too important, and the temptations too powerful, that the solid ground of Scriptural command could be dispensed with. . . . It is as plain as day that the obligation of the Old Testament command instead of being lessened is increased. This follows of course from the fact that the redemption through Christ is infinitely more glorious than the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt, which in the preface to the Ten Commandments is referred to as a special motive to obedience. No ingratitude is blacker than refusing to obey Him who for our sakes gave up his only begotten Son." [319] He had said before that the Sabbath "rests on the unalterable necessities of our nature, inasmuch as men inevitably become godless if the cares and labours of their earthly life be not regularly interrupted" [320]

---

[307] Palmer, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie, art. "Sonntagsfeier."

[308] The force of this argument does not depend on the supposition that the days of creation were periods of twenty-four hours. Admitting that they were geologic periods, at the end of the sixth of which man appeared, and that then followed a period of permanent rest, that would be reason enough why every seventh day should be selected as a memorial of the creation, to teach Adam and his descendants that the earth did not owe its existence to a blind process of development, but to the fiat of Jehovah.

[309] De Veritate Religionis Christianæ, v. 10; Works, London, 1679, vol. iii. p. 79.

[310] Die Genesis Ausgelegt, von Franz Delitzsch, Leipzig, 1852, pp. 84, 85.

[311] Theologische Commentar zum Pentateuch, Kiel, 1843, vol. i. p. 29.

[312] Die Genesis Erklärt, von August Knobel, Leipzig, 1852.

[313] Of this general prevalence in the ancient world, of a special reverance for the seventh day and of the division of time into weeks, Grotius gives abundant evidence in his work De Veritate Religionis Christianæ, v. 16; Works, vol. iii. p. 16. On this subject, see Winer's Realwörterbuch, word "Sabbath." Winer refers, among other authoritities discussing this question of the antiquity of the Sabbath, to Selden, Jus Nat. et Gent.; Spencer, Legg. ritual.; Eichhorn, Urgesch.; Hebenstreit, De Sabb. ante legg. Mos. existente; Michaelis, Mos. Recht.

[314] Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, v. 7, edit. Boston, 1848, vol. ii. p. 43.

[315] Palmer in Herzog's Real Encyklopädie.

[316] The doctrine that the Jewish sabbath was simply a day of relaxation from labour, was advanced among Protestants towards the close of the seventeenth century, by Selden, in his work De Legibus Hebræorum. This opinion was adopted by Vitringa in the first book of his Observationes Sacræ. It is also advocated by Bähr in his Symb. des Mos. Cultus. The contrary doctrine was adopted by all the Reformers, and by the great body of Christian theologians; and is ably sustained by Hengstenberg in his treatise Ueber den Tag des Herrn, pp. 29-41. This subject is discussed in the January number of the Princeton Review, for 1831, pp. 86-134.

[317] A free-thinker is a man whose understanding is emancipated from his conscience. It is therefore natural for him to wish to see civil

government emancipated from religion.

[318] The Sabbath and Free Institutions. A paper read before the National Sabbath Convention, Saratoga, August 13, 1863, by Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., President of Williams College, Mass. See also an able article from the pen of Rev. Joshua H. McIlvaine, D. D. entitled, "A Nation's Right to Worship God," in the Princeton Review for October, 1859; also the article on "Sunday Laws," in the same number of that journal.

[319] Ueber den Tag des Herrn, Berlin, 1852, pp. 92-94.

[320] Ibid. p. 40.

---

§ 9. The Fifth Commandment.

Its Design.

The general principle of duty enjoined in this commandment, is that we should feel and act in a becoming manner towards our superiors. It matters not in what their superiority consists, whether in age, office, power, knowledge, or excellence. There are certain feelings, and a certain line of conduct due to those who are over us, for that very reason, determined and modified in each case by the degree and nature of that superiority. To superiors are due, to each according to the relation in which he stands to us, reverence, obedience, and gratitude.

The ground of this obligation is to be found, (1.) In the will of God, who has enjoined this duty upon all rational creatures. (2.) In the nature of the relation itself. Superiority supposes, in some form or degree, on the part of the inferior, dependence and indebtedness, and therefore calls for reverence, gratitude, and obedience; and, (3.) In expediency, as the moral order of the divine government and of human society depend upon this due submission to authority.

In the case of God, as his superiority is infinite the submission of

his creatures must be absolute. To Him we owe adoration or the profoundest reverence, the most fervent gratitude, and implicit obedience. The fifth commandment, however, concerns our duty to our fellow-creatures. First in order and in importance is the duty of children to their parents, hence the general duty is embodied in the specific command, "Honour thy father and thy mother."

The Filial Relation.

When a child is born into the world it is entirely helpless and dependent. As it derives its existence from its parents, so it would immediately perish without their assiduous and constant care. The parents are not only its superiors in knowledge, in power, and in every other attribute of humanity; but they are also the proximate source of all good to the child. They protect, cherish, feed, clothe, educate, and endow it. All the good be-stowed, is bestowed disinterestedly. Self is constantly sacrificed. The love of parents to their children is mysterious and immutable, as well as self-sacrificing. It is a form of love which none but a parent can know. A mother's love is a mystery and a wonder. It is the most perfect analogue of the love of God.

As the relation in which parents stand to their children has this close analogy to the relation in which God stands to his rational creatures, and especially to his own people, so the duties resulting from that relation are analogous. They are expressed by the same word. Filial piety is as correct an expression as it is common. Parents stand to their dependent children, so to speak, in the place of God. They are the natural objects of the child's love, reverence, gratitude, confidence, and devotion. These are the sentiments which naturally flow out of the relation; and which in all ordinary cases do flow from it; so that Calvin is justified in saying that children destitute of these feelings, "monstra sunt non homines." This endearing and intimate

relation between parents and children (which cannot exist where monogamy is not the law), binding all in the closest union which can exist among men, makes the family the corner-stone of the well-being of society on earth, and the type of the blessedness of heaven. The Church is the family of God. He is the Father, its members are brethren.

While the relative duties of parents and children must be everywhere and always essentially the same, yet they are more or less modified by varying conditions of society. There are laws on this subject in the Bible, which being intended for the state of things existing before the coming of Christ, are no longer binding upon us. It was unavoidable in the patriarchal state of society, and especially in its nomadic state, that the father of a family should be at once father, magistrate, and priest. And it was natural and right that many of the parental prerogatives necessary in such a state of society, should be retained in the temporary and transition state organized under the Mosaic institutions. We find accordingly that the laws of Moses invested parents with powers which can no longer properly belong to them; and sustained parental authority by penal enactments which are no longer necessary. Thus it was ordered, "He that curseth (or revileth, Septuagint ho kakologon, Vulgate qui maledixerit') his father or his mother shall surely be put to death." (Exod. xxi. 17) In the fifteenth verse of the same chapter it is said, "He that smiteth his father or his mother, shall be surely put to death." (Compare Deut. xxvii. 16; Prov. xx. 20; Matt. xv. 4.) It may be remarked here, in passing, that our Lord's comment on this commandment given in Matthew xv. 4-6, shows that the honouring of their parents required of children, does not mean simply the cherishing right feelings towards them, but as well the ministering to their support when necessary. Christ said to the Pharisees, "God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother;

. . . . but ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift (consecrated to God), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free." That is, the Pharisees taught that a son might evade the obligation to honour, i.e., to support his father or mother, by saying that his property was consecrated to God.

The Mosaic law also enacted that "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city and unto the gates of his place: and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard. And all the men of the city shall stone him with stones, that he die." (Deut. xxi. 18-21.)

Fathers under the old economy had the right to choose wives for their sons and to give their daughters in marriage. (Gen. xxiv.; Ex. xxi. 9; Judges xiv. 2; Gen. xxix. 18; xxxiv. 12.) Children also were liable to be sold to satisfy the debts of their fathers. (Levit. xxv. 39-41; 2 Kings iv. 1; Is. l. 1; Matt. xviii. 25.) These judicial enactments have passed away. They serve to prove, however, how intimate in the sight of God is the relation between parents and children. A father's benediction was coveted as the greatest blessing; and his curse deprecated as a fearful evil. (Gen. xxvii. 4, 12, 34-38; xlix. 2 ff.)

In the New Testament the duty enjoined in the fifth commandment is frequently recognized and enforced. Our blessed Lord himself was subject to his parents. (Luke ii. 51.) The Apostle commands children to obey their parents in the Lord (Eph. vi. 1), and to obey them in all things, for this is well pleasing unto the Lord. (Col. iii. 20.) This

obedience is to be not only religious, but specifically Christian, as the word Lord, in Ephesians vi. 1, refers to Christ. This is plain because in ch. v. 21, the Apostle says that these specific duties are to be performed "in the fear of Christ;" [321] because the Lord is always in the New Testament to be understood of Christ, unless the context forbids; and because especially throughout these chapters Lord and Christ are interchanged, so that it is evident that both words refer to the same person. Children are required to obey their parents in the Lord, i.e., as a religious duty, as part of the obedience due to the Lord. They are to obey them "in all things;" i.e., in all things falling within the sphere of parental authority. God has never committed unlimited power to the hands of men. The limitations of parental authority are determined partly by the nature of the relation, partly by the Scriptures, and partly by the state of society or the law of the land. The nature of the relation supposes that parents are to be obeyed as parents, out of gratitude and love; and that their will is to be consulted and respected even where their decisions are not final. They are not to be obeyed as magistrates, as though they were invested with the power to make or to administer civil laws; nor yet as prophets or priests. They are not lords of the conscience. They cannot control our faith or determine for us questions of duty so as to exonerate us from personal obligation. Being a service of love, it does not admit of strictly defined boundaries. Children are to conform to the wishes and to be controlled by the judgments of their parents, in all cases where such submission does not conflict with higher obligations.

The Scriptural rule is simple and comprehensive. It does not go into unnecessary details. It prescribes the general rule of obedience. The exceptions to that rule must be such as justify themselves to a divinely enlightened conscience, i.e., a conscience enlightened by the

Word and Spirit of God. The general principle given in the Bible in all such cases is, "It is right to obey God rather than man."

The Promise.

This commandment has a special promise attached to it. This promise has a theocratical form as it stands in the decalogue, "That thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." The Apostle, in Ephesians vi. 3, by leaving out the last clause generalizes it, so that it applies to no one land or people, but to obedient children everywhere. The promise announces the general purpose of God and a general principle of his providential government. "The hand of the diligent maketh rich," that is the general rule, which is not invalidated if here and there a diligent man remains poor. It is well with obedient children; they prosper in the world. Such is the fact, and such is the divine promise. The family being the corner-stone of social order and prosperity, it follows that those families are blessed in which God's plan and purpose are most fully carried out and realized.

Parental Duties.

As children are bound to honour and obey their parents, so parents have duties no less important in reference to their children. These duties are summarily expressed by the Apostle in Ephesians vi. 4, first in a negative, and then in a positive form. "Ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath." This is what they are not to do. They are not to excite the bad passions of their children by anger, severity, injustice, partiality, or any undue exercise of authority. This is a great evil. It is sowing tares instead of wheat in a fruitful soil. The positive part of parental duty is expressed by the cemprehensive direction, "but bring them up in the nurture (paideia) and admonition (nouthesia) of the Lord." The former of these words is comprehensive,

the latter specific. The one expresses the whole process of education or training; the other the special duty of warning and correction. The "nurture and admonition" is to be Christian; that is, not only such as Christ approves and enjoins, but which is truly his, i.e., that which He exercises by his word and Spirit through the parent as his organ. "Christ is represented as exercising this nurture and admonition, in so far as He by his Spirit influences and controls the parent." [322] According to the Apostle, this religious or Christian element is essential in the education of the young. Man has a religious as well as an intellectual nature. To neglect the former would be as unreasonable as to neglect the latter and make all education a matter of mere physical training. We must act in accordance with facts. It is a fact that men have a moral and religious nature. It is a fact that if their moral and religious feelings are enlightened and properly developed, they become upright, useful, and happy; on the other hand, if these elements of their nature are uncultivated or perverted, they become degraded, miserable, and wicked. It is a fact that this department of our nature as much needs right culture as the intellectual or the physical. It is a fact that this culture can be effected only by the truth instilled into the mind and impressed upon the conscience. It is a fact that this truth, as all Christians believe, is contained in the Holy Scriptures. It is a fact, according to the Scriptures, that the eternal Son of God is the only Saviour of men, and that it is by faith in Him and by obedience to Him, men are delivered from the dominion of sin; and therefore it is a fact that unless children are brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, they, and the society which they constitute or control, will go to destruction. Consequently, when a state resolves that religious instruction shall be banished from the schools and other literary institutions, it virtually resolves on

self-destruction. It may indeed be said that such a resolution does not imply that religious education is to be neglected. It simply declares that it is not a function of the state, that it is a duty which belongs to the family and to the Church. This is plausible, but it is fallacious.

1. All the education received by a large portion of the people of any country, is received in its primary schools. If that be irreligious (in the negative sense, if in this case there be such a sense), their whole training is irreligious.

2. It is to be remembered that the Christian people of a country are the Church of that country. The Christians of Antioch were the Church of Antioch, and the Christians of Rome were the Church of Rome. In like manner the Christians in the United are the Church in the United States. As therefore the schools belong to the people, as they are their organs for the education of their children; if the people be Christians, the schools of right must be Christian. Any law which declares that they shall not be so, is tyrannical. It may be said that the law does not forbid Christians having religious schools, it only says that such schools shall not be supported by the public money. But the people are the public; and if the people be Christians, Christians are the public. The meaning of such a law, therefore, really is, that Christians shall not use their own money for the support of their own schools.

3. If Christian men therefore constitute a nation, a state, a county, a town, or a village, they have the right, with which no civil power can justly interfere, of having Christian schools. If any who are not Christians choose to frequent such schools, they should not be required to attend upon the religious instruction. They can derive all the benefit they seek, although they omit attendance on what is designed

for the children of Christian parents.

4. It is true that Church and State are not united in this country as they ever have been in Europe. It is conceded that this separation is wise. But it is not to be inferred from that concession that the state has nothing to do with religion; that it must act as though there were no Christ and no God. It has already been remarked that this is as impossible as it would be for the state to ignore the moral law. It may be admitted that Church and State are, in this country, as distinct as the Church and a banking company. But a banking company, if composed of Christians, must conduct its business according to Christian principles, so far as those principles apply to banking operations. So a nation, or a state, composed of Christians, must be governed by Christianity, so far as its spirit and precepts apply to matters of civil government. If therefore the state assumes that the education of the people is one of its functions, it is bound in a Christian country, -- a country in which ninety hundredths of the population consist of Christians, -- to conduct the schools on Christian principles, otherwise it tramples on the most sacred rights of the people. This the people never will submit to, until they lose all interest in their religion. No one doubts that the Bible does require that education should be religiously conducted. "These words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." (Deut. vi. 6, 7. and xi. 19.) "He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children; that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children; that they

might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments." (Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6, 7.) "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." (Prov. xxii. 6.) Fathers bring up your children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 4.) These are not ceremonial or obsolete laws. They bind the consciences of men just as much as the command, "Thou shalt not steal." If parents themselves conduct the education of their children, these are the principles upon which it must be conducted. If they commit that work to teachers, they are bound, by the law of God, to see that the teachers regard these divine prescriptions; if they commit the work to the state, they are under equally sacred obligation to see that the state does not violate them. This is an obligation which they cannot escape.

5. When the Sunday laws were under discussion, on a previous page, it was urged that it would be unreasonable and unjust for a man who joined a business association of moral men, to insist that the affairs of the association should be conducted on immoral principles; if he joined a company of Christian manufacturers, it would be unjust for him to require that they should violate the laws of Christianity. So if a Christian should go to Turkey, it would be preposterous for him to insist that the Koran should be banished from the public schools. No less preposterous is it for any man to demand that Christians in this country should renounce their religion. Christianity requires that education in all its departments should be conducted religiously. If any set of men should found a school or a university from which all religious instruction should be banished, the law of the land would doubtless permit them to do so. But for the law to forbid that the religion of the people should be taught in schools sustained by the money of the people, ought not to be submitted to.

6. The banishment of religious influence from our schools is impossible. If a man is not religious, he is irreligious; if he is not a believer, he is an unbeliever. This is as true of organizations and institutions, as it is of Individuals. Byron uttered a profound truth when he put into the mouth of Satan the words "He that does not bow to God, has bowed to me." If you banish light, you are in darkness. If you banish Christianity from the schools, you thereby render them infidel. If a child is brought up in ignorance of God, he becomes an atheist. If never taught the moral law, his moral nature is as undeveloped as that of a pagan. This controversy, therefore, is a controversy between Christianity and infidelity; between light and darkness; between Christ and Belial. [323]

It is admitted that this subject is encumbered with practical difficulties where the people of a country differ widely in their religious convictions. In such cases it would be far better to refer the matter to the people of each school district, than by a general law to prohibit all religious instruction from the public schools. This would, in fact, be to make them infidel, in deference to a numerically insignificant minority of the people. It is constantly said that the state, if it provides for anything more than secular education, is travelling out of its sphere; that civil government is no more organized to teach religion than a fire company is. This latter assertion may be admitted so far as this, that the same rule applies to both cases. That is, all individual men, and all associations of men, are bound to act according to the principles of morality and religion, so far as those principles are applicable to the work which they have to do. Men cannot lawfully cheat in banking, nor can they rightfully conduct their business on the Lord's Day. In like manner if God requires that education should be conducted religiously, the state has

no more right to banish religion from its schools, than it has to violate the moral law. The whole thing comes to this: Christians are bound by the express command of God as well as by a regard to the salvation of their children and to the best interests of society, to see to it that their children are brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" this they are bound to do; through the state if they can; without it, if they must.

Obedience due to Civil Magistrates.

It the fifth commandment enjoins as a general principle, respect and obedience to our superiors, it includes our obligations to civil rulers, we are commanded to "Submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God." (1 Peter ii. 13-15.) The whole theory of civil government and the duty of citizens to their rulers, are comprehensively stated by the Apostle in Romans xiii. 1-5. It is there taught, (1.) That all authority is of God. (2.) That civil magistrates are ordained of God. (3.) That resistance to them, is resistance to Him; they are ministers exercising his authority among men. (4.) That obedience to them must be rendered as a matter of conscience, as a part of our obedience to God. From this it appears, -- First, that civil government is a divine ordinance. It is not merely an optional human institution; something which men are free to have or not to have, as they see fit. It is not founded on any social compact; it is something which God commands. The Bible, however, does not teach that there is any one form of civil government which is always and everywhere obligatory. The form of government is determined by the providence of God and the will of the people. It changes as the state of society changes. Much less is it

implied in the proposition that government is a divine institution, that God designates the persons who are to exercise the various functions of the government; or the mode of their appointment; or the extent of their powers.

Secondly, it is included in the Apostle's doctrine, that magistrates derive their authority from God; they are his ministers; they represent Him. In a certain sense they represent the people, as they may be chosen by them to be the depositaries of this divinely delegated authority; but the powers that be are ordained by God; it is his will that they should be, and that they should be clothed with authority.

Thirdly, from this it follows that obedience to magistrates and to the laws of the land, is a religious duty. We are to submit to "every ordinance of man," for the Lord's sake, out of our regard to Him, as St. Peter expresses it; or for "conscience sake," as the same idea is expressed by St. Paul. We are bound to obey magistrates not merely because we have promised to do so; or because we have appointed them; or because they are wise or good; but because such is the will of God. In like manner the laws of the land are to be observed, not because we approve of them, but because God has enjoined such obedience. This is a matter of great importance; it is the only stable foundation of civil government and of social order. There is a great difference between obedience to men and obedience to God; between lying to men and lying to God; and between resistance to men and resistance to God. This principle runs through the Bible, which teaches that all authority is of God, and therefore all obedience to those in authority is part of our obedience to God. This applies not only to the case of citizens and rulers, but also to parents and children, husbands and wives, and even masters and slaves. In all these relations we are to act not as the servants of men, but as the servants of God. This gives to authority by

whomsoever exercised a divine sanction; it gives it power over the conscience; and it elevates even menial service into an element of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. No man can have a servile spirit who serves God in rendering obedience to men. None but a law-abiding people can be free or prosperous; and no people can be permanently law-abiding who do not truly believe that "the powers that be are ordained of God. "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power (those in authority), resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation (krima)." That is, God will punish them.

Fourthly, another principle included in the Apostle's doctrine is, that obedience is due to every de facto government, whatever its origin or character. His directions were written under the reign of Nero, and enjoined obedience to him. The early Christians were not called to examine the credentials of their actual rulers, every time the prætorian guard chose to depose one emperor and install another. The people of England were not free from their obligation to William and Mary when once established on the throne, because they might think that James II. was entitled to the crown. We are to obey "the powers that be." They are in authority by the will of God, which is revealed by facts, as clearly as by words. It is by Him that "kings reign and princes decree justice." "He raiseth up one, and putteth down another."

Fifthly, the Scriptures clearly teach that no human authority is intended to be unlimited. Such limitation may not be expressed, but it is always implied. The command "Thou shalt not kill," is unlimited in form, yet the Scriptures recognize that homicide may in some cases be not only justifiable but obligatory. The principles which limit the authority of civil government and of its agents are simple and obvious. The first is that governments and magistrates have authority only

within their legitimate spheres. As civil government is instituted for the protection of life and property, for the preservation of order, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of those who do well, it has to do only with the conduct, or external acts of men. It cannot concern itself with their opinions, whether scientific, philosophical, or religious. An act of Parliament or of Congress, that Englishmen or Americans should be materialists or idealists, would be an absurdity and a nullity. The magistrate cannot enter our families and assume parental authority, or our churches and teach as a minister. A justice of the peace cannot assume the prerogatives of a governor of a state or of a president of the United States. Out of his legitimate sphere a magistrate ceases to be a magistrate. A second limitation is no less plain. No human authority can make it obligatory on a man to disobey God. If all power is from God, it cannot be legitimate when used against God. This is self-evident. The Apostles when forbidden to preach the Gospel, refused to obey. When Daniel refused to bow down to the image which Nebuchadnezzar had made; when the early Christians refused to worship idols; and when the Protestant martyrs refused to profess the errors of the Romish Church, they all commended themselves to God, and secured the reverence of all good men. On this point there can be no dispute. It is important that this principle should be not only recognized, but also publicly avowed. The sanctity of law, and the stability of human governments, depend on the sanction of God. Unless they repose on Him, they rest on nothing. They have his sanction only when they act according to his will; that is in accordance with the design of their appointment and in harmony with the moral law.

Sixthly, another general principle is that the question, When the civil government may be, and ought to be disobeyed, is one which every man must decide for himself. It is a matter of private judgment. Every man

must answer for himself to God, and therefore, every man must judge for himself, whether a given act is sinful or not. Daniel judged for himself. So did Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego. So did the Apostles, and so did the martyrs.

An unconstitutional law or commandment is a nullity; no man sins in disregarding it. He disobeys, however, at his peril. If his judgment is right, he is free. If it be wrong, in the view of the proper tribunal, he must suffer the penalty. There is an obvious distinction to be made between disobedience and resistance. A man is bound to disobey a law, or a command, which requires him to sin, but it does not follow that he is at liberty to resist its execution. The Apostles refused to obey the Jewish authorities; but they submitted to the penalty inflicted. So the Christian martyrs disobeyed the laws requiring them to worship idols, but they made no resistance to the execution of the law. The Quakers disobey the law requiring military service, but quietly submit to the penalty. This is obviously right. The right of resistance is in the community. It is the right of revolution, which God sanctions, and which good men in past ages have exercised to the salvation of civil and religious liberty. When a government fails to answer the purpose for which God ordained it, the people have a right to change it. A father, if he shamefully abuses his power, may rightfully be deprived of authority over his children. [324]

Obedience to the Church.

The Apostle commands Christians "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls." "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God." (Heb. xiii. 17, 7.) Our Lord said to his disciples, that if an offending brother resisted other means to bring him to repentance, his offence must be told to the Church; and that if he neglected to hear

the Church, he was to be regarded as a heathen man and a publican. (Matt. xviii. 17.)

The principles which regulate our obedience to the Church, are very much the same as those which concern our relation to the State, --

1. The visible Church is a divine institution. In one sense indeed it is a voluntary society, in so far as that no man can be coerced to join it. If he joins it at all, it must be of his own free will.

Nevertheless it is the will of God that the visible Church as an organized body should exist; and every man who hears the Gospel, is bound to enroll himself among its members and to submit to its authority.

2. All Church power is of God, and all legitimate Church officers are his ministers. They act in his name and by his authority. Resistance to them, therefore, is resistance to the ordinance of God.

3. All the prerogatives of the Church and all the powers of its officers are laid down in the word of God.

4. The prerogatives of the Church are, first, to teach. Its great commission is to teach all nations. It is to teach what God has revealed in his word as to what men are to believe and what they are to do. Beyond the limits of the revelation contained in the Scriptures the Church has no more authority to teach than any other association among men. Secondly, the Church has the right and duty to order and conduct public worship, to administer the sacraments, to select and ordain its own officers, and to do whatever else is necessary for its own perpetuity and extension. Thirdly, it is the prerogative of the Church to exercise discipline over its own members, and to receive or to reject them as the case may be.

5. As to the external organization of the Church all Christians agree that there are certain rules laid down in the word of God which are of

universal and perpetual obligation. All Christian Churches, however, have acted on the assumption, that beyond these prescribed rules, the Church has a certain discretion to modify its organization and its organs to suit varying emergencies.

6. The visible Church being organized for a definite purpose, its power being derived from God, and its prerogatives being all laid down in the Scriptures, it follows not only that its powers are limited within the bounds thus prescribed, but also that the question, whether its decisions and injunctions are to be obeyed, is to be determined by every one concerned, on his own responsibility. If the decision is within the limits to which God has confined the action of the Church, and in accordance with the Scriptures, it is to be obeyed. If it transcends those limits, or is contrary to the word of God, it is to be disregarded. If therefore the Church through any of its organs should assume to decide questions of pure science, or of political economy, or of civil law, such decisions would amount to nothing. Or, if it should declare that to be true which the Scriptures pronounce to be false; or that to be false which the Scriptures declare to be true, such judgment would bind no man's conscience. And in like manner, should the Church declare any thing to be sinful which the word of God teaches to be right or indifferent; or that to be right and obligatory which that word pronounces to be evil, then again its teaching is void of all authority. All this is included in the principle that we must obey God rather than man; and that as to when obedience to man conflicts with our allegiance to God, every man from the nature of the case must judge for himself. No man can estimate the importance of these simple principles. It was by disregarding them that the Church came gradually to deny the right of private judgment; to subordinate the Scriptures to its decisions; and to put itself in the place of God. In this way it

has imposed unscriptural doctrines upon the faith of men; made multitudes of things to be obligatory which God never enjoined; and declared the greatest sins, such at treason, persecution, and massacre to be Christian duties.

While, therefore, the duty of obedience to our superiors, and submission to law, as enjoined in the fifth commandment, is the source of all order in the family, the Church, and the State; the limitation of this duty by our higher obligation to God, is the foundation of all civil and religious liberty.

---

[321] The common text indeed in Ephesians v. 21, has Theou, but the authority of the MSS. is so decidedly in favour of Christou that that reading is almost universally adopted by editors and commentators.

[322] Meyer, Commentary in loco.

[323] So little is this matter understood, that one of the most respectable and influential journals in this land, recently announced the fact one of the cantons of Switzerland had prohibited all religious instruction in the schools, as a proof that "the world was getting tired of sacerdotalism." Thus religion is reduced to sacerdotalism or priestcraft.

[324] All these subjects are fully expounded in the great works on Jurisprudence and Civil Polity. For a popular discussion of them, reference may be made to, Discussions of Church Principles, By William Cunningham, D. D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1863, particularly chapters vi. and vii. See also the Princeton Review for January, 1851, article, "Civil Government."

---

§ 10. The Sixth Commandment.

Its Design.

This commandment, as expounded by our Lord (Matt. v. 21, 22), forbids malice in all its degrees and in all its manifestations. The Bible recognizes the distinction between anger and malice. The former is on due occasion allowable; the other is in its nature, and therefore always, evil. The one is a natural or constitutional emotion arising out of the experience or perception of wrong, and includes not only disapprobation but also indignation, and a desire in some way to redress or punish the wrong inflicted. The other includes hatred and the desire to inflict evil to gratify that evil passion. Our Lord is said to have been angry; but in Him there was no malice or resentment. He was the Lamb of God; when He was reviled, He reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not; He prayed for his enemies even on the cross.

In the several commandments of the decalogue, the highest manifestation of any evil is selected for prohibition, with the intention of including all lesser forms of the same evil. In forbidding murder, all degrees and manifestations of malicious feeling are forbidden. The Bible assigns special value to the life of man, first, because he was created in the image of God. He is not only like God in the essential elements of his nature, but he s also God's representative on earth. An indignity or injury inflicted on him, is an act of irreverence toward God. And secondly, all men are brethren. They are of one blood; children of a common father. On these grounds we are bound to love and respect all men as men; and to do all we can not only to protect their lives but also to promote their well-being. Murder therefore, is the highest crime which a man can commit against a fellow-man.

Capital Punishment.

As the sixth commandment forbids malicious homicide, it is plain that the infliction of capital punishment is not included in the

prohibition. Such punishment is not inflicted to gratify revenge, but to satisfy justice and for the preservation of society. As these are legitimate and most important ends, it follows that the capital punishment of murder is also legitimate. Such punishment, in the case of murder, is not only lawful, but also obligatory.

1. Because it is expressly declared in the Bible, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." (Gen. ix. 6.) That this is of perpetual obligation is clear, because it was given to Noah, the second head of the human race. It was, therefore, not intended for any particular age or nation. It is the announcement of a general principle of justice; a revelation of the will of God. Moreover the reason assigned for the law is a permanent reason. Man was created in the image of God; and, therefore, whoso sheds his blood, by man shall his blood be shed. This reason has as much force at one time or place as at any other. Rosenmüller's comment on this clause is, "Cum homo ad Dei imaginem sit factus, æquum est, ut, qui Dei imaginem violavit et destruxit, occidatur, cum Dei imagini injuriam faciens, ipsum Deum, illius auctorem, petierit." [325] This is a very solemn consideration, and one of wide application. It applies not only to murder and other injuries infficted on the persons of men, but also to anything which tends to degrade or to defile them. The Apostle applies it even to evil words, or the suggestion of corrupt thoughts. If it is an outrage to defile the statue or portrait of a great and good man, or of a father or mother, how much greater is the outrage when we defile the imperishable image of God impressed on the immortal soul of man. We find the injunction, that the murderer should surely be put to death, repeated over and over in the Mosaic law. (Ex. xxi. 12, 14; Lev. xxiv. 17; Num. xxxv. 21; Deut. xix. 11, 13.)

There are clear recognitions in the New Testament of the continued

obligation of the divine law that murder should be punished with death. In Romans xiii. 4, the Apostle says that the magistrate "beareth not the sword in vain." The sword was worn as the symbol of the power of capital punishment. Even by profane writers, says Meyer, "bearing the sword" by a magistrate was the emblem of the power over life and death. The same Apostle said (Acts xxv. 11): "If I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die;" which clearly implies that, in his judgment, there were offenses, for which the appropriate penalty is death.

2. Besides these arguments from Scripture, there are others drawn from natural justice. It is a dictate of our moral nature that crime should be punished; that there should be a just proportion between the offence and the penalty; and that death, the highest penalty, was the proper punishment for the greatest of all crimes. That such is the instinctive judgment of men is proved by the difficulty often experienced in restraining the people from taking summary vengeance in cases of atrocious murder. So strong is this sentiment that a species of wild justice is sure to step in to supply the place of judicial remissness. Such justice, from being lawless and impulsive, is too often misguided and erroneous, and, in a settled state of society, is always criminal. It being the nature of men, that if the regular, lawful infliction of death as a judicial penalty be abolished, it will be inflicted by the avenger of blood, or by tumultuous assemblies of the people, society has to choose between securing to the homicide a fair trial by the constituted authorities, and giving him up to the blind spirit of revenge.

3. Experience teaches that where human life is undervalued, it is insecure; that where the murderer escapes with impunity or is inadequately punished, homicides are fearfully multiplied. The

practical question, therefore, is, Who is to die? the innocent man or the murderer?

Homicide in Self-Defence.

That homicide in self-defence is not forbidden by the sixth commandment, is plain, (1.) Because such homicide is not malicious, and, therefore, does not come within the scope of the prohibition. (2.) Because sell-preservation is an instinct of our nature, and therefore, a revelation of the will of God. (3.) Because it is a dictate of reason and of natural justice that if of two persons we must die, it should be the aggressor and not the aggrieved. (4.) Because the universal judgment of men, and the Word of God, pronounce the man innocent who kills another in defence of his own life or that of his neighbor.

War.

It is conceded that war is one of the most dreadful evils that can be inflicted on a people; that it involves the destruction of property and life; that it demoralizes both the victors and the vanquished; that it visits thousands of non-combatants with all the miseries of poverty, widowhood, and orphanage; and that it tends to arrest the progress of society in everything that is good and desirable. God overrules wars in many cases, as He does the tornado and the earthquake, to the accomplishment of his benevolent purposes, but this does not prove that war in itself is not a great evil. He makes the wrath of man to praise Him. It is conceded that wars undertaken to gratify the ambition, cupidity, or resentment of rulers or people, are unchristian and wicked. It is also conceded that the vast majority of the wars which have desolated the world have been unjustifiable in the sight of God and man. Nevertheless it does not follow from this that war in all cases is to be condemned.

1. This is proved because the right of self-defence belongs to nations

as well as to individuals. Nations are bound to protect the lives and property of their citizens. If these are assailed by force, force may be rightfully used in their protection. Nations also have the right to defend their own existence. If that be endangered by the conduct of other nations, they have the natural right of self-protection. A war may be defensive and yet in one sense aggressive. In other words, self-defence may dictate and render necessary the first assault. A man is not bound to wait until a murderer actually strikes his blow. It is enough that he sees undeniable manifestations of a hostile purpose. So a nation is not bound to wait until its territories are actually invaded and its citizens murdered, before it appeals to arms. It is enough that there is clear evidence on the part of another nation of an intention to commence hostilities. While it is easy to lay down the principle that war is justifiable only as a means of self-defence, the practical application of this principle is beset with difficulties. The least aggression on national property, or the slightest infringement of national rights, may be regarded as the first step toward national extinction, and therefore justify the most extreme measures of redress. A nation may think that a certain enlargement of territory is necessary to its security, and, therefore, that it has the right to go to war to secure it. So a man may say that a portion of his neighbour's farm is necessary to the full enjoyment of his own property, and therefore that he has the right to appropriate it to himself. It is to be remembered that nations are as much bound by the moral law as individual men; and therefore that what a man may not do in the protection of his own rights, and on the plea of self-defence, a nation may not do. A nation therefore is bound to exercise great forbearance, and to adopt every other available means of redressing wrongs, before it plunges itself and others into all the demoralizing miseries of war.

2. The lawfulness of defensive war, however, does not rest exclusively on these general principles of justice; it is distinctly recognized in Scripture. In numerous cases, under the Old Testament, such wars were commanded. God endowed men with special qualifications as warriors. He answered when consulted through the Urim and Thummim, or by the prophets, as to the propriety of military enterprises (Judges xx. 27 f., 1 Sam. xiv. 37, xxiii. 2, 4; 1 Kings xxii. 6 ff.); and He often interfered miraculously in behalf of his people when they were engaged in battle. Many of the Psalms of David, dictated by the Spirit, are either prayers for divine assistance in war or thanksgivings for victory. It is very plain, therefore, that the God whom the patriarchs and prophets worshipped did not condemn war, when the choice was between war and annihilation. It is a very clear case that if the Israelites had not been allowed to defend themselves against their heathen neighbours they would have soon been extirpated, and their religion would have perished with them.

As the essential principles of morals do not change, what was permitted or commanded under one dispensation, cannot be unlawful under another, unless forbidden by a new revelation. The New Testament, however, contains no such revelation. It does not say, as in the case of divorce, that war was permitted to the Hebrews because of the hardness of their hearts, but that under the Gospel a new law was to prevail.

This very silence of the New Testament leaves the Old Testament rule of duty on this subject still in force. Accordingly, although there is no express declaration on the subject, as none was needed, we find the lawfulness of war quietly assumed. When the soldiers inquired of John the Baptist what they should do to prepare for the kingdom of God, he did not tell them that they must forsake the profession of arms. The centurion, whose faith our Lord so highly commended (Matt. viii. 5-13),

was not censured for being a soldier. So also the centurion, a devout man, whom God in a vision commanded to send for Peter, and on whom, and his associates, according to the record in the tenth chapter of Acts, the Holy Ghost came with miraculous gifts, was allowed to remain in the army of even a heathen emperor. If magistrates, as we learn from the thirteenth chapter of Romans, are armed with a right or power of life and death over their own citizens, they certainly have the right to declare war in self-defence.

In the early ages of the Church there was a great disinclination to engage in military service, and the fathers at times justified this reluctance by calling the lawfulness of all wars into question. But the real sources of this opposition of Christians to entering the army, were that they thereby gave themselves up to the service of a power which persecuted their religion; and that idolatrous usages were inseparably connected with military duties. When the Roman empire became Christian, and the cross was substituted for the eagle on the standards of the army, this opposition died away, till at length we hear of fighting prelates, and of military orders of monks.

No historical Christian Church has pronounced all war to be unlawful. The Augsburg Confession [326] expressly says that it is proper for Christians to act as magistrates, and among other things "jure bellare, militare," etc. And Presbyterians especially have shown that it is not against their consciences to contend to the death for their rights and liberties.

Suicide.

It is conceivable that men who do not believe in God or in a future state of existence, should think it allowable to take refuge in annihilation from the miseries of this life. But it is unaccountable, except on the assumption of temporary or permanent insanity, that any

man should rush uncalled into the retributions of eternity. Suicide, therefore, is most frequent among those who have lost all faith in religion. [327] It is a very complicated crime; our life is not our own; we have no more right to destroy our life than we have to destroy the life of a fellow-man. Suicide is, therefore, self murder. It is the desertion of the post which God has assigned us; it is a deliberate refusal to submit to his will; it is a crime which admits of no repentance, and consequently involves the loss of the soul.

Duelling.

Duelling is another violation of the sixth commandment. Its advocates defend it on the same principle on which international war is defended. As independent nations have no common tribunal to which they can resort for the redress of injuries, they are justifiable, on the principle of self-defence, in appealing to arms for the protection of their rights. In like manner, it is said, there are offences for which the law of the land affords no redress, and therefore, the individual must be allowed to seek redress for himself. But (1.) There is no evil for which the law does not, or should not, afford redress. (2.) The redress sought in the duel is unjustifiable. No one has the right to kill a man for a slight or an insult. Taking a man's life for a hasty word, or even for a serious injury, is murder in the sight of God, who has ordained the penalty of death as the punishment for only the most atrocious crimes. (3.) The remedy is preposterous; for most frequently it is the aggrieved party who loses his life. (4.) Duelling is the cause of the greatest suffering to innocent parties, which no man has a right to inflict to gratify his pride or resentment. (5.) The survivor in a fatal duel entails on himself, unless his heart and conscience be seared, a life of misery.

[325] Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, Leipzig, 1795.

[326] I. xvi. 2; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. p. 14.

[327] It is estimated that one death out of 175 in London is suicide; in New York, one in 172; in Vienna, one in 160; in Paris, one in 72.

---

§ 11. The Seventh Commandment.

This commandment, as we learn from our Lord's exposition of it, given in his sermon on the mount, forbids all impurity in thought, speech, and behaviour. As the social organization of society is founded on the distinction of the sexes, and as the well-being of the state and the purity and prosperity of the Church rest on the sanctity of the family relation, it is of the last importance that the normal, or divinely constituted relation of the sexes be preserved in its integrity.

Celibacy.

Among the important questions to be considered under the head of this commandment, the first is, Whether the Bible teaches that there is any special virtue in a life of celibacy? This is really a question, whether there was an error in the creation of man.

1. The very fact that God created man, male and female, declaring that it was not good for either to be alone, and constituted marriage in paradise, should be decisive on this subject. The doctrine which degrades marriage by making it a less holy state, has its foundation in Manicheeism or Gnosticism. It assumes that evil is essentially connected with matter; that sin has its seat and source in the body; that holiness is attainable only through asceticism and "neglecting of the body;" that because the "vita angelica" is a higher form of life than that of men here on earth, therefore marriage is a degradation. The doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject, therefore, is thoroughly anti-Christian. It rests on principles derived from the

philosophy of the heathen. It presupposes that God is not the author of matter; and that He did not make man pure, when He invested him with a body.

2. Throughout the Old Testament Scriptures marriage is represented as the normal state of man. The command to our first parents before the fall was, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." Without marriage the purpose of God in regard to our world could not be carried out; it is, therefore, contradictory to the Scriptures to assume that marriage is less holy, or less acceptable to God than celibacy. To be unmarried, was regarded under the old dispensation as a calamity and a disgrace. (Judges xi. 37; Ps. lxxviii. 63; Is. iv. 1; xiii. 12.) The highest earthly destiny of a woman, according to the Old Testament Scriptures, which are the word of God, was not to be a nun, but to be the mistress of a family, and a mother of children. (Gen. xxx. 1; Ps. cxiii. 9; cxxvii. 3; cxxviii. 3, 4; Prov. xviii. 22; xxxi. 10, 28.)

3. The same high estimate of marriage, characterizes the teachings of the New Testament. Marriage is declared to be "honourable in all." (Heb. xiii. 4.) Paul says, " Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." (1 Cor. vii. 2.) In 1 Timothy v. 14, he says: "I will, that the younger women marry." In 1 Timothy iv. 3, "forbidding to marry" is included among the doctrines of devils. As the truth comes from the Holy Spirit, so false doctrines, according to the Apostle's mode of thinking, come from Satan, and his agents, the demons; they are "the seducing spirits" spoken of in the same verse.

[328] Our Lord more than once (Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 7) quotes and enforces the original law given in Genesis ii. 24, that man shall "leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." The same passage is quoted by the Apostle as containing a great and symbolical truth. (Eph. v. 31.) It is thus

taught that the marriage relation is the most intimate and sacred that can exist on earth, to which all other human relations must be sacrificed. We accordingly find that from the beginning, with rare exceptions, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, confessors, and martyrs, have been married men. If marriage was not a degradation to them, surely it cannot be to monks and priests.

The strongest proof of the sanctity of the marriage relation in the sight of God, is to be found in the fact that both in the Old and in the New Testaments, it is made the symbol of the relation between God and his people. "Thy Maker is thy husband," are the words of God, and contain a world of truth, of grace, and of love. The departure of the people from God, is illustrated by a reference to a wife forsaking her husband; while God's forbearance, tenderness, and love, area compared to those of a faithful husband to his wife. "As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." (Is. lxii. 5.) In the New Testament, this reference to the marriage relation, to illustrate the union between Christ and the Church, is frequent and instructive. The Church is called "the Bride, the Lamb's wife." (Rev. xxi. 9.) And the consummation of the work of salvation is set forth as the marriage, or the marriage-supper of the Lamb. (Rev. xix. 7 , 9.) In Ephesians v. 22-33, the union between husbands and wives, and the duties thence resulting, are set forth as so analogous to the union between Christ and his Church, that in some cases it is hard to determine to which union the language of the Apostle is to be applied. It is a matter of astonishment, in view of all these facts, that marriage has so extensively and persistently been regarded as something degrading, and celibacy or perpetual virginity as a special and peculiar virtue. No more striking evidence of the influence of a false philosophy in perverting the minds of even good men, is afforded

in the whole history of the Church. Even the Reformers did not escape altogether from its influence. They often speak of marriage as the less of two evils; not as in itself a good; and not as the normal and appropriate state in which men and women should live, as designed by God in the very constitution of their nature, and as the best adapted to the exercise and development of all social and Christian virtues. Thus Calvin says: "Unde constat et aliam quamlibet, extra conjugium, societatem coram ipso [Deo] maledictam esse; et illam ipsam conjugalem in necessitatis remedium esse ordinatam, ne in effrenem libidinem proruamus. . . . . Jam quum per naturæ conditionem et accensa post lapsum libidine, mulieris consortio bis obnoxii simus, nisi quos singulari gratia Deus inde exemit; videant singuli quid sibi datum sit. Virginitas, fateor, virtus est non contemnenda: sed quoniam aliis negata est, allis nonnisi ad tempus concessa, qui ab incontinentia vexantur, et superiores in certamine esse nequeunt ad matrimonii subsidium se conferant, ut ita in suæ vocationis gradu castitatem colant." [329] That is, virginity is a virtue. Celibacy is a higher state than marriage. Those who cannot live in that state, should descend to the lower platform of married life. With such dregs of Manichean philosophy was the pure truth of the Bible contaminated, even as held by the most illustrious Reformers.

4. The teaching of Scripture as to the sanctity of marriage is confirmed by the experience of the world. It is only in the marriage state that some of the purest, most disinterested, and most elevated principles of our nature are called into exercise. All that concerns filial piety, and parental and especially maternal affection, depends on marriage for its very existence. Yet on the purifying and restraining influence of these affections the well-being of human society is in a large measure dependent. It is in the bosom of the

family that there is a constant call for acts of kindness, of sell-denial, of forbearance, and of love. The family, therefore, is the sphere the best adapted for the development of all the social virtues; and it may be safely said that there is far more of moral excellence and of true religion to be found in Christian households, than in the desolate homes of priests, or in the gloomy cells of monks and nuns. A man with his children or grandchildren on his knees, is an object of higher reverence than any emaciated anchorite in his cave.

5. Our Lord teaches that a tree is known by its fruits. There has been no more prolific source of evil to the Church than the unscriptural notion of the special virtue of virginity and the enforced celibacy of the clergy and monastic vows, to which that action has given rise. This is the teaching of history. On this point the testimony of Romanists as well as of Protestants is decisive and overwhelming. It may be admitted that the Catholic clergy in this and in some other countries are as decorous in their lives, as the clergy of other denominations, without invalidating the testimony of history as to the evils of vows of celibacy.

Protestants, while asserting the sanctity of marriage and denying the superior virtue of a life of celibacy, do not deny that there are times and circumstances in which celibacy is a virtue: i.e., that a man may perform a virtuous act in resolving never to marry. The Church often has work to do, for which single men are the only proper agents. The cares of a family, in other words, would unfit a man for the execution of the task assigned. This, however, does not suppose that celibacy is in itself a virtue. It may also happen that a rich man may be called upon to undertake a work which would necessitate his disencumbering himself of the care of his estate, and subjecting himself to a life of poverty. The same is true of the state. In fact military service, for

the great majority of the rank and file of an army, is an estate of forced celibacy so long as the service continues. And even with regard to the officers, the liberty to marry is very much restricted in the standing armies of Europe. There are times when marriage is inexpedient. Our Lord in foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem said, "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days." It is the part of wisdom to escape such woes. When Christians had no security for life or home; when they were liable to be torn away from their families, or to have all means of providing for their wants taken out of their hands, it was better for them not to marry. It is in reference to such times and circumstances that the words of Christ, in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, were uttered, and the advice of the Apostle, in the seventh chapter of First Corinthians was given. The Pharisees asked our Lord whether a man could put away his wife at pleasure. He referred them to the original institution of marriage, as showing that it was intended to be an indissoluble connection. His disciples said, In that case it is better that a man should not marry. Our Lord replied: Whether it is better for a man to marry or not, is not a question for every man to decide for himself. "That the unmarried state is better, is a saying not for every one, and indeed only for such as it is divinely intended for." [330] That is, those to whom the requisite grace is given, "Omnes hujus dicti capaces esse negans, significat electionem non esse positam in manu nostra, acsi de re nobis subjecta esset consultatio. Si quis utile sibi esse putat uxore carere, atque ita nullo examine habito, coelibatus legem sibi edicit, longe fallitur. Deus enim, qui pronuntiavit bonum esse, ut viro adjutrix sit mulier, contempti sui ordinis poenam exiget: quia nimium sibi arrogant mortales, dum se a coelesti vocatione eximere tentant. Porro non esse omnibus liberum, eligere utrum libuerit, inde probat Christus, quia

speciale sit continentiæ donum: nam quum dicit, non omnes esse capaces, sed quibus datum est, clare demonstrat non omnibus esse datum." [331]

Those to whom it is given to lead an unmarried life, as our Lord teaches (Matt. xix. 10), are not only those who by their natural constitution are unfit for the marriage state, but those whom God calls to special service in his Church and whom He fits for that work.

The doctrine which Paul teaches on this subject is perfectly coincident with the teachings of our Lord. He recognizes marriage as a divine institution; as in itself good; as the normal and proper state in which men and women should live; but as it is necessarily attended by many cares and distractions, it was expedient in times of trouble, to remain unmarried. This is the purport of Paul's teachings in First Corinthians ii. No one of the sacred writers, whether in the Old or in the New Testament, so exalts and glorifies marriage as does this Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians. He, therefore, is not the man, guided as he was in all his teachings by the Spirit of God, to depreciate or undervalue it, as only the less of two evils. It is a positive good: the union of two human persons to supplement and complement the one the other in a way which is necessary to the perfection or full development of both. The wife is to her husband what the Church is to Christ. Nothing higher than this can possibly be said.

History.

No one can read the Epistles of Paul, especially those to the Ephesians and Colossians, without seeing clear indications of the prevalence, even in the apostolic churches, of the principles of that philosophy which held that matter was contaminating; and which inculcated asceticism as the most efficacious means of the purification of the soul. This doctrine had already been adopted and reduced to practice by the Essenes among the Jews. Farther East, under a somewhat different

form, it had prevailed for ages before the Christian era, and still maintains its ground. According to the Brahminical philosophy the individuality of man depends on the body. Complete emancipation from the body, therefore, secures the merging of the finite into the infinite. The drop is lost in the ocean, and this is the highest and ultimate destiny of man. It is not therefore to be wondered at, that the early fathers came more or less under the influence of these principles, or that asceticism gained so rapidly and maintained so long its ascendancy in the Church. The depreciation of the divine institution of marriage, and the exaltation of virginity into the first place among Christian virtues, was the natural and necessary consequence of this spirit. Ignatius called voluntary virgins "the jewels of Christ." Justin Martyr desired celibacy to prevail to the "greatest possible extent." Tatian regarded marriage as inconsistent with spiritual worship. Origen "disabled himself in his youth" and regarded marriage as a pollution. Hieracas made "virginity a condition of salvation." Tertullian denounced second marriage as criminal, and represented celibacy as the ideal of Christian life, not only for the clergy, but also for the laity. Second marriage was early prohibited so far as the clergy were concerned, and soon came in their case the prohibition of marriage altogether. The Apostolical Constitutions prohibited priests from contracting marriage after consecration. The Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, allowed deacons to marry, provided they stipulated for the privilege before ordination. The Council of Elvira, A.D. 305, forbade the continuance of the marriage relation (according to the common interpretation of its canons) to bishops, presbyters, and deacons on pain of deposition. [332] Jerome was fanatical in his denunciation of marriage; and even Augustine was carried away by the spirit of the age. In answer to the objection that if men acted on his

principles the world would be depopulated, he answered So much the better, for in that case Christ would come the sooner. [333] Siricius, Bishop of Rome A.D. 385, decided that marriage was inconsistent with the clerical office; and was followed in this view by his successors. Great opposition, however, was experienced in enforcing celibacy, and it required all the energy of Gregory VII. to have the decisions of councils carried into effect. Ultimately, however, the rule, so far as the clergy are concerned, was acquiesced in, and received the authoritative sanction of the Council of Trent. That Council decided, [334] "Si quis dixerit, statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis, vel coelibatus, et non esse melius, et beatius manere in virginitate aut coelibatu, quam jungi matrimonio: anathema sit." On this assumed higher virtue of celibacy, in the preceding canon it was ordered: "Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto: et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium; posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voterint, habere donum; anathema sit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id, quod possumus, tentari."

Although the doctrine that virginity, as the Roman Catechism expresses it, "summopere commendatur," as being better, and more perfect and holy than a state of marriage, is made the ostensible ground of the enforced celibacy of the clergy, it is manifest that hierarchical reasons had much to do in making the Romish Church so strenuous in insisting that its clergy should be unmarried. This Gregory VII. avows when he says, [335] "Non liberari potest ecclesia a servitute laicorum, nisi liberentur clerici ab uxoribus." And Melancthon felt authorized to say

in reference to the celibacy of the clergy in the Church of Rome, "Una est vera et sola causa tuendi coelibatus, ut opes commodius administrentur et splendor ordinis retineatur." [336]

As the Reformation was a return to the Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and as in the Scriptures marriage is exalted as a holy state, and no preeminence in excellence is assigned to celibacy or virginity; and as the Reformers denied the authority of the Church to make laws to bind the conscience or to curtail the liberty with which Christ had made his people free, Protestants pronounced with one voice against the obligation of monastic vows and of the celibacy of the clergy.

The Greek Church petrified at an early date. It assumed the form which it still retains, before the doctrine of the special sanctity of celibacy had gained ascendancy. It abides therefore by the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, and of Trullo, A.D. 692, which permitted marriage to priests and deacons. Those Greeks who are in communion with the Church of Rome enjoy the same liberty. Benedict XIV. declared in reference to them, "Etsi expetendum quam maxime esset, ut Græci, qui sunt in sacris ordinibus constituti, castitatem non secus ac Latini servarent. Nihilominus, ut eorum clerici, subdiaconi, diaconi et presbyteri uxores in eorum ministerio retineant, dummodo ante sacros ordines, virgines, non viduas, neque corruptas duxerint, Romana non prohibet Ecclesia. Eos autem, qui viduam vel corruptam duxerunt, vel ad secunda vota, prima uxore mortua, convolarunt, ad subdiaconatum, diaconatum et presbyteratum promoveri omnino prohibemus." [337] In the Russian Church the priests are required to be married men; but second marriages are forthem prohibited. The bishops are chosen from the monks and must be unmarried.

Marriage a Divine Institution.

Marriage is a divine institution. (1.) Because founded on the nature of man as constituted by God. He made man male and female, and ordained marriage as the indispensable condition of the continuance of the race. (2.) Marriage was instituted before the existence of civil society, and therefore cannot in its essential nature be a civil institution. As Adam and Eve were man led not in virtue of any civil law, or by the intervention of a civil magistrate, so any man and woman cast together on a desert island, could lawfully take each other as husband and wife, It is a degradation of the institution to make it a mere civil contract. (3.) God commanded men to marry, when He commanded them to increase, and multiply and replenish the earth. (4.) God in his word has prescribed the duties belonging to the marriage relation; He has made known his will as to the parties who may lawfully be united in marriage; He has determined the continuance of the relation; and the causes which alone justify its dissolution. These matters are not subject to the will of the parties, or to the authority of the State. (5.) The vow of mutual fidelity made by husband and wife, is not made exclusively by each one to the other, but by each to God. When a man connects himself with a Christian Church he enters into covenant with his brethren in the Lord; mutual obligations are assumed; but nevertheless the covenant is made with God. He joins the Church in obedience to the will of God; he promises to regulate his faith and practice by the divine word; and the vow of fidelity is made to God. It is the same in marriage. It is a voluntary, mutual compact between husband and wife. They promise to be faithful to each other; but nevertheless they act in obedience to God, and promise to Him that they will live together as man and wife, according to his word. Any violation of the compact is, therefore, a violation of a vow made to God.

Marriage is not a sacrament in the sense in which baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments, nor in the sense of the Romish Church; but it is none the less a sacred institution. Its solemnization is an office of religion. It should, therefore, be entered upon with due solemnity and in the fear of God; and should be celebrated, i.e., the ceremony should be performed by a minister of Christ. He alone is authorized to see to it that the law of God is adhered to; and he alone can receive and register the marriage vows as made to God. The civil magistrate can only witness it as a civil contract, and it is consequently to ignore its religious character and sanction to have it celebrated by a civil officer. As the essence of the marriage contract is the mutual compact of the parties in the sight of God and in the presence of witnesses, it is not absolutely necessary that it should be celebrated by a minister of religion or even by a civil magistrate. It may be lawfully solemnized, as among the Quakers, without the intervention of either. Nevertheless as it is of the greatest importance that the religious nature of the institution should be kept in view, it is incumbent on Christians, so far as they themselves are concerned, to insist that it should be solemnized as a religious service.

Marriage as a Civil Institution.

As a man's being a servant of God and bound to make his word the rule of his faith and practice, is not inconsistent with his being a servant of the state, and bound to render obedience to its laws; so it is not inconsistent with the fact that marriage is an ordinance of God, that it should be, in another aspect, a civil institution. It is so implicated in the social and civil relations of men that it of necessity comes under the cognizance of the state. It is therefore a civil institution. (1.) In so far as it is, and must be, recognized and

enforced by the state. (2.) It imposes civil obligations which the state has the right to enforce. The husband is bound to sustain his wife, for example, and he is constrained by the civil law to the performance of this duty. (3.) Marriage also involves, on both sides, rights to property; and the claims of children born in wedlock to the property of their parents. All these questions concerning property fall legitimately under the control of the civil law. In many countries not only property, but rank, title, and political prerogatives are implicated with the question of marriage. (4.) It belongs to the state, therefore, as the guardian of these rights, to determine what marriages are lawful and what unlawful; how the contract is to be solemnized and authenticated; and what shall be its legal consequences. All these laws Christians are bound to obey, so far as obedience to them is consistent with a good conscience.

The legitimate power of the state in all these matters is limited by the revealed will of God. It can make nothing an impediment to marriage which the Scriptures do not declare to be a bar to that union. It can make nothing a ground of dissolving the marriage contract which the Bible does not make a valid ground of divorce. And the state can attach none other than civil pains and penalty to the violation of its laws concerning marriage. This is only saying that a Christian government is bound to respect the conscientious convictions of the people. It is a violation of the principles of civil and religious liberty for the state to make its will paramount to the will of God. Plain as this principle seems to be, it is nevertheless constantly disregarded in almost all Christian nations, whether Catholic or Protestant. In England, for example, it is still the law, that no member of the royal family can marry without the consent of the reigning sovereign. If this meant nothing more than that any member of the royal family thus

marrying, should forfeit for himself and his children all right of succession to the crown, it might be all right. But the real meaning is that such a marriage is null and void that parties otherwise lawfully married and whom God has joined together as man and wife, are not man and wife. This is to bring the law of man and the law of God into direct collision, and make the human supersede the divine. In Prussia a subordinate officer of the army cannot marry without the consent of his commander. If he should marry without that consent, it might be right to make him throw up his commission; but to say that his wife is not a wife, is not only untrue, but it is a monstrous injustice and cruelty.

In England, until of late years, no marriage was valid unless solemnized in church, within canonical hours, and by a man in priest's orders. This law was designed specially for the protection of heiresses from the wiles of fortune-hunters. It might be just to determine that no marriage not thus solemnized should convey any right to property; but to say that parties married five minutes after twelve o'clock, noon, are not married at all, whereas had the ceremony been performed ten minutes sooner, they would be truly man and wife, shocks the conscience and common sense of men. So in this country before the abolition of slavery, according to the laws of our Southern States, no slave could marry. A young white man married a young woman, whom no one in the community supposed had a drop of African blood in her veins. It was proved, however, that she was a slave. Her husband purchased her, manumitted her, repudiated her, married another woman, and was received into the communion of a Presbyterian Church. The law of God was thus regarded as a mere nullity. [338]

Because marriage is in some of its aspects a civil institution, to be regulated within certain limits, by the civil law, men have treated it as though it were a mere business engagement. They ignore its character

as a divine institution, regulated and controlled by divine laws. Civil legislatures should remember that they can no more annul the laws of God than the laws of nature. If they pronounce those not to be married who, by the divine law, are married; or if they separate those whom God hath joined together, their laws are absolute nullities at the bar of conscience and in the sight of God.

Monogamy.

Marriage is a compact between one man and one woman to live together, as man and wife, until separated by death. According to this definition, first, the marriage relation can subsist only between one man and one woman; secondly, the union is permanent, i.e., it can be dissolved only by the death of one or both of the parties, except for reasons specified in the word of God; and thirdly, the death of one of the parties dissolves the union, so that it is lawful for the survivor to marry again.

As to the first of these points, or that the Scriptural doctrine of marriage is opposed to and condemns polygamy, it is to be remarked, --

1. That such has been the doctrine of the Christian Church in all ages and in every part of the world. There has never been a church calling itself Christian which tolerated a plurality cf wives among its members. There could hardly be a stronger proof than this fact that such is the law of Christ. It is morally certain that the whole Church cannot have mistaken, on such a subject as this, the mind and will of its divine Head and Master.

2. Marriage as originally constituted and ordained by God was between one man and one woman. And the language of Adam when he received Eve from the hands of her Maker, proves that such was the essential nature of the relation: "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. . . . . Therefore shall a man leave his father and

his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh." (Gen. ii. 23, 24.) Or, as our Lord quotes and expounds the passage, "They twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh." (Mark x. 8.) "The two," and no more than two, become one. This was not only the language of unfallen Adam in Paradise, but the language of God uttered through the lips of Adam, as appears not only from the circumstances of the case, but also from our Lord's attributing to them divine authority, as He evidently does in the passage just quoted. Thus the law of marriage as originally instituted by God, required that the union should be between one man and one woman. This law could be changed only by the authority by which it was originally enacted. Delitzsch remarks on this passage: [339] "In these words not only the deepest spiritual union, but a union comprehending the whole nature of man, an all comprehending personal communion, is represented as the essence of marriage; and monogamy is set forth as its natural and divinely appointed form."

3. Although this original law was partially disregarded in later times it was never abrogated. Polygamy and divorce were in a measure tolerated under the Mosaic law, yet in all ages among the Hebrews, monogamy was the rule, and polygamy the exception, as it was among other civilized nations of antiquity. Polygamy first appears among the descendants of Cain. (Gen. iv. 19.) Noah and his sons had each but one wife. Abraham had but one wife, until the impatience of Sarah for children led him to take Hagar as a concubine. The same rule of marriage was observed by the prophets as a class. Polygamy was confined in a great measure to kings and princes. There was also an honourable distinction made between the wife and the concubine. The former retained her preeminence as the head of the family. Numerous passages of the Old Testament go to prove that monogamy was considered as the

law of marriage, from which plurality of wives was a departure. Throughout the Proverbs, for example, it is the blessing of a good wife, not of wives, that is continually set forth. (Prov. xii. 4; xix. 14; xxxi. 10 ff.) The apocryphal books contain clear evidence that after the exile monogamy was almost universal among the Jews; and it may be inferred from such passages as Luke i. 5; Acts v. 1, and many others, that the same was true at the time of the advent of Christ. With regard to the toleration of polygamy under the Mosaic law, it is to be remembered that the seventh commandment belongs to the same category as the sixth and eighth. These laws are not founded on the essential nature of God, and therefore are not immutable. They are founded on the permanent relations of men in their present state of existence. From this it follows, (1.) That they bind men only in their present state. The laws of property and marriage can have no application, so far as we know, to the future world, where men shall be as angels, neither marrying nor giving in marriage. (2.) These laws being founded on the permanent and natural relations of men, cannot be set aside by human authority, because those relations are not subject to the will or ordinance of men. (3.) They may however be dispensed with by God. He commanded the Israelites to despoil the Egyptians and to dispossess the Canaanites, but this does not prove that one nation may, of its own motion, seize on the inheritance of another people. If God, therefore, at any time said to any people granted permission to practise polygamy, then so long as that permission lasted and for those to whom it was given, polygamy was lawful, and at all other times and for all other persons it was unlawful. This principle is clearly recognized in what our Saviour teaches concerning divorce. It was permitted the Jews under the Mosaic law to put away their wives; as soon as that law was abolished, the right of divorce ceased.

4. Monogamy, however, does not rest exclusively on the original institution of marriage, or upon the general drift of the Old Testament teaching, but mainly on the clearly revealed will of Christ. His will is the supreme law for all Christians, and rightfully for all men. When the Pharisees came to Him and asked Him whether a man could lawfully put away his wife, He answered, that marriage as instituted by God was an indissoluble union between one man and one woman; and, therefore, that those whom God had joined together no man could put asunder. This is the doctrine clearly taught in Matthew xix. 4-9; Mark x. 4-9; Luke xvi. 18; Matthew v. 32. In these passages our Lord expressly declares that if a man marries while his first wife is living he commits adultery. The exception which Christ himself makes to this rule, will be considered under the head of divorce.

The Apostle teaches the same doctrine in Romans vii. 2, 3: "The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man." The doctrine of this passage is that marriage is a compact between one man and one woman, which can be dissolved only by the death of one of the parties. So in 1 Corinthians vii. 2: "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband," it is taken for granted that, in the Christian Church, a plurality of wives is as much out of the question as a plurality of husbands. This assumption runs through the whole New Testament. We not only never read of a Christian's having two or more wives; but whenever the duty of the marriage relation is spoken of, it is always of the husband to his wife, and of the wife to her husband. In the judgment,

therefore, of the whole Christian Church, marriage is a covenant between one man and one woman to live together as husband and wife until separated by death.

5. This Scriptural law is confirmed by the providential law which secures the numerical equality of the sexes. Had polygamy been according to the divine purpose, we should naturally expect that more women would be born than men. But the reverse is the fact. There are more men than women born into the world. The excess, however, is only sufficient to provide for the greater peril to life to which men are exposed. The law of providence is the numerical equality of the sexes; and this is a clear intimation of the will of God that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband. Such being the will of God, as revealed both in his word and in his providence, everything which tends to counteract it must be evil in its nature and consequences. The doctrine which depreciated marriage, and made celibacy a virtue, flooded the Church with corruption. And everything in our modern civilization and modes of living which renders marriage difficult, and consequently infrequent, is to be deprecated, and if possible removed. That every man should have his own wife and every woman her own husband, is the divinely appointed preventive of the "Social Evil" with all its unutterable horrors. [340] Every other preventive is human and worthless. Rather than that the present state of things should continue, it would be better to return to the old patriarchal usage, and let parents give their sons and daughters in marriage as soon as they attained the proper age, on the best terms they can.

6. As all the permanently obligatory laws of God are founded on the nature of his creatures, it follows that if He has ordained that marriage must be the union of one man and one woman, there must be a

reason for this in the very constitution of man and in the nature of the marriage relation. That relation must be such that it cannot subsist between one and many; between one man and more than one woman. This is plain, first, from the nature of the love which it involves; and secondly, from the nature of the union which it constitutes. First, conjugal love is peculiar and exclusive. It can have but one object. As the love of a mother for a child is peculiar, and can have no other object than her own child, so the love of a husband can have no other object than his wife, and the love of a wife no other object than her husband. It is a love not only of complacency and delight, but also of possession, of property, and of rightful ownership. This is the reason why jealousy in man or woman is the fiercest of all human passions. It involves a sense of injury; of the violation of the most sacred rights; more sacred even than the rights of property or life. Conjugal love, therefore, cannot by possibility exist except between one man and one woman. Monogamy has its foundation in the very constitution of our nature. Polygamy is unnatural, and necessarily destructive of the normal, or divinely constituted relation between husband and wife. Secondly, in another aspect, the union involved in marriage cannot exist except between one man and one woman. It is not merely a union of feeling and of interests. It is such a union as to produce, in some sense, identity. The two become one. Such is the declaration of our Lord. Husband and wife are one, in a sense which justified the Apostle in saying as he does, in Ephesians v. 30, that the wife is bone of her husband's bone, and flesh of his flesh. She is his body. She is himself (v. 28). Such is this union that "Qui uxorem repudiat, quasi dimidiam sui partem a seipso avellit. Hoc autem minime patitur natura, ut corpus suum quisque discerpat." What all this means it may be hard for us to understand. It is certain, -- (1.) That it does not refer to anything

material, or to any identification of substance. When Adam said of Eve, "This is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh," he doubtless referred to her being formed out of his body. But as these words are used by the Apostle to express the relation of all wives to their husbands, they must be understood of something else than identity of substance. (2.) The oneness of man and wife, of which the Scriptures speak cannot be understood in any sense inconsistent with their distinct subsistence or personality. They may be very different in character and destiny. The one may be saved, the other lost. (3.) It is evident, however, that the meaning of the strong language of Scripture on this subject is not exhausted, by representing the marriage union as being merely one of affection; or by saying that the husband is the complement of the wife and the wife of the husband; that is, that the marriage relation is necessary to the completeness of our nature and to its full development in the present state of existence; that there are capacities, feelings, and virtues which are not otherwise or elsewhere called into exercise. All this may be true, but it is not the whole truth. (4.) There is, in a certain sense, a community of life between husband and wife. We are accustomed to say, and to say truly, that the life of parents is communicated to their children. Each nation and every historical family has a form of life by which it is distinguished. As, therefore, the life of a father and the life of his son are the same, in that the blood (i.e., the life) of the parent flows in the veins of his children; so in an analogous sense the life of the husband and wife is one. They have a common life, and that common or joint life is transmitted to their offspring. This is the doctrine of the early Church. The Apostolical Constitutions say: [341] he gune koinonos esti biou, enoumene eis hen soma ek duo para Theou. The analogy which the Apostle traces out in Ephesians v. 22-33, between

the conjugal relation and the union between Christ and his Church, brings out the Scriptural doctrine of marriage more clearly than perhaps any other passage in the Bible. No analogy is expected to answer in all respects, and no illustration borrowed from earthly relations can bring out all the fulness of the things of God. The relation, therefore, between a husband and his wife, is only an adumbration of the relation of Christ to his Church. Still there is an analogy between the two, (1.) As the Apostle teaches, the love of Christ to his Church is peculiar and exclusive. It is such as He has for no other class or body of rational creatures in the universe. So the love of the husband for his wife is peculiar and exclusive. It is such as he has for no other object; a love in which no one can participate. (2.) Christ's love for his Church is self-sacrificing. He gave himself for it. He purchased the Church with his blood. So the husband should, and when true, does, in all things sacrifice himself for his wife. (3.) Christ and his Church are one; one in the sense that the Church is his body. So the husband and wife are in such a sense one, that a man in loving his wife loves himself. (4.) Christ's life is communicated to the Church. As the life of the head is communicated to the members of the human body; and the life of the vine to the branches, so there is, in a mysterious sense, a community of life between Christ and his Church. In like manner, in a sense no less truly mysterious, there is a community of life between husband and wife. From all this it follows that as it would be utterly incongruous and impossible that Christ should have two bodies, two brides, two churches, so it is no less incongruous and impossible that a man should have two wives. That is, the conjugal relation, as it is set forth in Scripture, cannot by possibility subsist, except between one man and one woman.

Conclusions.

1. If such be the true doctrine of marriage, it follows, as just stated, that polygamy destroys its very nature. It is founded on a wrong view of the nature of woman; places her in a false and degrading position; dethrones and despoils her; and is productive of innumerable evils.

2. It follows that the marriage relation is permanent and indissoluble. A limb may be violently severed from the body, and lose all vital connection with it; and husband and wife may be thus violently separated, and their conjugal relation annulled; but in both cases the normal connection is permanent.

3. It follows that the state can neither constitute nor dissolve the marriage relation. It can no more free a husband or wife "a vinculo matrimonii," than it can free a father "a vinculo paternitatis." It may protect a child from the injustice or cruelty of its father, or even, for due cause, remove him from all parental control, and it may legislate about its property, but the natural bond between parents and children is beyond its control. So the state may legislate about marriage, and determine its accidents and legal consequences; it may decide who, in the sight of the law, shall be regarded as husband and wife, and when, or under what circumstances, the legal or civil rights and privileges arising out of the relation shall cease to be enforced; and it may protect the person and rights of the wife, and, if necessary, remove her from the control of her husband, but the conjugal bond it cannot dissolve. All decrees of divorce "a vinculo matrimonii," issued by civil or ecclesiastical authorities, so far as the conscience is concerned, are perfectly inoperative, unless antecedently to such decree and by the law of God, the conjugal relation has ceased to exist.

4. It follows from the Scriptural doctrine of marriage that all laws are evil which tend to make those two whom God pronounces to be one; such laws, for example, as give to the wife the right to conduct business, contract debts, and sue and be sued, in her own name. This is attempting to correct one class of evils at the cost of incurring others a hundred-fold greater. The Word of God is the only sure guide of legislative action as well as of individual conduct.

5. It need hardly be remarked that it follows from the nature of marriage, that next to murder, adultery is the greatest of all social crimes, under the Old Dispensation it was punishable with death. And even now it is practically impossible to convict a husband of murder who kills the man who has committed adultery with his wife. This comes from human laws being in conflict with the laws of nature and of God. The law of God regards marriage as identifying a man and his wife; the laws of the state too often regard it as merely a civil contract, and give an injured husband no redress but a suit for damages for the pecuniary loss he has sustained by being deprived of the services of his wife. The penalty for adultery, to be in any due proportion to the magnitude of the crime, should be severe and degrading.

6. The relative duties of husband and wife arising out of their relation, may be expressed in a few comprehensive words. The husband is to love, protect, and cherish his wife as himself, i.e., as being to him another self. The duties of the wife are set forth in the time-honoured Christian formula, "love, honour, and obey."

Converted Polygamists.

The question has been mooted, Whether a polygamist, when converted to Christianity, should be required to repudiate all his wives but one, as a condition of his admission into the Christian Church? The answer to this question has been sought from three sources: First, the Scriptural

doctrine of marriage; secondly, the example of the Apostles when dealing with such cases; and thirdly, from a consideration of the effects which would follow from making monogamy an indispensable condition of admission to the Church.

As to the first point, it is admitted by all Christians, that it ie the law of God, the law of Christ, and consequently the law of the Christian Church that polygamy is sinful, being a violation of the original and permanently obligatory law of marriage. As every man who enters the Church professes to be a Christian, and as every Christian is bound to obey the law of Christ, it seems plain that no man should be received into the communion of the Church who does not conform to the law of Christ concerning marriage. The only question is, Whether Christ has made a special exception in favour of those who in the times of their ignorance, contracted the obligations of marriage with more than one woman? It is of course possible that such an exception might have been made. It would be analogous to the temporary suspension of the original law of marriage in favour of the hardhearted Jews. Has then such an exception been made? This is the second point to be considered. It concerns a matter of fact. Those who assume that such an exception has been made, are bound to produce the clearest evidence of the fact. This is necessary not only to satisfy the consciences of the parties concerned, but also to justify a departure from a plainly revealed law of God. It would be a very serious matter to set up in a heathen country, a church not conformed in this matter to the usual law of Christendom. Missionaries are sent forth to teach not only Christian doctrines but Christian morals. And the churches which they found, profess to be witnesses for Christ as to what He would have men to believe, and as to what He would have them to do. They ought not to be allowed to bear false testimony. It is certain that there is no clear

and definite expression of the will of Christ, recorded in the New Testament, that the case contemplated should be an exception to the Scriptural law of marriage. There is no instance recorded in the New Testament, of the admission of a polygamist to the Christian Church. It has, indeed, been inferred from 1 Timothy iii. 2, where the Apostle says, a bishop must be "the husband of one wife," that a private member of the Church might have more wives than one. But this is in itself a very precarious inference; and being inconsistent with Christ's express prohibition, it is altogether inadmissible. The meaning of the passage has been much disputed. What the Apostle requires is that a bishop should be in all respects an exemplary man: not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; the husband of one wife, i.e., not a polygamist. This no more implies that other men may be polygamists, than his saying that a bishop must not be greedy of filthy lucre and not a brawler, implies that other men may be covetous or contentious. According to another and widely accepted interpreation of the passage in 1 Timothy iii. 2, and the corresponding passage in Titus i. 6, the injunction of the Apostle is that a man who has been married more than once, must not be appointed a bishop or presbyter. If this be the true meaning of the Apostle, his language affords still less ground for the argument drawn from it in favour of the lawfulness of polygamy in church members. If even second marriage was forbidden to presbyters, a fortiori must polygamy be regarded as inconsistent with the law of Christ.

This interpretation was very generally adopted in the early Church, during the Middle Ages, and by Romanists, and is sustained by many of the recent commentators. Bishop Ellicott decides in favour of this interpretation. His reasons are, -- (1.) The opinion of the early writers and of some councils. (2.) The special respect paid among

pagans to a woman who was "univira." (3.) The propriety, in the case of episkopoi and diakonoi, of a greater temperance. (4.) And the manifestation of a greater sanctity (semnotes) of a single marriage, which he thinks is indicated even in Scripture (Luke ii. 36, 37). The objections to it are, In the first place, that it rests on an unscriptural view of marriage. According to the Bible, marriage is a better, higher, and holier, because the normal state, than celibacy. It was only in the interest of the doctrine of the peculiar sanctity of celibacy, that this interpretation was adopted by the fathers.

In the second place, it rests on the no less unscriptural assumption of the superior holiness of the clergy. No higher degree of moral purity is required of them than of other men, for the simple reason that every man is required to be perfectly holy in heart and life. The interpretation in question gained the stronger hold of the Church as the doctrine of "the grace of orders," and of the priesthood of the clergy gained ascendancy. When the Reformation came and swept away these two doctrines, it removed the two principal supports of the interpretation in question. It is not to be admitted that there can be anything unholy in second marriages, which an infinitely holy God declares to be lawful (Rom. vii. 3), nor can it be conceded that the clergy are holier than other believers, seeing that the only priesthood in the Church on earth is the priesthood common to all believers.

In the third place, the interpretation which makes the Apostle interdict second marriages to bishops and deacons, is contrary to the natural meaning of the words. The parallel passage in Titus i. 5, 6, reads thus: "That thou shouldest, ... ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, etc;" ei' tis estin . . . mias gunaikos, aner, if any one is at this present time the husband of one wife.' It is the present state and

character of the man that are to be taken into the account. He might before have been unmarried, or even a polygamist, but when ordained, he must, if married at all, be the husband of but one woman. "Qui sit: non autem, Qui fuerit," says Calvin in his comment on 1 Timothy iii. 2. And on Titus i. 6 he says, "Qui defuncta uxore alteram jam coelebs inducit, nihilominus unius uxoris maritus censeri debet. Non enim eligendum docet qui fuerit maritus unius uxoris, sed qui sit." Whichever of these interpretations of 1 Timothy iii. 2, be adopted, whether we understand the Apostle to forbid that a polygamist, or that a man twice married, should be admitted to the ministry, in neither case does the passage give authority to receive a polygamist into the fellowship of the Church. Considering, then, that monogamy is the undoubted law of Christ; considering that we have no evidence that He made an exception in favour of heathen converts; and considering the great importance that churches, founded in heathen lands, should bear true witness of the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, it would seem clear that no man having more than one wife should be admitted to Christian fellowship.

The third aspect of this question concerns the effects of enforcing the Christian law of marriage in heathen lands. It is urged that this would result in great cruelty and injustice. For a man to cast off women whom he had engaged to protect and cherish, to abandon not only them but their children, it is said, cannot be reconciled with any right principle. To this it may be replied, (1.) That in many heathen countries it is not the husband who supports the wives, but the wives who support the husband. They are his slaves, and sustain him by their labour. There would be no great hardship in his setting them free. (2.) But when this is not the case, it does not follow that because a man ceases to regard several women as his wives, he should cease to provide

for them, and for the welfare of his children. This in any event, as a Christian, he is bound to do.

It is also suggested, as a difficulty in this matter, that it is hard to determine which of his several wives a converted polygamist should retain. Some say, that it is the one first married; others say, that he should be allowed to make his own selection. If marriage among the heathen were what it is in Christian countries, there would be no room for doubt on this subject. Then the first contract would be the only binding one, and all the rest null and void. But in the Christian sense of the word there has been no marriage in any case. There has been no promise and vow of mutual fidelity. The relation of a heathen polygamist to the women of his harem, is more analogous to concubinage than to Christian marriage. The relation of a heathen polygamist to his numerous wives, is so different from the conjugal relation as contemplated in Scripture, as to render it at least doubtful whether the husband s obligation is exclusively, or preeminently, to the woman first chosen. This is a point of casuistry to which those who expect to labour in heathen countries should direct their attention. The Romish Church decides in favour of the first wife. The Roman Catechism [342] says: "Atque ob eam rem fieri intelligimus, ut, si infidels quispiam, gentis suæ more et consuetudine, plures uxores duxisset, cum ad veram religionem conversus fuerit, jubeat eum Ecclesia ceteras omnes relinquere, ac priorem tantum justæ et legitimæ uxoris loco habere."

Divorce.

The questions which call for, at least a brief consideration, under this head are, (1.) What is divorce, and what are its legitimate effects? (2.) What are the Scriptural grounds of divorce? (3.) What are the Romish doctrine, and practice on this subject? (4.) What are the doctrine and practice of Protestant Churches and countries? (5.) What

is the duty of the Church and of its officers in cases where the laws of the state on this subject are in conflict with the law of God? Works on civil and canon law, when treating of divorce, take a much wider range than this, but the points above indicated seem to include those of most interest and importance to the theologian.

Divorce; its Nature and Effects.

Divorce is not a mere separation, whether temporary or permanent, "a mensa et thoro." It is not such a separation as leaves the parties in the relation of husband and wife, and simply relieves them from the obligation of their relative duties. Divorce annuls the "vinculum matrimonii," so that the parties are no longer man and wife. They stand henceforth to each other in the same relation as they were before marriage. That this is the true idea of divorce is plain from the fact that under the old dispensation if a man put away his wife, she was at liberty to marry again. (Deut. xxiv. 1, 2.) This of course supposes that the marriage relation to her former husband was effectually dissolved. Our Lord teaches the same doctrine. The passages in the Gospels, referring to this subject, are Matthew v. 31, 32; xix. 3-9; Mark x. 2-12; and Luke xvi. 18. The simple meaning of these passages seems to be, that marriage is a permanent compact, which cannot be dissolved at the will of either of the parties. If, therefore, a man arbitrarily puts away his wife and marries another, he commits adultery. If he repudiates her on just grounds and marries another, he commits no offence. Our Lord makes the guilt of marrying after separation to depend on the ground of the separation. Saying, that if a man puts away his wife for any cause save fornication, and marries another, he commits adultery'; is saying that the offence is not committed if the specified ground of divorce exists.' And this is saying that divorce, when justifiable, dissolves the marriage tie.

Although this seems so plainly to be the doctrine of the Scriptures, the opposite doctrine prevailed early in the Church, and soon gained the ascendancy. Augustine himself taught in his work "De Conjugiis Adulterinis," [343] and elsewhere, that neither of the parties after divorce could contract a new marriage. In his "Retractions," however, he expresses doubt on the subject. It passed, however, into the canon law, and received the authoritative sanction of the Council of Trent, which says, [344] "Si quis dixerit, ecclesiam errare, cum docuit et docet, juxta evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam, propter adulterium alterius conjugum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi; et utrumque, vel etiam innocentem, qui causam adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjuge vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere; moecharique eum, qui, dimissa adultera, aliam duxerit, et eam, quæ, dimisso adultero, alii nupserit; anathema sit." This is the necessary consequence of the doctrine, that the marriage relation can be dissolved only by death. The indisposition of the mediæval and Romish Church to admit of remarriages after divorce, is no doubt to be attributed in part to the low idea of the marriage state prevailing in the Latin Church. It had its ground, however, in the interpretation given to certain passages of Scripture. In Mark x. 11, 12, and in Luke xvi. 18, our Lord says without any qualification: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." This was taken as the law on the subject, without regard to what is said in Matthew v. 31, 32, and xix. 3-9. As, however, there is no doubt of the genuineness of the passages in Matthew, they cannot be overlooked. One expression of the will of Christ is as authoritative and as satisfactory as a thousand repetitions could make it. The exception stated in Matthew, therefore, must stand. The reason for the omission in Mark and Luke may

be accounted for in different ways. It is said by some that the exception was of necessity understood from its very nature, whether mentioned or not. Or having been stated twice, its repetition was unnecessary. Or what perhaps is most probable, as our Lord was speaking to Pharisees, who held that a man might put away his wife when he pleased, it was enough to say that such divorces as they were accustomed to, did not dissolve the bonds of marriage, and that the parties remained as much man and wife as they were before. Under the Old Testament, divorce on the ground of adultery, was out of the question, because adultery was punished by death. And, therefore, it was only when Christ was laying down the law of his own kingdom, under which the death penalty for adultery was to be abolished, that it was necessary to make any reference to that crime.

It has been earnestly objected to the doctrine that adultery dissolves the marriage bond, that both parties, the guilty as well the innocent become free, and either may contract a new marriage. If this be so, it is said, that all that a man, who wishes to get rid of his wife, has to do, is to commit that offence. He will then be at liberty to marry whom he chooses. To this it might be a sufficient answer to say that the objection bears rather against the wisdom of the law, than against the fact that it is the law; or in other words, the objection is against the plain meaning of the words of Christ. But it is to be remembered, that adultery is a crime in the sight of man as well as in the sight of God, and as such it ought to be punished. Under the old dispensation it was punished by death; under the new, it may be punished by imprisonment, or by prohibition of any future marriage. Christ leaves the punishment of this, as of other crimes, to be determined by his disciples in their civil capacity. All He does is to teach what its effects are, "in foro conscientiæ," as to the marriage bond.

Grounds of Divorce.

As already stated, marriage is an indissoluble compact between one man and one woman. It cannot be dissolved by any voluntary act of repudiation on the part of the contracting parties; nor by any act of the Church or State. "Those whom God has joined together, no man can put asunder." The compact may, however, be dissolved, although by no legitimate act of man. It is dissolved by death. It is dissolved by adultery; and as Protestants teach, by wilful desertion. In other words, there are certain things which from their nature work a dissolution of the marriage bond. All the legitimate authority the state has in the premises is to take cognizance of the fact that the marriage is dissolved; officially to announce it, and to make suitable provision for the altered relation of the parties.

Under the preceding head it has already been shown that according to the plain teaching of our Saviour the marriage bond is annulled by the crime of adultery. The reason of this is, that the parties are no longer one, in the mysterious sense in which the Bible declares a man and his wife to be one. [345] The Apostle teaches on this subject the same doctrine that Christ had taught. The seventh chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians is devoted to the subject of marriage, in reference to which several questions had been proposed to him.

He first lays down the general principle, founded on the Word of God and the nature of man, that it is best that every man should have his own wife and every wife her own husband; but in view of the "present (or imminent) distress," he advises his readers not to marry. He writes to the Corinthians as a man would write to an army about to enter on a most unequal conflict in an enemy's country, and for a protracted period. He tells them: This is no time for you to think of marriage. You have a right to marry. And in general it is best that all men

should marry. But in your circumstances marriage can only lead to embarrassment and increase of suffering.' This limitation of his advice not to marry, to men in the circumstances of those to whom the advice is given, is not only stated in so many words in verse 26, but it is the only way in which Paul can be reconciled with himself or with the general teaching of the Bible. It has already been remarked, that no one of the sacred writers speaks in more exalted terms of marriage than this Apostle. He represents it as a most ennobling spiritual union, which raises a man out of himself and makes him live for another; a union so elevated and refining as to render it a fit symbol of the union between Christ and his Church. Marriage, according to this Apostle, does for man in the sphere of nature, what union with Christ does for him in the sphere of grace.

Having thus given it as a matter of advice that it was best, under existing circumstances, for Christians not to marry, he proceeds to give directions to those who were already married. Of these here were two classes: first, those where both husband and wife were Christians; and secondly, those where one of the parties was a believer and the other an unbeliever, i.e., a Jew or a heathen. With regard to the former he says, that as according to the law of Christ the marriage is indissoluble, neither party had the right to repudiate the other. But if, in violation of the law of Christ, a wife had deserted her husband, she was bound either to remain unmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband. The Apostle thus impliedly recognizes the principle that there may be causes which justify a woman's leaving her husband, which do not justify a dissolution of the marriage bond.

With regard to those cases in which one of the parties was a Christian and the other an unbeliever, he teaches, first, that such marriages are lawful, and, therefore, ought not to be dissolved. But, secondly, that

if the unbelieving partner depart, i.e., repudiates the marriage, the believing partner is not bound; i.e., is no longer bound by the marriage compact. This seems to be the plain meaning. If the unbelieving partner is willing to continue in the marriage relation, the believing party is bound; bound, that is, to be faithful to the marriage compact. If the unbeliever is not willing to remain, the believer in that case is not bound; i.e., bound by the marriage compact. In other words, the marriage is thereby dissolved. This passage is parallel to Romans vii. 2. The Apostle there says, a wife "is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." So here he says, A wife is bound to her husband if he is willing to remain with her; but if he deserts her, she is free from him.' That is, wilful desertion annuls the marriage bond. This desertion, however, must be deliberate and final. This is implied in the whole context. The case contemplated is where the unbelieving husband refuses any longer to regard his believing partner as his wife.

This interpretation of the passage is given not only by the older Protestant interpreters, but also by the leading modern commentators, as De Wette, Meyer, Alford, and Wordsworth, and in the Confessions of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Even the Romanists take the same view. They hold, indeed, that among Christians marriage is absolutely indissoluble except by the death of one of the parties. But if one of the partners be an unbeliever, then they hold that desertion annuls the marriage contract. On this point Cornelius à Lapide, of Louvain and Rome, says, "Nota, Apostolum permittere hoc casu non tantum thori divortium sed etiam matrimonii; ita ut possit conjux fidelis aliud matrimonium inire." Lapide refers to Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Ambrose in support of this opinion. [346] The Canon Law, under the

title "Divortiis" teaches the same doctrine. Wordsworth's comment on the passage is, "Although a Christian may not put away his wife, being an unbeliever, yet if the wife desert her husband (chorizetai) he may contract a second marriage."

The Romanists indeed rest their sanction to remarriage in the case supposed, on the ground that there is an essential difference between marriage where one or both the parties are heathen, and marriage where both parties are Christians. This, however, makes no difference. Paul had just said that such unequal marriages were lawful and valid. Neither party could legitimately repudiate or leave the other. The ground of divorce indicated is not difference of religion, but desertion.

There is a middle ground taken by many, both ancients and moderns, in the interpretation of this passage. They admit that desertion justifies divorce, but not the remarriage of the party deserted. To this it may be objected, --

1. That this is inconsistent with the nature of divorce. We have already seen that divorce among the Jews, as explained by Christ, and as understood in the apostolic Church, was such a separation of man and wife as dissolved the marriage bond. This idea was expressed in the use of the words apoluein, aphienai, chorizein and these are the words here used.

2. This interpretation is inconsistent with the context and with the design of the Apostle. Among the questions submitted to his decision, was this, Is it lawful for a Christian to remain in the marriage relation with an unbeliever?' Paul answers, Yes; such marriages are lawful and valid. Therefore if the unbeliever is willing to continue the marriage relation, the believer remains bound; but if the unbeliever refuses to continue the marriage, the believer is no longer

bound by it.' To say that the believer is no longer bound to give up his or her religions which seems to be Neander's idea, or is not bound to force himself or herself upon an unwilling partner, would be nothing to the point. No Christian could think himself bound to give up his religion, and no one could think it possible that married life could be continued without the consent of the parties. The question, in this sense, was not worth either asking or answering.

3. Desertion, from the nature of the offence, is a dissolution of the marriage bond. Why does death dissolve a marriage? It is because it is a final separation. So is desertion. Incompatibility of temper, cruelty, disease, crime, insanity, etc., which human laws often make grounds of divorce, are not inconsistent with the marriage relation. A woman may have a disagreeable, a cruel, or a wicked husband, but a man in his grave, or one who refuses to recognize her as his wife, cannot be her husband.

It is said, indeed, that this doctrine makes marriage depend on the option of the parties. Either may desert the other; and then the marriage is dissolved. The same objection was made to our Lord's doctrine that adultery destroys the marriage bond. It was maid that if this be so, either party might dissolve the marriage, by committing that crime. As the objections are the same, the answer is the same. As adultery is a crime, so is desertion; and both should be punished. The question is not what these crimes deserve, but what are their legitimate effects, according to the Scriptures, on the marriage relation.

That desertion is a legitimate ground of divorce, was therefore, as before mentioned, the doctrine held by the Reformers, Luther, Calvin, and Zwingle, and almost without exception by all the Protestant churches. [347]

Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

Marriage is thus defined in the Roman Catechism: "Matrimonium est viri, et mulieris maritalis conjunctio inter legitimas personas, individuam vitæ consuetudinem retinens." The clause "inter legitimas personas," is explained by saying, "Qui a nuptiarum conjunctione legibus omnino exclusi sunt, ii matrimonium inire non possunt; neque, si ineant, ratum est, exempli enim gratia: qui intra quartum gradum propinquitate conjuncti sunt, puerque ante decimum quartum annum, aut puella ante duodecimum, quæ ætas legibus constituta est, ad matrimonii justa foedera ineunda apti esse non possunt." The clause, "Individuam vitæ consuetudinem retinens," it is said, "indissolubilis vinculi naturam declarat quo vir, et uxor colligantur." [348]

Marriage is to be contemplated under two aspects. It is an institution founded in nature, and therefore exists wherever men exist. It is a lawful institution among the heathen as well as among Christians. But as it is an ordinance of God it has a character among those who know the true God and thus regard it, far higher than it has for those who are the worshippers of false gods. And, therefore, marriage, under the old dispensation, had a much higher character than it had among the heathen. Nevertheless, among Christians marriage is something far more sacred than it was under the Mosaic economy. Christ had raised it te the dignity of a sacrament. [349]

Marriage a Sacrament.

The word sacrament is one of vague and various meaning. Sometimes it means that which is sacred or consecrated; sometimes that which has, or is intended to have a sacred meaning; i.e., an external sign of some religious truth or grace; sometimes a divinely appointed external rite instituted to be a means of grace; and sometimes a divinely appointed external sign that contains and conveys the grace which it signifies.

It is in this last sense that the word is used by Romanists; and it is in this sense they teach that marriage is a sacrament. The principal Scriptural authority for this doctrine they find in Ephesians v. 32, where, as they understand the passage, the words to musterion touto mega estin, rendered in the Vulgate, "Sacramentum hoc magnum est," are spoken of marriage. According to this version and interpretation, the Apostle does indeed directly assert that marriage is a mystery. But (1.) The words do not refer to marriage, but to the mystical union between Christ and his people as appears from the Apostle's own explanation in the following clause: "I speak concerning Christ and the Church." The two subjects, the union of husband and wife and the union between Christ and his people, had been so combined and interwoven in the preceding verses, that it would have been difficult to determine to which the words, "This is a great mystery," were intended to refer, had not the Apostle himself told us. But (2.) Even if the Apostle does say that the marriage union is a great mystery, which in one sense it clearly is, that would not prove that it is a sacrament. The word "mystery," as used in the Bible, means something hidden or unknown; something which can be known only by divine revelation. Thus the Gospel itself is repeatedly said to be a mystery (Eph. iii. 3-9); the future conversion of the Jews is said to be a mystery (Rom. xi. 25); the incarnation is said to be the great mystery of godliness (1 Tim. iii. 16); and anything obscure or enigmatical is called a mystery (Rev. xvii. 6); thus the mystery of the seven candlesticks is their secret meaning. If, therefore, Paul says that marriage is a great mystery in the sense that no one can fully understand what is meant when God says that husband and wife are one, or even in the sense that marriage has a sacred import, that it is a symbol of a great religious truth, this is what all Protestants admit and what is clearly taught in Scripture.

Paul had himself just set forth marriage as the great analogue of the mystical union of Christ and the Church. (3.) Admitting still further that marriage was properly called "sacramentum," that would prove nothing to the purpose. That Latin word had not the sense attached to it by Romanists until long after the apostolic age. It has not that sense even in the Vulgate. In 1 Timothy iii. 16, the manifestation of God in the flesh is declared to be the "great mystery of godliness," which the Vulgate translates "magnum pietatis sacramentum;" but Romanists do not hold that the incarnation is a sacrament in the ecclesiastical sense of that term. The Latin Church, however, having gradually come to attach to the word the idea of a divinely appointed rite or ceremony, which signifies, contains, and conveys grace, and finding, as the words were understood, marriage declared in Ephesians v. 32 to be a "sacramentum," it came to teach that it was a sacrament in the same sense as baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Romanists then teach that marriage is a sacrament not merely because it is the sign or symbol of the union of Christ and his Church. The Roman Catechism says, [350] (1). That no one should doubt "quod scilicet viri, et mulieris conjunctio, cujus Deus auctor est, sanctissimi illius vinculi, quo Christus dominus cum Ecclesia conjungitur, sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum sit." If this were all, no Protestant could object. (2). But Romanists teach that marriage is a sacrament because it not only signifies but also confers grace. The ceremony, including the consent of the parties, the benediction, and the intention of the priest, renders the bride and groom holy. It sanctifies them. "Ex opere operato," it transforms mere natural human love into that holy spiritual affection which renders their union a fit emblem of the union of Christ and the Church. On this point the Council of Trent says: [351] "Gratiam, vero, quæ naturalem illum amorem perficeret, et

indissolubilem unitatem confirmaret, conjugesque sanctificaret, ipse Christus, venerabilium sacramentorum institutor, atque perfector, sua nobis passione promeruit." It would be a great blessing if this were so. Facts, however, prove that the sacramental efficacy of matrimony no more so sanctifies husbands and wives as to make their mutual love like the holy love of Christ for his Church, than baptism confers (to those not opposing an obstacle) all the benefits, subjective and objective, of the redemption of Christ. If the sacramentarian theory were true, all Christians would be perfect and Christendom would be paradisaical. Marriage between Christians, according to Romanists, is indissoluble. Neither adultery nor desertion justifies divorce. Death alone can sever the bond. It is not to be inferred from this, however, that marriage is a more sacred institution among Romanists than among Protestants. Any departure from Scriptural rules is sure to work evil. The denial that adultery destroys the marriage bond, leads naturally, and in fact has led, not only to render that crime more frequent, but also to unscriptural devices to remedy the injustice of forcing a husband or wife to maintain the conjugal relation with a guilty partner. One of these devices is the multiplication of the causes of separation "a mensa et thoro"; and another still more unscriptural, is the multiplying the reasons which render marriage null and void "ab initio." No less than sixteen causes which render marriages null are enumerated by Romish theologians. [352]

The causes which justify separation without divorce, are vows, adultery, apostasy, and crimes. Under the last head they include cruelty and prodigality. If the parties had not been baptized, divorce "a vinculo" was allowed when one of the partners became a Romanist and the other refused to, and also for any serious crime. The whole matter is in the hands of the Church, which claims the right of making and

unmaking impediments to marriage at pleasure. "Si quis dixerit Ecclesiam non potuisse constituere impedimenta, matrimonium dirimentia, vel in iis constituendis errasse; anathema sit." [353] At one period the Church of Rome made consanguinity within the seventh degree an impediment to marriage; at present it forbids marriage within the fourth degree inclusive. "The old Catholic theory of marriage," says President Woolsey, "was practically a failure in all its parts, in its ascetic frown on marriage, in its demand from the clergy of an abstinence not required from the Christian laity, in teaching that nothing but death could release the married pair from their obligations. When it sought for impracticable virtue, and forbade to some what God had allowed to all, it opened a fountain of vice with the smallest incitement to virtue." [354]

Laws of Protestant Countries concerning Divorce.

It has already been shown that Protestants, making the Scriptures their guide, taught that the dissolution of the bond of marriage was allowable only for the two offences of adultery and wilful desertion. So far as the churches and their confessions are concerned, this is still the doctrine of almost all Protestant denominations. When, however, marriage came to be regarded as essentially a civil contract, it gradually fell under the jurisdiction of the state, and laws were passed varying in different countries, as legislators were influenced by mere views of justice or expediency. The legislation of all European nations was greatly influenced by the old Roman law; and, therefore, when marriage was removed from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church, the laws concerning it were more or less adopted from the ancient code. The Roman laws concerning divorce were very lax. Mutual consent was, even after the Roman emperors became Christian, regarded as a sufficient reason for dissolving the bond of marriage. When the

Church gained the ascendancy over the State, and the pope became the virtual legislator of Christendom, divorce for any reason was forbidden; and when and where the pope in his turn was dethroned, there was a general tendency to return to the laxity of the Roman legislation.

England.

England was an exception to this rule. It discarded less of popish usages than any other Protestant nation. For a long time after the Reformation no special law concerning divorce was passed. The ecclesiastical courts could decree separation "a mensa et thoro," but a full divorce "a vinculo" could be obtained only by a special act of Parliament. Under the reign of the present sovereign all such questions were removed from the ecclesiastical courts and remitted to a civil tribunal. That tribunal is authorized to grant judicial separation "a mensa et thoro" on the ground of adultery, or cruelty, or desertion without just cause for two years and upward; and dissolution of marriage on account of simple adultery on the part of the wife, or aggravated adultery on the part of the husband. Such divorce gives both parties liberty to contract a new marriage. "On the whole, with serious defects," says President Woolsey, "it seems to us to be an excellent law. It does honour to the Christian country where it is in force, and it is certainly a great improvement on the former mode of regulating divorce in England." [355] It may be a good law in comparison with the lawlessness that preceded it, and in comparison with the lax legislation of other Protestant nations, but it is not good so far as it is not conformed to the Scriptures. The New Testament makes no such distinction as is made in this law, between adultery on the part of the wife and the same offence on the part of the husband. And it is not good in not allowing wilful desertion to be a legitimate ground of

divorce, if, as Protestants almost universally believe, the Bible teaches the contrary.

France.

In France the laws of the Romish Church were in force until the Revolution. That event threw everything into confusion, and the sanctity of marriage was in a great degree disregarded. Under the empire of the first Napoleon, the civil code allowed divorce, (1.) for simple adultery on the part of the wife; (2.) for aggravated adultery on the part of the husband; (3.) for outrages and cruelty; (4.) for the condemnation of either party to an infamous punishment; and (5.) for mutual persistent consent. The restoration of the Bourbons put an end to these laws and led to the entire prohibition of divorce.

Germany.

Among the Protestants of Germany, the views of the Reformers, as a general thing, controlled the action of the several states on this subject until about the middle of the eighteenth century, when the laws of marriage were greatly relaxed. Göschen attributes this change in a great measure to the influence of Thomasius (1728), who regarded marriage as merely a civil institution designed for the purposes of the state, and which, therefore, might be set aside whenever it failed to answer the desired end. [356] The present law of Prussia, although an improvement on the previous legislation, is far below the Scriptural standard. Besides adultery and wilful desertion, it makes many other offences grounds of divorce, for example, plots endangering the life or health of the other party; gross injuries; dangerous incompatibility of temper; crimes entailing an infamous punishment; habitual drunkenness and extravagance; and deliberate mutual consent, if there be no children fruit of the marriage to be dissolved.

The United States.

The laws of the several states of this Union on the subject of divorce vary from the extreme of strictness to the extreme of laxness. In South Carolina no divorce has ever been given. The effect of refusing to regard adultery as a dissolution of the marriage bond is, as proved by the experience of Catholic countries, to lead the people to regard that crime as a pardonable offence. It was indictable. In New York adultery is the only ground of divorce; but separation from bed and board is granted for cruelty, desertion, and refusal on the part of the husband to make provision for the support of the wife. In several of the other states, besides adultery and desertion, many other grounds are made sufficient to justify divorce; of these grounds the following are the principal: imprisonment, neglect to provide for the maintenance of the wife, habitual drunkenness, and cruelty. In some states the whole matter is left to the discretion of the courts. In the laws of Maine it is said that divorce "a vinculo" may be granted by any justice of the Supreme Court, "when in the exercise of a sound discretion, he deems it reasonable and proper, conducive to domestic harmony, and consistent with the peace and morality of society." The law of Indiana says divorce may be granted for any cause for which the court deems it proper. [357] In Rhode Island to the enumeration of specific causes is added, "and for any other gross misbehaviour and wickedness in either of the parties, repugnant to and in violation of the marriage covenant." In Connecticut the statute passed in 1849 allows divorce for "any such misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner and defeats the purpose of the conjugal relation." [358]

Duty of the Church and of its Officers.

There are certain principles bearing on this subject which will be generally conceded, (1.) Every legislative body is bound to conform its enactments to the moral law. This may be assumed as a self-evident

proposition. (2.) Every Christian legislature is bound to conform its action to the laws of Christianity. By a Christian legislature is meant one which makes laws for a Christian people. It is not necessary that it should represent them as Christians, to be their agents in teaching, propagating, or enforcing the principles of the Christian religion. It is enough to constitute it a Christian legislature that the great body of its constituents who are bound to obey its laws are Christians. No one hesitates to say that Italy, Spain, and France are Catholic countries; or that England, Sweden, and Prussia are Protestant. As all the powers of legislatures are derived from the people, it is irrational to suppose that the people would delegate to their representatives authority to violate their religion. No legislature of a Christian state, therefore, can have the right to make laws inconsistent with the Christian religion. This principle, so reasonable and obvious, is conceded in the abstract. No state in this Union would dare to legalize adultery or bigamy. Before the Reformation all questions concerning marriage were under the jurisdiction of the Church; after that event they were, in Protestant countries, referred to the authorities of the state. "It never, however," says Stahl, "entered the minds of the Reformers, to assert that marriage was purely a civil institution, to be determined by civil, and not religious laws, or that the testimony of the Church as to the divine laws of marriage was not a binding rule for the legislation of the state." [359] And in still more general terms he declares that "What the Church as such [the body of Christians] testifies to be an unchangeable divine law, jus divinum,' and upholds within its sphere, is the impassable rule and limit for the legislation of a Christian state." [360]

3. No act of any human legislature contrary to the moral law can bind any man, and no such act contrary to the law of Christ can bind any

Christian. If, therefore, a human tribunal annuls a marriage for any reason other than those assigned in the Bible, the marriage is not thereby dissolved. In the judgment of Christians it remains in full force; and they are bound so to regard it. And on the other hand, if the state pronounces a marriage valid, which the Bible declares to be invalid, in the view of Christians it is invalid. There is no help for this. Christians cannot give up their convictions; nor can they renounce their allegiance to Christ. This state of conflict between the laws and the conscience of the people, is the necessary consequence, if a body making laws for a Christian people disregards an authority which the people recognize as divine.

4. The laws of many of the states of this Union, on the matter of divorce, are unscriptural and immoral. If the former, they are the latter in the view of all who believe in the divine authority of the Bible. If the Scriptures be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, they contain the only standard of right and wrong. The moral law is not something self-imposed. It is not what any man or body of men may think right or expedient. It is the revealed will of God as to human conduct; and whatever is contrary to that will is morally wrong. If this be so, then there can be no doubt that the divorce laws of many of our states are immoral. They contravene the law of God. They annul marriages for other reasons than those allowed in Scripture, and even, in some cases, at the discretion of the courts. They pronounce persons not to be man and wife, who by the law of God are man and wife. They pronounce those to be legally married, whose union Christ declares to be adulterous. That is, they legalize adultery. This is a conclusion which cannot be avoided, except by denying either the authority of the Bible, or that it legislates on the subject of marriage. If marriage were a mere civil compact, with regard to which the Scriptures gave no

special directions, it might be regulated by the state according to its news of wisdom or expediency. But if it be an ordinance of God; if He has revealed his will as to who may, and who may not intermarry, and who, when married, may or may not be released from the marriage bond, then the state has no more right to alter these laws than it has to alter the decalogue, and to legalize idolatry or blasphemy. There is no use in covering this matter over. It is wrong to regard anti-Christian laws as matters of small importance.

The action of the state in this matter is not merely negative. It does not simply overlook or refuse to punish the violation of the Scriptural law of divorce, but it intervenes by its positive action, and declares that certain parties are not man and wife, between whom, according to the law of God, the bond of marriage still subsists. It condemns bigamy, but it sanctions what the Bible pronounces bigamy. The law of the state and the law of God, in this regard, are so opposed to each other, that he who obeys the one violates the other.

5. As the Church and its officers are under the highest obligations to obey the law of Christ, it follows that where the action of the state conflicts with that law, such action must be disregarded. If a person be divorced on other than Scriptural grounds and marries again, such person cannot consistently be received to the fellowship of the Church. If a minister be called upon to solemnize the marriage of a person improperly divorced, he cannot, in consistency with his allegiance to Christ, perform the service. This conflict between the civil and divine law is a great evil, and has often, especially in Prussia, given rise to great difficulty.

As all denominations of Christians, Romanists and Protestants, are of one mind on this subject, it is matter of astonishment that these objectionable divorce laws are allowed to stand on the statute-books of

so many of our states. This fact proves either that public attention has not to a sufficient degree been called to the subject, or that the public conscience is lamentably blinded or seared. The remedy is with the Church, which is the witness of God on earth, bound to testify to his truth and to uphold his law. If Christians, in their individual capacity and in their Church courts, would unite in their efforts to arouse and guide public sentiment on this subject, there is little doubt that these objectionable laws would be repealed.

The Social Evil.

This is not a subject to be discussed in these pages; a few remarks, however, in reference to it may not be out of place.

1. It is obviously Utopian to expect that all violations of the seventh commandment can be prevented, any more than that the laws against theft or falsehood should never be disregarded.

2. The history of the world shows that the instinct which leads to the evil in question can never be kept within proper limits, except by moral principle, or by marriage.

3. To these two means of correction, therefore, the efforts of the friends of virtue should be principally directed. There can be no efficient moral culture without religious training. If we would reform our fellow-men, we must bring and keep them from the beginning to the end of their lives under the influence of the truth and ordinances of God; to accomplish this work is the duty assigned to the Church. Besides this general moral culture, there is needed special effort to produce a proper public sentiment with regard to this special evil. So long as the seventh commandment can be violated without any serious loss of self-respect or of public confidence, one of the strongest barriers against vice is broken down. If loss of character as certainly followed a breach of the seventh commandment, as it follows theft or

perjury, the evil would be to a good degree abated. This is already the fact with regard to certain classes. It is so with regard to women; and it is so in the case of the clergy. If a minister of the gospel be guilty of this offence, he is as certainly and effectually ruined as he would be by the commission of any other crime short of murder. The same moral law, however, binds all men. Theft in the case of one man is, in its essential character, just what it is in the case of any other man.

4. The divinely appointed preventive of the social evil is laid down in 1 Corinthians vii. 2: "Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." That there are serious difficulties, in the present state of society, in the way of frequent and early marriages, cannot be denied. The principal of these is no doubt the expensive style of living generally adopted. Young people find it impossible to commence life with the conveniences and luxuries to which they have been accustomed in their fathers houses, and therefore marriage is neglected or postponed. With regard to the poorer classes, provision might be made to endow young women of good character, so as to enable them to begin their married life in comfort. Arrangements may also be made in various ways to lessen the expense of family living.

The end to be accomplished is to facilitate marriage. Those who are so happy as to find in a dictum of Scripture the ultimate reason and the highest motive, may see the end to be attained, although, as in the present case, they are obliged to leave the means of its accomplishment to experts in social science.

Prohibited Marriages.

That certain marriages are prohibited is almost the universal judgment of mankind. Among the ancient Persians and Egyptians, indeed, the nearest relations were allowed to intermarry and in the corrupt period of the Roman Empire, equal laxness more or less prevailed. These

isolated facts do not invalidate the argument from the general judgment of mankind. What all men think to be wrong, must be wrong. This unanimity cannot be accounted for, except by assuming that the judgment in which men thus agree is founded on the constitution of their nature, and that constitution is the work of God. There are cases, therefore, in which the "vox populi" is the "vox Dei."

The Ground or Reason of such Prohibitions.

The reason why mankind so generally condemn the intermarriage of near relations cannot be physical. Physiology is not taught by instinct. It is, therefore, not only an unworthy, but is an altogether unsatisfactory assumption, that such marriages are forbidden because they tend to the deterioration of the race. The fact assumed may, or may not be true; but if admitted, it is utterly insufficient to account for the condemnatory judgment in question.

The two most natural and obvious reasons why the intermarriage of near relations is forbidden are, first, that the natural affection which relatives have for each other is incompatible with conjugal love. They cannot coexist. The latter is a violation and destruction of the former. This reason need only be stated. It requires no illustration. These natural affections are not only healthful, but in the higher grades of relationship, even sacred. The second ground for such prohibitions is a regard to domestic purity. When persons are so nearly related to each other as to justify their living together as one family, they should be sacred one to the other. If this were not the case, evil could hardly fail to occur, when young people grow up in the familiarity of domestic life. The slightest inspection of the details of the law as laid down in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus, shows that his principle underlies many of its specifications.

J. D. Michaelis, in his work on the law of Moses, makes this the only

reason for the Levitical prohibitions. He goes to the extreme of denying that "nearness of kin" is in itself any bar to marriage. His views had great influence, not only on public opinion, but even on legislation in Germany. That influence, however, passed away when a deeper moral and religious feeling gained ascendancy. [361]

Augustine's Theory.

Augustine advanced a theory on this subject, which still has its earnest advocates. He held that the design of all these prohibitory laws was to widen the circle of the social affections. Brothers and sisters are bound together by mutual love. Should they intermarry the circle is not extended. If they choose husbands and wives from among strangers, a larger number of persons are included in the bonds of mutual love. "Habita est ratio rectissima charitatis, ut homines quibus esset utilis atque honesta concordia, diversarum necessitudinum vinculis necterentur; nec unus in uno multas haberet, sed singulæ spargerentur in singulos; ac sic ad socialem vitam diligentius colligandam plurimæ plurimos obtinerent." Thus it would come to pass, "Ut unus homo haberet alteram sororem, alteram uxorem, alteram consobrinam, alterum patrem, alterum avunculum, alterum socerum, alteram matrem, alteram amitam, alteram socrum: atque ita se non in paucitate coarctatum, sed latius atque numerosius propinquitatibus crebris vinculum sociale diffunderet." [362]

A writer in Hengstenberg's "Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung," adopts and elaborately vindicates this theory. He endeavours to show that it answers all the criteria by which any theory on the subject should be tested. These marriages are called "abominations;" and he asks, Is it not shameful that the benevolent ordinance of God for extending the circle of the social affections should be counteracted? They are called "confusion," because they unite those whom God commands to remain

separate. It also accounts for the propriety of the intermarriage of brothers and sisters in the family of Adam; for in the beginning the circle of affection did not admit of being enlarged. It even meets the case if the Levirate law which bound a man to marry the childless widow of his brother. The law which forbids the marriage of relations, holds only where the relationship is close. There must, therefore, be cases just on the line beyond which relationship is no bar to marriage. And with regard to those just within the line, there must be considerations which sometimes outweigh the objections to a given marriage. That God dispensed with the law forbidding the marriage of a man with his brother's widow, when the brother died without children, this German writer regards as impossible. "Evil," he says, "may be tolerated, but not commanded." He adds that it provokes a smile (man muss es naiv nennen) that Gerhard finds an analogy between the case in question and the permission given to the Israelites to despoil the Egyptians. [363]
It is probable that the venerable Gerhard would smile at the writer's criticisms. In the first place, God can no more allow evil than He can command it. An act otherwise evil, ceases to be so when He either allows (i.e., sanctions) it, or commands it. If He commands a man to be put to deaths it ceases to be murder to put him to death. There are two principles of morality generally accepted and clearly Scriptural; one of which is, that any of those moral laws which are founded, not on the immutable nature of God, but upon the relations of men in the present state of existence, may be set aside by the divine law-giver whenever it seems good in his sight; just as God under the old dispensation set aside the original monogamic law of marriage. Polygamy was not sinful as long as God permitted it. The same principle is involved in the words of Christ, God loves mercy and not sacrifice. When two laws conflict, the weaker yields to the stronger. It is wrong to labour on

the Sabbath, but any amount of labour on that day becomes a duty, if necessary to save life. In the case of the Levirate law, the prohibition to marry a brother's widow, yielded to what under the Mosaic economy was regarded as a higher obligation, that is, to perpetuate the family. To die childless was considered one of the greatest calamities.

The question, however, concerning the rationale of these laws is one of minor importance. We may not be able to see exactly in all cases why certain things are forbidden. The fact that they are forbidden should satisfy the reason and the conscience. The two important questions in connection with this subject, to be considered, are, first, is the Levitical law respecting prohibited marriages still in force? and, second, how is that law to be interpreted, and what marriages does it forbid?

Is the Levitical Law of Marriage still in force?

1. It is a strong à priori argument in favour of an affirmative answer to that question, that it always has been regarded as obligatory by the whole Christian Church.

2. The reason assigned for the prohibition contained in that law, has no special reference to the Jews. It is not found is their peculiar circumstances, nor in the design of God in selecting them to be depositaries of his truth to prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah. The reason assigned "is nearness of kin." This reason has as much force at one time as at another, for all nations as for any one nation. There was nothing peculiar in the relation in which Hebrew parents and children, Hebrew brothers and sisters, and Hebrew uncles and nieces, stood, which was the ground of these prohibitions. That ground was the nearness of the relationship itself as it exists in every and in all ages. There is, therefore, in the sight of God, a

permanent reason why near relations ought not to intermarry.

3. If the Levitical law be not still in force, we have no divine law on the subject. Then there is no such sin as incest. It is an offence only against the civil law, and a sin against God only in so far as it is sinful to violate the law of the state. But this is contrary to the universal judgment of men, at least of Christian men. For parents and children, brothers and sisters, to intermarry is universally considered as sin against God, irrespective of any human prohibition. But if a sin against God, it must be forbidden in his Word, or we must give up the fundamental principle of Protestantism, that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of our faith and practice. As such marriages are nowhere in the Bible forbidden except in the Levitical law, if that law does not forbid them, the Bible does not forbid them.

4. The judgments of God are denounced against the heathen nations for permitting the marriages which the Levitical law forbids. In Leviticus xviii. 8, it is said, "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances." This is the introduction to the law of prohibited marriages, containing the specification of the "ordinances" of the Egyptians and Canaanites, which the people of God were forbidden to follow. And in the twenty-seventh verse of the same chapter, at the close of these specifications, it is said, "All these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is deified." Again, in ch. xx. 23, still in reference to these marriages, it is said, "Ye shall not walk in the manners of the nations which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them." This is a clear proof that these laws were binding, not on the Jews alone, but upon all people and at all times.

5. The continued obligation of the Levitical law on this subject is also recognized in the New Testament. This recognition as involved in the constant reference to the law of Moses as the law of God. If in any of its parts or specifications it is no longer obligatory, that is to be proved. It contains much which we learn from the New Testament was designed simply to keep the Hebrews a distinct people; much which was typical; much which was a shadow of things to come, and which passed away when the substance was revealed. It contained, however, much which was moral and of permanent obligation. If God gives a law to men, those who deny its perpetual obligation are bound to prove it. The presumption is that it continues in force until the contrary is proved. It must be hard to prove that laws founded on the permanent social relations of men were intended to be temporary.

Besides this general consideration, we find specific recognitions of the continued obligation of the Levitical law in the New Testament. John the Baptist, as recorded in Mark vi. 18 and Matthew xiv. 4, said to Herod that it was not lawful for him to have his brother Philip's wife. It matters not, as to the argument, whether Philip was living or not. The offence charged was not that he had taken another man's wife, but that he had taken his brother's wife. It may be objected to this argument that during the ministry of John the Baptist the law of Moses was still in force. This Gerhard denies, who argues from Matthew xi. 13, "All the prophets and the law prophesied until John, that the Baptist's ministry belongs to the new dispensation. [364] This may be doubted. Nevertheless John expressed the moral sentiment of his age; and the record of the fact referred to by the Evangelists whose Gospels were written after the Christian Church was fully organized, is given in a form which involves a sanction of the judgment which the Baptist had expressed against the marriage of Herod with his brother's wife. It

is also to be remembered that the Herodian family was Idumean, and therefore, that a merely Jewish law would have no natural authority over them.

The Apostle Paul, moreover, in 1 Corinthians v. 1, speaks of a man's marrying his step-mother as an unheard of offence. That this was a case of marriage and not of adultery is plain because the phrase gunaika echein is never used in the New Testament except of marriage. This, therefore, is a clear recognition of the continued obligation of the law forbidding marriage between near relations, whether the relationship was by consanguinity or affinity.

6. The Bible everywhere enforces those laws which have their foundation in the natural constitution of men. That this Levitical law is a divine authentication of a law of nature, may be inferred from the fact that with rare exceptions the intermarriage of near relations is forbidden among all nations. Paul says that the marriage of a man with his step-mother was unheard of among the heathen; i.e., it was forbidden and abhorred. Cicero exclaims, "Nuoit genero socrus. . . . . O mulieris incredibile et præter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum!" [365] Beza says, It must not be overlooked that the civil laws of the Romans agree completely in reference to this subject with the divine law. They seemed to have copied from it. [366]

No Christian Church doubts the continued obligation of any of the laws of the Pentateuch, of which it can be said that the reason assigned for their enactment is the permanent relations of men; that the heathen are condemned for their violation; and that the New Testament refers to them as still in force: and which heathen nations under the guidance of natural conscience have enacted.

How is the Levitical Law to be interpreted?

Admitting the Levitical law of marriage to be still in force, the next

question is, How is it to be interpreted? Is it to be understood as specifying the degrees of relation, whether of consanguinity or of affinity, within which intermarriage is forbidden? or, is it to be viewed as an enumeration of particular cases, so that no case not specifically mentioned is to be included in the prohibition?

The former of these rules of interpretation is the one generally adopted; for the following reasons: --

1. The language of the law itself. It begins with a general prohibition of marriage between those who are near of kin. Nearness of kindred is made the ground of the prohibition. The specifications which follow are intended to show what degree of nearness of kindred works a prohibition. This reason applies to many cases not particularly mentioned in Leviticus xvii. or elsewhere. The law would seem to be applicable to all cases in which the divinely assigned reason for its enactment is found to exist.

2. The design of the law, as we have seen, is twofold: first, to keep sacred those relationships which naturally give rise to feelings and affections which are inconsistent with the marriage relation; and secondly, the preservation of domestic purity. As the natural affections are due partly to the very constitution of our nature, and partly to the familiarity and constancy of intercourse, and the interchange of kindly offices, it is natural that in the enumeration of the prohibited cases regard should be had, in the selection, to those in which this familiarity of intercourse, at the time the law was enacted, actually prevailed. In the East the family is organized on different principles from those on which it is organized in the West. Among the early Oriental nations especially, the males of a family with their wives remained together; while the daughters, being given in marriage, went away and were amalgamated with the families of their

husbands. Hence it would happen that relatives by the father's side would be intimate associates, while those of the same degree on the mother's side might be perfect strangers. A law, therefore, constructed on the principle of prohibiting marriage between parties so related as to be already in the bonds of natural affection and who were domesticated in the same family circle, would deal principally in specifications of relationships on the father's side. It would not follow, however, from this fact, that relations of the same grade of kindred might freely intermarry, simply because they were not specified in the enumeration. The law in its principle applies to all cases, whether enumerated or not, in which the nearness of kin is the source of natural affection, and in which it leads to and justifies intimate association.

3. Another consideration in favour of the principle of interpretation usually adopted, is, that the opposite rule would introduce the greatest inconsistencies into the law. The law forbids marriage between those near of kin; and, according to this rule, it goes on alternately permitting and forbidding marriages where the relationship is precisely the same. Thus, a man cannot marry the daughter of his son; but a woman may marry the son of her daughter; a man cannot marry the widow of his father's brother, but he may marry the widow of his mother's brother; a woman cannot marry two brothers, but a man may marry two sisters. These inconsistencies might be intelligible if the law were a temporary and local enactment, designed for a transient state of society; but they are utterly unaccountable if the law be one of permanent and universal obligation. A rule of interpretation which brings uniformity and consistency into these enactments of Scripture, is certainly to be preferred to one which renders them confused and inconsistent.

Prohibited Degrees.

The cases specifically mentioned are: 1. Mother. 2. Stepmother. 3. Grand-daughter. 4. Sister and half-sister, "born at home or born abroad," i.e., legitimate or illegitimate. 5. Aunt on the father's side. 6. Maternal aunt. 7. The wife of a father's brother. 8. Daughter-in-law. 9. Brother's wife. 10. A woman and her daughter. 11. A wife's grand-daughter. 12. Two sisters at the same time.

The meaning of Leviticus xviii. 18, has been much disputed. The question is, Whether the words 'sh 'l'tth, "a woman to her sister," are to be understood in their idiomatic sense, "one to another," so that the law forbids bigamy, the taking of one wife to another during her lifetime; or, Whether they are to be taken literally, so that this law forbids a man's marrying the sister of his wife while the latter is living. It is certain that the words in question have in several places the idiomatic sense ascribed to them. In Exodus xxvi. 3, "Five curtains shall be coupled together one to another," literally, "a woman to her sister;" so in verse 5, the loops take hold, "a woman and her sister;" ver. 6, the taches of gold unite the curtains, "a woman and her sister." Also in ver. 17. Thus also in Ezekiel i. 9, it is said, "their wings were joined one to another," "a woman to her sister;" and again in ch. iii. 13. The words therefore admit of the rendering given in the margin of the English version. But it is objected to this interpretation in this case: (1.) That the words in question never mean "one to another," except when preceded by a plural noun; which is not the case in Leviticus xviii. 18. (2.) If this explanation be adopted, the passage contains an explicit prohibition of polygamy, which the law of Moses permitted. (3.) It is unnatural to take the words "wife" and "sister" in a sense different from that in which they are used throughout the chapter. (4) The ancient versions agree with the rendering given in the text of the English Bible. The Septuagint has

gunaika ep adelphe autes; the Vulgate, "sororem uxoris tuæ."

In this interpretation the modern commentators almost without exception agree. Thus Maurer renders the passage: "Uxorem ad (i.e., præter) sororem ejus ne ducito,' i.e., Nolli præter tuam conjugem aliam insuper uxorem ducere, quæ illius soror est." [367] Baumgarten's comment is: "From the fact that the prohibition of the marriage of a wife's sister is expressly conditioned on the life of the former, we must infer with the Rabbins, that after the death of the wife this marriage is permitted. True, the degree of affinity is here the same as in ver. 16, but there the relationship is on the male, here on the female side; this makes a difference, because under the Old Testament the woman had not attained to the same degree of personality and independence as the man." [368] Rosenmüller says: "Uxorem ad sororem ejus ne ducas, duas sorores ne ducas in matrimonium, scil. vhyyh in vita ejus, i.e., uxore tua vivente. Non igitur prohibet Moses matrimonium cum sorores uxoris mortuæ." [369] Knobel says: "Finally, a man shall not marry . . . . the sister of his wife, so long as the latter lives. . . . . To marry one after the other, after the death of the other, is not forbidden." [370] Keil understands v. 18 in the same way. It forbids, according to his view, a man's having two sisters, at the same time, as his wives. "After the death of the first wife," he adds, "marriage with her sister was allowed." [371]

The inference which these writers draw from the fact that in this passage the marriage of a wife's sister is forbidden during the life of the wife, that the marriage of the sister, after the death of the wife, is allowed, is very precarious. All that the passage teaches is, that if a man chooses to have two wives, at the same time, which the law allowed, they must not be sisters; and the reason assigned is, that it would bring the sisters into a false relation to each other. This

leaves the question of the propriety of marrying the sister of a deceased wife just where it was. This verse has no direct bearing on that subject.

The cases not expressly mentioned in Leviticus xviii., although involving the same degree of kindred as those included in the enumeration, are: 1. A man's own daughter. This is a clear proof that the enumeration was not intended to be exhaustive. 2. A brother's daughter. 3. A sister's daughter. 4. A maternal uncle's widow. 5. A brother's son's widow. 6. A sister's son s widow. 7. The sister of a deceased wife.

As nearness of kindred is made the ground of prohibition, and as these cases are included within "the degrees" specified, the Church has considered them as belonging to the class of prohibited marriages. It is, however, to be considered that the word "prohibited," as here used, is very comprehensive. Some of the marriages specified in the Levitical law are prohibited in very different senses. Some are pronounced abominable, and those who contract them are made punishable with death. Others are pronounced unseemly, or evil, and punished by exclusion from the privileges of the theocracy. Others again incur the penalty of dying childless; probably meaning that the children of such marriages should not be enrolled in the family registers which the Jews were so careful to preserve.

As this distinction is recognized in the law itself, so it is founded in the nature of the case. As nearness of kin varies from the most intimate relationship to the most distant, so these marriages vary in their impropriety from the highest to the lowest degree. Some of them may, in certain cases, be wrong, not in themselves, but simply from the obligation to uphold a salutary law. That is, there may be cases to which the law, but not the reason of the law applies. For example; a

man may go thousands of miles from home and marry: his wife would stand in a very different relation to her husband's brothers, than had she lived in the same house with them. The law forbidding a woman to marry the brother of her deceased husband, would apply to her; but the reason of that law would affect her in a very slight degree; nevertheless, even in her case, the law should be observed.

There is another obvious remark that ought to be made. Strong repugnance is often felt and expressed against the Levitical law, not only because it is regarded as placing all the marriages specified on the same level, representing all as equally offensive in the sight of God, but also from the assumption that all the marriages forbidden are, if contracted, invalid. This is a wrong view of the subject. It is inconsistent with the law itself, and contrary to the analogy of Scripture. The law recognizes a great disparity in the impropriety of these marriages. Some, as just remarked, are utterly abominable and insufferable. Others are specified because inexpedient or dangerous, as conflicting with some ethical or prudential principle.

It is in this as in many other cases. The Mosaic law discountenanced and discouraged intermarriage between the chosen people and their heathen neighbours. With regard to the Canaanites, such intermarriages were absolutely forbidden; with other heathen nations, although discountenanced, they were tolerated. Joseph married an Egyptian; Moses, a Midianite; Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter. Such marriages, in the settled state of the Jewish nation, may have been wrong, but they were valid. Even now under the Christian dispensation, believers are forbidden to be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. It does not follow from this that every marriage between a believer and an unbeliever is invalid. These remarks are not out of place. The truth suffers from being misapprehended. If the Bible is made to teach what

is contrary to the common sense, or the intuitive judgments of men, it suffers great injustice. No man can force himself to believe that a man's marrying the sister of a deceased wife is the same kind of offence as a father's marrying his own daughter. The Bible teaches no such doctrine; and it is a slander so to represent it.

Concluding Remarks.

The laws of God are sacred. They are founded, not only on his infinite wisdom, but also on the nature of his creatures, and, therefore, should be sedulously observed. There may, in some cases, be honest difference of opinion as to what the law or will of God is, but when ascertained, it is our wisdom and duty to make it the rule of our conduct. This is so obvious that the statement of it may seem entirely superfluous. It is so common. however, for men professing to be Christians to make their own feelings, opinions, and views of expediency, the rule of action for themselves and others, that it is by no means a work of supererogation, to reiterate on all proper occasions the truism that there is no wisdom like God's wisdom, and that men are never wise except when they follow the wisdom of God as revealed in his Word, even when they have to do it blindly.

There are certain principles which underlie the marriage laws of the Bible, which all men in their private capacity and when acting as legislators, would do well to respect, --

1. The first is, that marriage is not a mere external union; it is not simply a mutual compact; it is not merely a civil contract. It is a real, physical, vital, and spiritual union, in virtue of which man and wife become, not merely in a figurative sense, but really, although in a mysterious sense, one flesh. This is not only expressly declared by Christ himself to be the nature of marriage, but it is the doctrine which underlies the whole Levitical law on this subject. Nearness of

kin is expressed constantly by saying that one is "flesh of the flesh" of the other, s'r vsrv, "Carnem carnis suæ s. corporis sui esse cognatam propinquam, quæ est ut caro ejusdem corporis." [372] According to the Scriptures, therefore, husband and wife are the nearest of all relations to each other. According to the spirit, and most of the legislation of the present age, they are no relations at all. They are simply partners. If one member of a business firm die, his property does no; go to his partner, but to his own family; so if a wife die, without children, her property does not go to her husband, but to her third or fourth cousins. They, in the eye of the law, are more nearly related to her than her husband. This is not the light in which God looks upon marriage.

2. The second principle which underlies these marriage-laws is, that affinity is as real a bond of relationship as consanguinity. Fully one half of the marriages specified in Leviticus are prohibited on the ground of affinity. The same form of expression is used to designate both kinds of relationship. Those related to each other by affinity are said to be "flesh of the flesh," one of the other, just as blood relations; because all the specifications contained in the eighteenth

CHAPTER XX: THE MEANS OF GRACE

THE MEANS OF GRACE

By means of grace are not meant every instrumentality which God may please to make the means of spiritual edification to his children. The phrase is intended to indicate those institutions which God has ordained to be the ordinary channels of grace, i.e., of the supernatural influences of the Holy Spirit, to the souls of men. The means of grace, according to the standards of our Church, are the word, sacraments, and prayer.

---

§ 1. The Word.

1. The word of God, as here understood, is the Bible. And the Bible is the collection of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.

2. These books are the word of God because they were written by men who were prophets, his organs, or spokesmen, in such a sense that whatever they declare to be true or obligatory, God declares to be true and binding. These topics have already been considered in the first volume of this work, so far as they fall within the limits of systematic theology.

3. The word of God, so far as adults are concerned, is an in dispensable means of salvation. True religion never has existed, and never can exist, where the truths revealed in the Bible are unknown. This point also has already been discussed when speaking of the insufficiency of natural religion.

4. The word of God is not only necessary to salvation, but it is also divinely efficacious to the accomplishment of that end. This appears,

(a.) From the commission given to the Church. After his resurrection

our Lord said to his disciples: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in 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. Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). The words as recorded in Mark xvi. 15, 16, are, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." The end to be accomplished, was the salvation of men. The means of its accomplishment was teaching. The disciples were to teach what Christ had taught them. That is, they were to teach the Gospel to every creature under heaven. All means derive their efficiency from the ordinance of God; as He has ordained the Gospel to be the means of salvation, it must be efficacious to that end. (b.) This appears further from the manner in which the Apostles executed the commission which they had received. They went everywhere, preaching Christ. They were sent to teach; and teaching was their whole work. "I determined," said Paul, "not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." (1 Cor. ii. 2.) (c.) The power of the Word is proved from many direct assertions in the Bible. Paul tells the Romans that he was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, because "it is the power of God unto salvation." (Rom. i. 16.) To the Corinthians he says, in view of the utter impotence of the wisdom of the world, that "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." (1 Cor. i. 21.) The preaching of Christ crucified was "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." (Vers. 23, 24.) In the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said: "The word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and

spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv. 12.)

The sacred writers, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are exuberant in their praise of the Word of God, as its power was revealed in their own experience. "The law of the Lord," says the Psalmist, "is perfect, converting the soul." (Ps. xix. 7.) By the law of the Lord is meant the whole revelation which God has made in his Word to determine the faith, form the character, anu control the conduct of men. It is this revelation which the Psalmist pronounces perfect, that is, perfectly adapted to accomplish the end of man's sanctification and salvation. "Thy word." he says "is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Ps. cxix. 105.) "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes: the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb." (Ps. xix. 7-10.) Almost every one of the hundred and seventy-six verses of the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm contains some recognition of the excellence or power of the Word of God. "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" (Jer. xxiii. 29.)

In the New Testament the same divine efficacy is attributed to ths Word of God. It is the gospel of our salvation, i.e., that by which we are saved. Paul said that Christ commissioned him to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, saying, for this purpose I appeared unto thee to make thee minister and a witness, delivering thee from the Gentiles, "unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may

receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." (Acts xxvi. 17, 18.) All this was to be effected by the Gospel. The same Apostle writing to Timothy says: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." (2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.) The Apostle Peter says that men are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Pet. i. 23.) Our Lord prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (John xvii. 17.)

Testimony of History.

There can, therefore, be no doubt that the Scriptures teach that the Word of God is the specially appointed means for the sanctification and the salvation of men. This doctrine of the Bible is fully confirmed by the experience of the Church and of the world. That experience teaches, -- First, that no evidences of sanctification, no indications of the saving influences of the Spirit are found where the Word of God is unknown. This is not saying that none such occur. We know from the Bible itself, "That God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts x. 34, 35.) No one doubts that it is in the power of God to call whom He pleases from among the heathen and to reveal to them enough truth to secure their salvation. [432] Nevertheless it remains a fact patent to all eyes that the nations where the Bible is unknown sit in darkness. The absence of the Bible is just as distinctly discernible as the absence of the sun. The declaration of the Scriptures is that "the whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 John v. 19); and that declaration

is confirmed by all history.

A second fact on which the testimony of experience is equally clear is, that true Christianity flourishes just in proportion to the degree in which the Bible is known, and its truths are diffused among the people. During the apostolic age the messengers of Christ went everywhere preaching his Gospel, in season and out of season; proving from the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; requiring those to whom they preached to search the Scriptures; exhorting younger ministers to preach the Word; to hold forth the Word of life; to give attendance to reading, exhortation, and doctrine; to meditate upon these things and to give themselves wholly to them. During this period the Gospel made more rapid progress, and perhaps brought forth more abundant fruits than during any equally long period of its history. When, however, the truth began to be more and more corrupted by the speculations of philosophy, and by the introduction of the Jewish doctrines concerning ceremonies and the priesthood; when "reserve" in preaching came into vogue, and it was held to be both lawful and wise to conceal the truth, and awaken reverence and secure obedience by other means; and when Christian worship was encumbered by heathen rites, and the trust of the people turned away from God and Christ, to the virgin and saints, then the shades of night overspread the Church, and the darkness became more and more intense, until the truth or light was almost entirely obscured. At the Reformation, when the chained Bible was brought from the cloisters, given to the press, and scattered over Europe, it was like the bright rising of the sun: the darkness was dissipated; the Church arose from the dust, and put on her beautiful garments, for the glory of God had arisen upon her. Wherever the reading and preaching of the Word was unrestricted, there light, liberty, and true religion prevailed, in a proportionate degree.

Wherever the Bible was suppressed and the preaching of its truths was forbidden, there the darkness continued and still abides.

A third important fact equally well established is, that true religion prevails in any community, in proportion to the degree in which the young are instructed in the facts and indoctrinated in the truths of the Bible. This, in one view, is included under the previous head, but it deserves separate notice. The question does not concern the reason why the religious education of the young is so important; or the way in which that education can most advantageously be secured; but simply the fact that where the young are from the beginning imbued with the knowledge of the Bible, there pure Christianity abides; and where they are allowed to grow up in ignorance of divine truth, there true religion languishes and loses more and more its power. Such is the testimony of experience.

It is, therefore, the united testimony of Scripture and of history that the Bible, the Word of God, is the great means of promoting the sanctification and salvation of men, that is, of securing their temporal and eternal well being. Those consequently who are opposed to religion; who desire the reign of indifferentism, or the return of heathen doctrines and heathen morality, are consistent and wise in their generation, in endeavouring to undermine the authority of the Bible; to discourage its circulation; to discountenance attendance on its preaching; and especially to oppose its being effectually taught to the young. Those on the other hand who believe that without holiness no man can see God, and that without the light of divine truth, holiness is impossible, are bound as pastors, as parents, and as citizens to insist that the Bible shall have free course, and that it shall be faithfully taught to all under their influence or for whose training they are responsible.

To what is the Power of the Word to be attributed?

It being admitted as a fact that the Bible has the power attributed to it, the question arises, To what is that due? To this question different answers are given. Some say that its whole power lies in the nature of the truths which it contains. This is the doctrine held by Pelagians and Rationalists. On this subject it may be remarked, (1.) That all truth has an adaptation to the human mind and tends to produce an impression in accordance with its nature. If a mind could be conceived or destitute of all truth, it would be in a state of idiocy. The mind is roused to action and expanded, and its power is increased by the truth, and, other things being equal, in proportion to the amount of truth communicated to it. (2.) It is the tendency of all moral truth in itself considered, to excite right moral feelings and to lead to right moral action. (3.) It is further conceded that the truths of the Bible and the sources of moral power therein contained are of the highest possible order. The doctrine, for example, therein taught concerning God, that He is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, is immeasurably above all that human reason ever discovered or human philosophy ever taught. There is more moral power in that single truth, than in all the systems of moral philosophy. The same may be said of what the Bible teaches of God's relation to the world. He is not merely its creator and architect, but also its constant preserver and governor; everywhere present, working with and by his creatures, using each according to its nature, and overruling all things to the accomplishment of the highest and most beneficent designs. To his rational creatures, especially to men, He reveals Himself as a father, loving, guiding, and providing for them; never afflicting them willingly, but only when it would be morally wrong to do otherwise. The

Bible doctrine concerning man is not only true, conformed to all that man reveals himself to be, but it is eminently adapted to make him what he was designed to be: to exalt without inflating; to humble without degrading him. The Bible teaches that God made man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul conformed to the image of God in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. Thus man is apparently the lowest of God s rational creatures, but made capable of indefinite progress in capacity, excellence, and blessedness. The actual state of man however exhibits a sad contrast with this account of his original condition. The Bible accordingly informs us that man fell from the state in which he was created by sinning against God. Thus sin was introduced into the world: all men are sinners, that is, guilty, polluted, and helpless. These are facts of consciousness, as well as doctrines of the Bible. The Scriptures however inform us that God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son, that whoso believeth on Him might not perish but have everlasting life. We are told that this Son is the image of God, equal with God. 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. This divine Person, for us and for our salvation, took upon Him our nature, fulfilled all righteousness, bore our sins in his own body on the tree; and having died for our offences, rose again for our justification; and is now seated at the right hand of the majesty on high; all power in heaven and earth having been committed to his hands. There is more of power to sanctify, to elevate, to strengthen and to cheer in the single word Jesus, which means "Jehovah-saviour," than in all the utterances of men since the world began. This divine and

exalted Saviour has sent forth his disciples to preach his Gospel to every creature, promising pardon, sanctification, and eternal life, including a participation in his glory, to every one, on the sole condition that he receive Him as his God and Saviour, and, trusting in Him alone for salvation, honestly endeavour to do his will; that is, to love God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself, and to do to others as he would have others do to him. In view of all these truths, God asks, "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" All the resources of moral power are exhausted in the Bible. Every consideration that can affect the intellect, the conscience, the feelings, and the hopes of man is therein presented: yet all in vain.

There are two conditions necessary for the production of a given effect. The one is that the cause should have the requisite efficiency; and the other, that the object on which it acts should have the requisite susceptibility. The sun and rain shed their genial influences on a desert, and it remains a desert; when those influences fall on a fertile plain, it is clothed with all the wonders of vegetable fertility and beauty. The mid-day brightness of the sun has no more effect on the eyes of the blind than a taper; and if the eye be bleared the clearest light only enables it to see men as trees walking. It is so with moral truth: no matter what may be its inherent power, it fails of any salutary effect unless the mind to which it is presented be in a fit state to receive it.

The minds of men since the fall are not in a condition to receive the transforming and saving power of the truths of the Bible and therefore it is necessary, in order to render the Word of God an effectual means of salvation, that it should be attended by the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit. The Apostle says expressly, "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 Cor. ii. 14.) In the preceding chapter he had said, that the same gospel which to the called was the power and wisdom of God, was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. Our Lord said to the Jews: "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my Word. He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not because ye are not of God." (John viii. 43, 47.) Everything that the Scriptures teach of the state of men since the fall proves that until enlightened by the Holy Ghost they are spiritually blind, unable to discern the true nature of the things of the Spirit, and therefore incapable of receiving a due impression from them. Experience confirms this teaching of the Bible. It shows that no mere moral power of truth as presented objectively to the mind is of any avail to change the hearts of men. There once appeared on earth a divine person clothed in our nature; exhibiting the perfection of moral excellence in the form of a human life: holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners; humble, disinterested, beneficent, tender, patient, enduring, and dispensing blessings on all who approached him. Yet this person was to the men of his generation without form or comeliness. He came to his own and his own received him not. They rejected him and preferred a murderer. And in what respect are we better than they? How is Christ regarded by the mass of the men of this generation? Multitudes blaspheme Him. The majority scarcely think of Him. He is to them no more than Socrates or Plato. And yet there is in Him such a revelation of the glory of God, as would constrain every human heart to love and adore Him, had not the god of this world blinded the eyes of those who believe not. It is vain therefore to talk of the moral power of truth converting men.

There are some who throw a vail over this rationalistic doctrine, and delude themselves and others into the belief that they stand on more Scriptural ground than Rationalists, because they admit that the Spirit is operative in the truth. Every theist believes that God is everywhere present in the world and always sustaining and coöperating with physical causes in the production of their various effects. So the Spirit is in the world, everywhere present and everywhere active, coöperating with moral causes in producing their legitimate effects. There is nothing in the operation of physical causes transcending their legitimate effects; and there is nothing in the regeneration, conversion, and sanctification of men which transcends the legitimate effects of moral truth. The one series of effects is just as natural, and just as little supernatural, as the other. It has already been shown on a previous page, [433] that this is all that the most advanced rationalists require. It excludes the supernatural, which is all they demand. In the effects produced by physical causes guided by the providential efficiency of God, there is nothing which exceeds the power of those causes; and in the effects produced by the moral power of the truth under the coöperation of the Spirit, there is nothing which exceeds the power of the truth. The salvation of the soul is as much a natural process as the growth of a plant. The Scriptures clearly teach that there is an operation of the Spirit on the soul anterior to the sanctifying influence of the truth, and necessary to render that influence effective. A dead man must be restored to life, before the objects of sense can produce upon him their normal effect. Those spiritually dead must be quickened by the almighty power of God, before the things of the Spirit can produce their appropriate effect. Those spiritually blind must have their eyes opened before they can discern the things freely given, or revealed, to them of God. This influence

being anterior to, cannot be through, the truth. Hence we find numerous prayers in every part of the Scriptures for this antecedent work of the Spirit; prayers that God would change the hearts, open the eyes, and unstop the ears of men; or that He would give them ears to hear, and eyes to see. The Spirit is everywhere represented as a personal agent, distributing his gifts to every one severally as He will. He arouses their attention, controls their judgments, and awakens their affections. He convinces them of sin, righteousness, and judgment. He works in the people of God both to will and to do. He teaches, guides, comforts, and strengthens. His influence is not confined to one activity producing an initial change, and then leaving the renewed soul to the influences of the truth and of the ordinances, it is abiding. It is not however the influence of a uniformly acting force coöperating with the truth; but that of a person, acting when and where He pleases; more at one time than at another, sometimes in one way and sometimes in another. He is a "Helper" who can be invoked, or who can be grieved and resisted. All these representations of the Scriptures, which are utterly inconsistent with the purely rationalistic doctrine, as well as with the doctrine which either confounds the operations of the Spirit with the providential efficiency of God, or regards them as analogous, have impressed themselves on the general consciousness of the Church. Every believer feels that he stands to the Holy Spirit in the relation which one person sustains to another: a person on whom he is dependent for all good; whose assistance must be sought, and whose assistance may be granted or withheld at pleasure; and who may come or withdraw either for a season or forever. Such has been the faith of the Church in all ages, as is manifest from its creeds, its hymns, and its prayers. While all Christians admit that God's providential efficiency extends over all his works, and that all good in fallen man is due to the presence

and power of his Holy Spirit, yet they have ever felt and believed, under the guidance of the Scriptures, that the divine activity in these different spheres is entirely different. The spheres themselves are different; the ends to be accomplished are different; and the mode of operation is different. In nature (especially in the external world) God acts by law; his providential efficiency is a "potentia ordinata;" in grace it is more a "potentia absoluta," untrammelled by law. It is personal and sovereign. He does not act continuously or in any one way; but just as He sees fit. He works in us "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." (Phil. ii. 13.) As just remarked, therefore, every Christian feels his dependence not upon law, but on the good-will of a person. Hence the prayers so frequent in Scripture, and so constantly on the lips of believers, that the Spirit would not cast us off; would not give us up; would not be grieved by our ingratitude or resistance: but that He would come to us, enlighten us, purify, elevate, strengthen, guide, and comfort us; that He would come to our households, renew our children, visit our churches, and multiply his converts as the drops of the morning dew; and that He would everywhere give the Word of God effect.

This sovereignty in the operations of the Spirit is felt and recognized by every parent, by every pastor, and by every missionary. It is the revealed purpose of God that it must be acknowledged. "See your calling brethren," says the Apostle; not the wise, the great, the good, but the foolish, those who are of no account, hath God chosen in order "that no flesh should glory in his presence." (1 Cor. i. 26-29.) No man is to be allowed to attribute his conversion or salvation to himself, to law, or to the efficiency of means. It is in the hands of God. It is of Him that any man is in Christ Jesus. (1 Cor. i. 30.) In like manner He so gives or withholds the influences of the Spirit that every minister of

the Gospel, as the Apostles themselves did, should feel and acknowledge that his success does not depend on his official dignity, or his fidelity, or his skill in argument, or his power of persuasion, but simply and solely on the demonstration of the Spirit, given or withheld as He sees fit. Why was it that so few were converted under the ministry of Christ, and so many thousands under that of the Apostles? Why is it that a like experience has marked the whole history of the Church? The only Scriptural or rational answer that can be given to that question is, "Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight." We know indeed that the Spirit's sovereignty is determined in its action by infinitely wise and good reasons; and we know that his withholding his coöperation is often judicial and punitive, that He abandons individuals, churches, communities, and nations who have sinned away their day of grace. It is important that we should remember, that, in living under the dispensation of the Spirit, we are absolutely dependent on a divine Person, who gives or withholds his influence as He will; that He can be grieved and offended; that He must be acknowledged, feared, and obeyed; that his presence and gifts must be humbly and earnestly sought, and assiduously cherished, and that to Him all right thoughts and right purposes, all grace and goodness, all strength and comfort, and all success in winning souls to Christ, are to be ascribed.

The Office of the Word as a Means of Grace.

Christians then do not refer the saving and the sanctifying power of the Scriptures to the moral power of the truths which they contain; or to the mere coöperation of the Spirit in a manner analogous to the way in which God coöperates with all second causes, but to the power of the Spirit as a divine Person acting with and by the truth, or without it, as in his sovereign pleasure He sees fit. Although light cannot restore

sight to the blind, or heal the diseases of the organs of sight, it is nevertheless essential to every exercise of the power of vision. So the Word is essential to all holy exercises in the human soul.

In every act of vision there are three essential conditions -- 1. An object. 2. Light. 3. An eye in a healthful or normal state. In all ordinary cases this is all that is necessary. But when the object to be seen has the attribute of beauty, a fourth condition is essential to its proper apprehension, namely, that the observer have æsthetic discernment or taste natural or acquired. Two men may view the same work of art. Both have the same object before them and the same light around them. Both see alike all that affects the organ of vision; but the one may see a beauty which the other fails to perceive; the same object therefore produces on them very different effects. The one it delights, elevates, and refines; the other it leaves unmoved if it does not disgust him. So when our blessed Lord was upon earth, the same person went about among the people; the same Word sounded in their ears; and the same acts of power and love were performed in their presence. The majority hated, derided, and finally crucified Him. Others saw in Him the glory of the only begotten Son of God full of grace and truth. These loved, adored, worshipped, and died for Him. Without the objective revelation of the person, doctrines, work, and character of Christ, this inward experience of his disciples had been impossible. But this outward revelation would have been, and in fact was to most of those concerned, utterly in vain, without the power of spiritual discernment. It is clear, therefore, what the office of the Word is, and what that of the Holy Spirit is in the work of sanctification. The Word presents the objects to be seen and the light by which we see; that is, it contains the truths by which the soul is sanctified, and it conveys to the mind the intellectual knowledge of

those truths. Both these are essential. The work of the Spirit is with the soul. That by nature is spiritually dead; it must be quickened. It is blind; its eyes must be opened. It is hard; it must be softened. The gracious work of the Spirit is to impart life, to open the eyes, and to soften the heart. When this is done, and in proportion to the measure in which it is done, the Word exerts its sanctifying influence on the soul.

It is a clear doctrine of the Bible and fact of experience that the truth when spiritually discerned has this transforming power. Paul was full of pride, malignity, and contempt for Christ and his Gospel. When the Spirit opened his eyes to behold the glory of Christ, he instantly became a new man. The effect of that vision -- not the miraculous vision of the person of the Son of God but the spiritual apprehension of his divine majesty and love -- lasted during the Apostle's life, and will last to all eternity. The same Apostle, therefore, teaches us that it is by beholding the glory of Christ that we are transformed into his image, from glory to glory, by the Spirit of the Lord. (2 Cor. iii. 18.) Hence the Scriptures so constantly represent the heavenly state, as seeing God. It is the beatific vision of the divine glory, in all its brightness, in the person of the Son of God, that purifies, ennobles, and enraptures the soul; filling all its capacities of knowledge and happiness. It is thus that we are sanctified by the truth; it is by the spiritual discernment of the things of the Spirit, when He opens, or as Paul says, enlightens the eyes of our understanding. We thus learn how we must use the Scriptures in order to experience their sanctifying power. We must diligently search them that we may know the truths therein revealed; we must have those truths as much as possible ever before the mind; and we must pray earnestly and constantly that the Spirit may open our eyes that we may see wondrous

things out of his law. It matters little to us how excellent or how powerful the truths of Scripture may be, if we do not know them. It matters little how well we may know them, if we do not think of them. And it matters little how much we think of them, if we cannot see them; and we cannot see them unless the Spirit opens the eyes of our heart. We see too from this subject why the Bible represents it as the great duty of the ministry to hold forth the Word of life; by the manifestation of the truth to commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. This is all they need do. They must preach the Word in season and out of season, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear. They know that the Gospel which they preach is the power of God unto salvation, and that if it be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. (2 Cor. iv. 4.) Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God only can give the increase.

Besides this general sanctifying power of the Word of God, when spiritually discerned, it is to be further remarked that it is the means of calling forth all holy thoughts, feelings, purposes, and acts. Even a regenerated soul without any truth before is, would be in blank darkness. It would be in the state of a regenerated infant; or in the state of an unborn infant in relation to the external world; having eyes and ears, but nothing to tall its faculties of sight and hearing into exercise. It is obvious that we can have no rational feelings of gratitude, love, adoration and fear toward God, except in view of the truths revealed concerning Him in his Word. We can have no love or devotion to Christ, except so far as the manifestation of his character and work is accepted by us as true. We can have no faith except as

founded on some revealed promise of God; no resignation or submission except in view of the wisdom and love of God and of his universal providence as revealed in the Scriptures; no joyful anticipation of future blessedness which is not founded on what the Gospel makes known of a future state of existence. The Bible, therefore, is essential to the conscious existence of the divine life in the soul and to all its rational exercises. The Christian can no more live without the Bible, than his body can live without food. The Word of God is milk and strong meat, it is as water to the thirsty, it is honey and the honeycomb.

The Lutheran Doctrine.

This doctrine has already been briefly, and, perhaps, sufficiently discussed on a preceding page; [434] it cannot, however, be properly overlooked in this connection. The Lutherans agree in words with Rationalists and Remonstrants, in referring the efficiency of the Word of God in the work of sanctification to the inherent power of the truth. But Rationalists attribute to it no more power than that which belongs to all moral truth; such truth is from its nature adapted to form the character and influence the conduct of rational creatures, and as the truths of the Bible are of the highest order and importance, they are willing to concede to them a proportionate degree of power. The Lutherans, on the other hand, teach, -- First, that the power of the Word which is inherent and constant, and which belongs to it from its very nature as the Word of God, is supernatural and divine. Secondly, that its efficiency is not due to any influence of the Spirit, accompanying it at some times and not at others, but solely to its own inherent virtue. Thirdly, that its diversified effects are due not to the Word's having more power at one time than at another; or to its being attended with a greater or less degree of the Spirit's influence, but to the different ways in which it is received. Christ,

it is said, healed those who had faith to be healed. He frequently said: "According to your faith be it unto you," or "Thy faith hath saved thee." It was not because there was more power in the person of Christ when the woman touched his garment, than at other times, that she was healed, but because of her faith. Fourthly, that the Spirit never operates savingly on the minds of men, except through and in the Word. Luther in the Smalcald Articles says: "Constanter tenendum est, Deum nemini Spiritum vel gratiam suam largiri nisi per verbum et cum verbo externo et præcedente, ut ita præmuniamus nos adversum enthusiastas, i.e., spiritus, qui jactitant se ante verbum et sine verbo Spiritum habere." [435] And in the Larger Catechism, [436] he says: In summa, quicquid Deus in nobis facit et operatur, tantum externis istius modi rebus et constitutionibus operari dignatur." Luther went so far as to refer even the inspiration of the prophets to the "verbum vocale," or external word. [437]

This divine power of the Word, however, is not, as before remarked, to be referred to the mere moral power of the truth. On this point the Lutheran theologians are perfectly explicit. Thus Quenstedt [438] says: "Verbum Dei non agit solum persuasiones morales, proponendo nobis objectum amabile; sed vero, reali, divino et ineffabili influxu potentiæ suæ gratiosæ." This influx of divine power, however, is not something occasional, giving the word a power at one time which it has not at another. It is something inherent and permanent. Quenstedt says: [439] "Verbo Dei virtus divina non extrinsecus in ipso usu demum, accedit, sed . . . . in se et per se, intrinsice ex divina ordinatione et communicatione, efficacia et vi conversiva et regeneratrice præditum est, etiam ante et extra omnem usum." And Hollaz [440] says it has this power "propter mysticam verbi cum Spiritu Sancto unionem intimam et individuam."

Professor Schinid, of Erlangen, in his "Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche," quotes from the leading Lutheran theologians their views on this subject. Hollaz, for example, says that this "vis divina" is inseparably conjoined with the Word; that the Word of God cannot be conceived of without the Spirit; that if the Holy Spirit could be separated from the Word, it would not be the Word of God, but the word of man. [441] Quenstedt says that the action of the Word and of the Spirit is one and indivisible. Baier says: [442] "Nempe eadem illa infinita virtus, quæ essentialiter, per se et independenter in Deo est, et per quam Deus nomines illuminat et convertit, verbo communicata est: et tanquam verbo communicata, divina tamen, hic spectari debet." A distinction, says Quenstedt, is to be made between the natural instruments, such as the staff of Moses, or rod of Aaron, which God uses to produce supernatural effects, and those, as the Word and sacraments, which are "sua essentia supernaturalia. . . . . Illa indigent novo motu et elevatione nova ad effectum novum ultra propriam suam et naturalem virtutem producendum; hæc vero a prima institutione et productione sufficienti, hoc est, divina et summa vi ac efficacia prædita sunt, nec indigent nova et peculiari aliqua elevatione ultra efficaciam ordinariam, jamdum ipsis inditam ad producendum spiritualem effectum." [443] That the Word is not always efficacious is not because it is attended by greater power in one case than another, but because of the difference in the moral state of those to whom it is presented. On this point Quenstedt says, "Quanquam itaque effectus Verbi divini prædicati nonnunquam impediatur, efficacia tamen ipsa, seu virtus intrinseca a verbo tolli et separari non potest. Et ita per accidens fit inefficax, non potentiæ defectu, sed malitiæ motu, quo ejus operatio impeditur, quo minus effectum suum assequatur." [444] A piece of iron glowing with heat, if placed in contact with anything easily

combustible, produces an immediate conflagration. If brought in contact with a rock, it produces little sensible effect. So the Word of God fraught with divine power, when presented to one mind regenerates, converts, and sanctifies, and when presented to another leaves it as it was, or only exasperates the evil of its nature. It is true these theologians say that the operation of the Word is not physical, as in the case of opium, poison, or fire; but moral, "illustrando mentem, commovendo voluntatem," etc. Nevertheless the illustration holds as to the main point. The Word has an inherent, divine, and constant power. It produces different effects according to the subjective state of those on whom it acts. The Spirit acts neither on them nor on it more at one time than at another.

Remarks.

1. It is obvious that this peculiar theory has no support from Scripture. The Bible does indeed say that the Word of God is quick and powerful; that it is the wisdom of God and the power of God; and that it convinces, converts, and sanctifies. But so does the Bible say that Christ gave his Apostles power to work miracles; and that they went about communicating the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, healing the sick, and raising the dead. But the power was not in them. Peter was indignant at such an imputation. "Why look ye so earnestly on us," he said to the people, "as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?" If the Apostles working miracles did not prove that the power was in them, the effects produced by the Word do not prove that the power is in it.

2. This doctrine is inconsistent with the constant representations of the Scriptures, which set forth the Spirit as attending the Word and giving it effect, sometimes more and sometimes less; working with and by the truth as He sees fit. It is inconsistent with the command to

pray for the Spirit. Men are not accustomed to pray that God would give fire the power to burn or ice to cool. If the Spirit were always in mystical, indissoluble union with the Word, giving it inherent divine power, there would be no propriety in praying for his influence as the Apostles did, and as the Church in all ages has ever done, and continues to do.

3. This theory cuts us off from all intercourse with the Spirit and all dependence upon Him as a personal voluntary agent. He never comes; He never goes; He does not act at one time more than at another. He has imbued the Word with divine power, and sent it forth into the world. There his agency ends. God has given opium its narcotic power, and arsenic its power to corrode the stomach, and left them to men to use or to abuse as they saw fit. Beyond giving them their properties, He has nothing to do with the effects which they produce. So the Spirit has nothing to do with the conviction, conversion, or sanctification of the people of God, or with illuminating, consoling, or guiding them, beyond once for all giving his Word divine power. There it is: men may use or neglect it as they please. The Spirit does not incline them to use it. He does not open their hearts, as He opened the heart of Lydia, to receive the Word. He does not enlighten their eyes to see wondrous things out of the law.

4. Lutherans do not attribute divine power to the visible words or to the audible sounds uttered, but to the truth which these conventional signs are the means of communicating to the mind. They admit that this truth, although it has inherent in it divine power, never produces any supernatural or spiritual effect unless it is properly used. They admit also that this proper use includes the intellectual apprehension of its meaning, attention, aud the purpose to believe and obey. Yet they believe in infant regeneration. But if infants are incapable of using

the Word; and if the Spirit never operates except in the Word and by its use, how is it possible that infants can be regenerated. If, therefore, the Bible teaches that infants are regenerated and saved, it teaches that the Spirit operates not only with and by the Word, but also without it, when, how, and where He sees fit. If Christ healed only those who had faith to be healed, how did He heal infants, or raise the dead?

5. The theory in question is contrary to Scripture, in that it assumes that the reason why one man is saved and another not, a simply that one resists the supernatural power of the Word and another does not. Why the one resists, is referred to his own free will. Why the other does not resist, is referred not to any special influence, but to his own unbiased will. Our Lord, however, teaches that those only come to Him who are given to Him by the Father; that those come who besides the outward teaching of the Word, are inwardly taught and drawn of God. The Apostle teaches that salvation is not of him that willeth or of him that runneth, but of God who showeth mercy. The Lutheran doctrine banishes, and is intended to banish, all sovereignty in the distribution of saving grace, from the dispensations of God. To those who believe that that sovereignty is indelibly impressed on the doctrines of the Bible and on the history of the Church and of the world, this objection is of itself sufficient. The common practical belief of Christians, whatever their theories may be, is that they are Christians not because they are better than other men; not because they coöperate with the common and sufficient grace given to all men; not because they yield to, while others resist the operation of the divine Word; but because God in his sovereign mercy made them willing in the day of his power; so that they are all disposed to say from the heart, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory."

6. This Lutheran doctrine is inconsistent with the experience of believers individually and collectively. On the day of Pentecost, what fell upon the Apostles and the brethren assembled with them? It was no "verbum vocale;" no sound of words; and no new external revelation. The Spirit of God Himself, enlightened their minds and enabled them to remember and to understand all that Christ had taught, and they spoke every man, as the Spirit (not the Word) gave them utterance. Here was a clear manifestation of the Spirit's acting directly on the minds of the Apostles. To say that the effects then exhibited were due to the divine power inherent in the words of Christ; and that they had resisted that power up to the day of Pentecost, and then yielded to its influence, is an incredible hypothesis. It will not account for the facts of the cast. Besides, our Lord promised to send the Spirit after his ascension. He commanded the disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they were imbued with power from on high. When the Spirit came they were instantly enlightened, endowed with plenary knowledge of the Gospel, and with miraculous gifts. How could the "verbum vocale" impart the gift of tongues, or the gift of healing? What according to the Lutheran theory is meant by being full of the Holy Ghost? or, by the indwelling of the Spirit? or, by the testimony of the Spirit? or, by the demonstration of the Spirit? or, by the unction of the Holy One which teaches all things? or, by the outpouring of the Spirit? In short, the whole Bible, and especially the evangelical history and the epistles of the New Testament, represents the Holy Spirit not as a power imprisoned in the truth, but as a personal, voluntary agent acting with the truth or without it, as He pleases. As such He has ever been regarded by the Church, and has ever exhibited himself in his dealings with the children of God.

7. Luther, glorious and lovely as he was -- and he is certainly one of

the grandest and most attractive figures in ecclesiastical history -- was impulsive and apt to be driven to extremes. [445] The enthusiasts of his age undervalued the Scriptures, pretending to private revelations, and direct spiritual impulses, communicating to them the knowledge of truths unrevealed in the Bible, and a rule of action higher than that of the written Word. This doctrine was a floodgate through which all manner of errors and extravagances poured forth among the people and threatened the overthrow of the Church and of society. Against these enthusiasts all the Reformers raised their voices, and Luther denounced them with characteristic vehemence. In opposition to their pretensions he took the ground that the Spirit never operated on the minds of men except through the Word and sacraments; and, as he held the conversion of sinners to be the greatest of all miracles, he was constrained to attribute divine power to the Word. He was not content to take the ground which the Church in general has taken, that while the Word and sacraments are the ordinary channels of the Spirit's influence, He has left himself free to act with or without these or any other means, and when He makes new revelations to individuals they are authenticated to others by signs, and miracles, and divers gifts; and that in all cases, however authenticated, they are to be judged by the written Word as the only infallible rule of faith or practice; so that if an Apostle or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel than that which we have received, he is to be pronounced accursed. (Gal. i. 8.) "We are of God:" said the Apostle John, "he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." (1 John iv. 6.) The Scriptures teach that not only the Holy Spirit, but also other spirits good and evil have access to the minds of men, and more or less effectually control their operations. Directions, therefore, are given

in the Bible to guide us in discriminating between the true and false. The power of individual men, who appear in special junctures, over the faith and character of coming generations, is something portentous. Of such "world controllers," at least in modern times, there are none to compare with Martin Luther, Ignatius Loyola, and John Wesley. Though so different from each other, each has left his impress upon millions of men. Our only security from the fallible or perverting influence of man, is in entire, unquestioning submission to the infallible Word of God.

---

[432] In the Second Helvetic Confession, chapter i., it is said: "Cum hodie hoc Dei verbum per prædicatores legitime vocatos annunciatur in ecclesia, credimus ipsum Dei verbum annunciari, et a fidelibus recipi, neque aliud Dei verbum fingendum vel coelitus esse expectandum. . . . . Agnoscimus interim, Deum illuminare posse homines etiam sine externo ministerio, quos et quando velit: id quod ejus potentiæ est. Nos autem loquimur de usitate ratione instituendi homines, et præcepto et exemplo tradita nobis a Deo." -- Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, pp. 467, 468.

[433] See vol. ii. p. 657, ff.

[434] See vol. ii. p. 656 f.

[435] II. viii. 3.; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 1846, p. 331.

[436] IV. 30; Hase, p. 540.

[437] See Smalcald Articles, II. viii. 10, 11: "Quare in hoc nobis est, constanter perseverandum, quod Deus non velit nobiscum aliter agere, nisi per vocale verbum et sacramenta, et quod, quidquid sine verbo et sacramentis jactatur, ut spiritus, sit ipse diabolus. Nam Deus etiam Mosi voluit apparere per rubum ardentem et vocale verbum. Et nullus propheta, sive Elias, sive Elisæus, Spiritum sine decalogo sive verbo

vocali accepit." Hase, p. 333.

[438] Theologia Didactio-Polemica, I. IV. ii. quæst. xvi. echthesis, 4; edit. Leipzig, 1715, p. 248.

[439] Ibid. I. IV. ii. quæst. xvi. fontes solutionum, 7; p. 268.

[440] Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum, III. ii. 1. quæst. 4; edit. Leipzig, 1763, p. 992.

[441] Hollaz, Examen, III. ii. 1, 4, edit. Holmiæ et Lipsiæ; 1741, p. 987.

[442] Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ, Prolegg. II. xxxix. d; edit. Frankfort and Leipzig, 1739, p. 106.

[443] Quenstedt, Theologia, I. IV. ii. quæst. xvi. echthesis, 7, ut supra, p. 249.

[444] Ibid. quæst. xvi. 9.

[445] No one knows Luther who has not read pretty faithfully the five octavo volumes of his letters, collected and edited by De Wette. These exhibit not only his power, fidelity, and courage, but also his gentleness, disinterestedness, and his childlike simplicity, as well as his joyousness and humour.

---

§ 2. The Sacraments. Their Nature.

Usage of the Word Sacrament.

1. In classical usage the word "sacramentum" means, in general, something sacred. In legal proceedings the money deposted by contending parties was called "sacramentum," because when forfeited it was applied to sacred purposes. "Ea pecunia, quæ in judiciuin venit in litibus, sacramentum a sacro." "Sacramentum æs significat, quod poenæ nomine penditur, sive eo quis interrogatur sive contenditur." Then in a secondary sense it meant a judicial process. In military usage it expressed the obligation of the soldier to his leader or country; then

the oath by which he was bound; and generally an oath; so that in ordinary language "sacramentum dicere" meant to swear. [446]

2. The ecclesiastical usage of the word was influenced by various circumstances. From its etymology and signification it was applied to anything sacred or consecrated. Then to anything which had a sacred or hidden meaning. In this sense it was applied to all religious rites and ceremonies. This brought it into connection with the Greek word musterion, which properly means a secret; something into the knowledge of which a man must be initiated. Hence in the Vulgate "sacramentum" is used as the translation of musterion in Ephesians i. 9, iii. 9, v. 32; Colossians i. 27; 1 Timothy iii. 16; Revelation i. 20, xvii. 7. It was therefore used in the wide sense for any sign which had a secret import. Thus Augustine says, [447] "Nimis autem longum est, convenienter disputare de varietate signorum, quæ cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur." And again he says, [448] "Ista fratres dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem." All religious rites and ceremonies, the sign of the cross, anointing with oil, etc., were therefore called sacraments. Augustine frequently calls the mystical or allegorical exposition of Scripture, a sacrament. Jerome [449] says, "Sacramenta Dei sunt prædicare, benedicere ac confirmare, communionem reddere, visitare infirmos, orare." [450] Lombard says, "Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum." [451]

The Theological Usage and Definition of the Word.

3. It is evident that the signification of the word "sacrament" is so comprehensive and its usage so lax, that little aid can be derived from either of those sources in fixing definitely its meaning in Christian theology. Hence theologians soon began to frame definitions of the word

more or less exact, derived from the teachings of the New Testament on the subject. The two simplest and most generally accepted of such definitions are the one by Augustine and the other by Peter Lombard. The former says, [452] "Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum;" the latter, [453] "Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma." These definitions however are too vague.

It is obvious that the only safe and satisfactory method of arriving at the idea of a sacrament, in the Christian sense of the word, is to take those ordinances which by common consent are admitted to be sacraments, and by analyzing them determine what are their essential elements or characteristics. We should then exclude from the category all other ordinances, human or divine, in which those characteristics are not found. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are admitted to be sacraments. They are (1.) Ordinances instituted by Christ. (2.) They are in their nature significant, baptism of cleansing; the Lord's Supper of spiritual nourishment. (3.) They were designed to be perpetual. (4.) They were appointed to signify, and to instruct; to seal, and thus to confirm and strengthen; and to convey or apply, and thus to sanctify, those who by faith receive them. On this principle the definition of a sacrament given in the standards of our Church is founded. "A sacrament," it is said, "is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the New Covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." [454]

To the same effect the other Reformed Symbols speak. For example, the Second Helvetic Confession says: "Sunt sacramenta symbola mystica, vel ritus sancti, aut sacræ actiones, a Deo ipso institutæ, constantes verbo suo, signis, et rebus significatis, quibus in ecclesia summa sua beneficia, homini exhibita, retinet in memoria, et subinde renovat, quibus item promissiones suas obsignat, et quæ ipse nobis interius

præstat, exterius repræsentat, ac veluti oculis contemplanda subiicit, adeoque fidem nostram, Spiritu Dei in cordibus nostris operante, roborat et auget: quibus denique nos ab omnibus aliis populis et religionibus separat, sibique soli consecrat et obligat, et quid a nobis requirat, significat." [455]

The definition given in the Geneva Catechism is that a sacrament is "externa divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ testificatio, quæ visibili signo spirituales gratias figurat, ad obsignandas cordibus nostris Dei promissiones, quo earum veritas melius confirmetur." [456]

The Heidelberg Catechism says, that sacraments are "sacra et in oculos incurrentia signa, ac sigilla, ob eam causam a Deo instituta, ut per ea nobis promissionem Evangelii magis declarat et obsignet: quod scilicet non universis tantum, verum etiam singulis credentibus, propter unicum illud Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, gratis donet remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam." [457]

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England teach [458] that "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 will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

Lutheran Doctrine.

The Lutheran definition of the sacraments agrees in all essential points with that of the Reformed churches. In the Augsburg Confession, its authors say: "De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his, qui utuntur, proposita. Itaque utendum est sacramentis ita, ut fides accedat, quæ credat

promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur." [459]
In the Apology for that Confession it is said: "Si sacramenta vocamus ritus, qui habent mandatum Dei, et quibus addita est promissio gratiæ, facile est judicare, quæ sint proprie sacramenta. Nam ritus ab hominibus instituti non erunt hoc modo proprie dicta sacramenta. Non est enim auctoritatis humanæ, promittere gratiam. Quare signa sine mandato Dei instituta, non sunt certa sigua gratiæ, etiamsi fortasse rudes docent, aut admonent aliquid." [460]
"Dicimus igitur ad sacramenta proprie sic dicta duo potissimum requiri, videlicet verbum et elementum, juxta vulgatum illud Augustini: Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.' Fundamentum hujus adsertionis ex ipsa natura et fine sacramentorum pendet, cum enim sacramenta id, quid in verbo evangelii prædicatur, externo elemento vestitum sensibus ingerere debeant, ex eo sponte sequitur, quod nec verbum sine elemento, nec elementum sine verbo constituat sacramentum. Per verbum intelligitur primo mandatum atque institutio divina, per quam elementum . . . . . separatur ab usu communi, et destinatur usui sacramentali; deinde promissio atque ea quidem evangelio propria, per sacramentum adplicanda et obsignanda. Per elementum non quodvis, sed certum et verbo institutionis expressum accipitur." [461] In all this the Reformed and Lutherans are agreed. The differences between them in relation to the sacraments do not concern their nature.
Romish Doctrine.
The distinctive doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject is that the sacraments contain the grace which they signify, and that such grace is conveyed "ex opere operato." That is, they have a real inherent and objective virtue, which renders them effectual in communicating saving benefits to those who receive them. In a certain sense these words may be used to express the Lutheran doctrine; but

that doctrine differs from the Romanist doctrine, as will appear when the efficacy of the sacraments comes to be considered. The language of the Council of Trent on this subject is: "Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant; aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre; quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptæ per fidem gratiæ, vel justitiæ, et notæ quædam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit." [462]

The Roman Catechism defines a sacrament "Rem esse sensibus subjectam, quæ ex Dei institutione sanctitatis et justitiæ tum significandæ, tum efficiendæ vim habet." [463] As the task devolved on the Council of Trent was to present and harmonize the doctrines elaborated by the Schoolmen in opposition to the doctrines of the Reformers, the definitions and explanations given by the writers of the Middle Ages throw as much light on the decrees of the Council as the expositions of the later theologians of the Latin Church. On this point Thomas Aquinas says: "Oportet, quod virtus salutifera a divinitate Christi per ejus humanitatem in ipsa sacramenta derivetur. . . . . Sacramenta ecelesiæ specialiter habent virtutem ex passione Christi, cujus virtus quodammodo nobis copulatur per susceptionem sacramentorum." [464] Again: "Ponendo quod sacramentum est instrumentalis causa gratiæ, necesse est simul ponere, quod in sacramento sit quædam virtus instrumentalis ad inducendum sacramentalem effectum. . . . . Sicut virtus instrumentalis acquiritur instrumento, ex hoc ipso quod movetur ab agente principali, ita et sacramentum consequitur spiritualem virtutem ex benedictione Christi et applicatione ministri ad usum sacramenti." Thus Thomas's own opinion was adopted by the Council as opposed to that of the Scotists to which Thomas refers, in the same connection: "Illi qui ponunt quod sacramenta non causant gratiam, nisi

per quandam concomitantiam ponunt quod in sacramento non sit aliqua virtus, quæ operetur ad sacramenti effectum, est tamen virtus divina sacramento assistens, quæ sacramentalem effectum operatur." [465] This is very nearly the doctrine of the Reformed Church upon the subject. Bellarmin's illustration of the point in hand is that as fire is the cause of combustion when brought into contact with proper materials, so the sacraments produce their effect by their own inherent virtue. "Exemplum," he says, "esse potest in re naturali. Si ad ligna comburenda, primum exsiccarentur ligna, deinde excuteretur ex silice, tum applicaretur ignis ligno, et sic tandem fieret combustio; nemo diceret, causam immediatam combustionis esse siccitatem aut excussionem ignis ex silice aut applicationem ignis ad ligna, sed solum ignem, ut causam primariam, et solum calorem seu calefactionem, ut causam instrumentalem." [466]

"Jam vero sacramenta gratiam, quam significant, continere, eamque conferre virtute sibi insita, seu ex opere operato, Scripturæ, patres, constansque Ecclesiæ sensus traditionalis luculentissime docent." [467]

According to Romanists, therefore, a sacrament is a divine ordinance which has the inherent or intrinsic power of conferring the grace which it signifies.

Remonstrant Doctrine.

It has already been shown that it was the tendency of the Remonstrants to eliminate, as far as possible, the supernatural element from Christianity. They therefore regarded the sacraments not properly as means of grace, but as significant rites intended to bring the truth vividly before the mind, which truth exerted its moral influence on the heart. "Sacramenta cum dicimus, externas ecclesiæ ceremonias seu ritus illos sacros ac solennes intelligimus, quibus veluti foederalibus signis ac sigillis visibilibus Deus gratiosa beneficia sua, in foedere

præsertim evangelico promissa, non modo nobis repræsentat 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." [468]

"Restat, ut dicamus, Deum gratiam suam per sacramenta nobis exhibere, non eam actu per illa conferendo; sed per illa tanquam signa clara ac evidentia eam repræsentando et ob oculos ponendo non eminus aut sub figuris quibusdam tanquam multo post futuram, sed tanquam præsentem: ut ita in signis istis tanquam in speculo quodam, exhibitionem iliam gratiæ, quam Deus nobis concessit, quasi conspiciamus. Estque hæc efficacia nulla alia quam objectiva, quæ requirit facultatem cognitivam rite dispositam, ut apprehendere possit illud, quod signum objective menti offert. Hinc videmus, quomodo sacramenta in nobis operentur, nimirum tanquam signa repræsentantia menti nostræ rem cujus signa sunt. Neque alia in illis quæri debet efficacia." [469]

Zwingle alone of the Reformers seems inclined to this view of the sacraments: "Sunt . . . . . sacramenta," he says, "signa vel ceremoniæ, pace tamen omnium dicam, sive neotericorum sive veteram, quibus se homo Ecclesiæ probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque Ecclesiam totam potius certiorem de tua fide quam te. Si enim fides tua non aliter fuerit absoluta, quam ut signo ceremoniali egeat, fides non est: fides enim est, qua nitimur misericordiæ Dei inconcusse, firmiter et indistracte, ut multis locis Paulus habet." [470] Elsewhere he says: "Credo, imo scio omnia sacramenta, tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent. . . . . Dux autem vel vehiculum Spiritui non est necessarium, ipse enim est virtus et latio qua cuncta feruntur, non qui ferri opus habeat: neque id unquam legimus in scripturis sacris, quod sensibilia, qualia sacramenta sunt, certo secum

ferrent Spiritum, sed si sensibilia unquam lata sunt cum Spiritu, jam Spiritus fuit qui tulit, non sensibilia. Sic cum ventus vehemens ferretur, simul adferebantur linguæ venti virtute, non ferebatur ventus virtute linguarum." [471] It is obvious that all that Zwingle here says of the sacraments, might be said of the Word of God; and, therefore, if he proves anything he proves that the sacraments are not means of grace; he proves the same concerning the Word, to which the Scriptures attribute such an important agency in the sanctification and salvation of men.

---

[446] Freund's Lateinische Wörterbuch.

[447] Epistola cxxxviii. (5); Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1836, vol. vii. p. 615, c.

[448] Sermo cclxxii. (16); Ibid. vol. v. p. 1614, b, c.

[449] Works, tom. ix. p. 59. (?)

[450] See Gerhard, Loci Theologici, XIX. i. §§ 6, 9; edit. Tübingen, 1768, vol. viii. pp. 204, 205.

[451] Lombard, Magister Sententiarum, lib. IV. dist. i. B. edit. (?) 1472.

[452] In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus, lxxx. 3; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1837, vol. iii. 2290, a.

[453] Lombard, ut supra.

[454] Westminster Shorter Catechism, quest. 92.

[455] xix.; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 512.

[456] v. de Sacramentis; Ibid. p. 160.

[457] lxvi., Niemeyer, p. 444.

[458] Art. XXV.

[459] I. xiii. 1, 2; Hase, Leipzig, 1840, p. 13.

[460] vii. 3; Hase, p. 200.

[461] Gerhard, Loci Theologici xix. 2. § 11; edit. Tübingen, 1768, vol. viii. p. 207.

[462] Sess. VII. De Sacramentis in genere, canon 6; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 39.

[463] II. i. quæst. 6 (x. 11); Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 241.

[464] Summa, III. lxii. 5; edit. Cologne, 1640, p. 129, b, of fourth set.

[465] Aquinas, ut supra, lxii. 4; p. 129, a.

[466] Bellarmin, De Sacramentis, II. i.; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, vol. iii. p. 109, a.

[467] Joannes Perrone, Prælectiones Theologicæ, De Sacramentis in genere, II. i. 39; edit. Paris, 1861, vol. ii. p. 221, a.

[468] Confessio Remonstrantium, xxiii. 1; Episcopii Opera, edit. Rotterdam, 1665, vol. ii. p. 92, a, of second set.

[469] Limborch, Theologia Christinia, V. lxvi. 31, 32; edit. Amsterdam, 1715, p. 606, b.

[470] De Vera et Falsa Religione, Works, edit. Schuler and Schultess, Turici, 1832, vol. iii. p. 231.

[471] Ad Carolum Rom. Imperatorum, Fidei Huldrychs Zwinglii Ratio, § 7; Niemeyer's Collectio Confessionum, p. 24.

---

§ 3. Nnmber of the Sacraments.

If the word sacrament be taken in the wide sense in which it was used in the early Church for any significant religious rite, it is obvious that no definite limit can be set to their number. If the word be confined to such divine ordinances as answer the conditions which characterize baptism and the Lord's Supper, then it is evident that they are the only sacraments under the Christian dispensation; and such is the view taken by all Protestants. It is true that in the Apology

for the Augsburg Confession it is said: "Vere sunt sacramenta, baptismus, Coena Domini, absolutio, quæ est sacramentum poenitentiæ. Nam hi ritus habent mandatum Dei et promissionem gratiæ, quæ est propria Novi Testamenti." The last was soon dropped out of the list of sacraments, although the Lutherans retained confession as a distinct Church institution. The confession however was to be general, an enumeration of sins not being required, and the absolution which followed was simply declarative, and not judicial, as among the Romanists. The Reformed symbols required private confession to be made to God, and general confession in the congregation of the people; and recommended in extraordinary cases, where the conscience is burdened ot the mind perplexed, private confession to the pastor or spiritual adviser.

The Romanists have seven sacraments, adding to baptism and the Lord's Supper, matrimony, orders, penance, confirmation, and extreme unction. Matrimony, however, although a divine institution, was not ordained for signifying, sealing, and applying to believers the benefits of redemption, and therefore, is not a sacrament. The same may be said of orders. And as to confirmation, penance, and extreme unction, in the sense in which Romanists use those terms, they are not divine institutions at all.

Confirmation.

Confirmation indeed, or a service attending the introduction of those baptized in infancy, into full communion in the Church, was early instituted and long continued among Protestants as well as among Romanists. Those who had been baptized in infancy, had their standing in the Church on the ground of the profession of faith and the engagements made in their name, by their parents or sponsors. When they came to years of discretion, they were examined as to their knowledge

and conduct, and if found competently instructed and free from scandal, they assumed the obligation of their baptismal vows upon themselves, and their church membership was confirmed. In all this, however, there was nothing of a sacramental character.

This simple service the Romanists have exalted into a sacrament. The "material," they say, is the anointing with oil, or the imposition of hands; or as Thomas Aquinas and Bellarmin say, the two united. Perrone makes the anointing the essential thing. The gift or grace conveyed, "ex opere operato," is that supernatural influence of the Holy Ghost, which enables the recipient to be faithful to his baptismal vows. The administrator must be a prelate, as prelates only are the official successors of the Apostles, and, therefore, they only have the power of conveying the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands, which was one of the prerogatives of the apostleship.

Penance.

Romanists distinguish between "poenitentia," repentance or penitence, as a virtue and as a sacrament. As a virtue it consists in sorrow for sin, a determination to forsake it, and a purpose "ad sui vindictam in compensationem injuriæ Deo per peccatum illatæ" i.e., a purpose to make satisfaction to God. As a sacrament it is an ordinance instituted by Christ for the remission of sins committed after baptism, through the absolution of a priest having jurisdiction. The matter of the sacrament is the act of the penitent including contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The form is the act of absolution on the part of the priest. By contrition is meant sorrow, or remorse. It is not necessary that this contrition should be anything more than a natural, as distinguished from a gracious, exercise or state of mind; or as the Romanists express it, it is not necessary that contrition should be "caritate perfecta." The confession included in this assumed sacrament,

must be auricular; it must include all mortal sins; a sin not confessed is not forgiven. This confession is declared by the Council of Trent to be necessary to salvation. "Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino; aut dixerit, modum secreti confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia catholica ab initio semper observavit, et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum; anathema sit." [472] In sin there is both a "reatus culpæ" and a "reatus poenæ." The former, together with the penalty of eternal death, is removed by absolution; but "reatus poenæ" as to temporal punishment, to be endured either in this life or in purgatory, remains or may remain. Hence the necessity of satisfaction for sin in the sense above stated. The absolution granted by the priest, is not merely declaratory, but judicial and effective. On this point the Romish Church teaches "1º Christum delere peccata sacerdotum ministerio; 2º sacerdotes sedere judices in tribunali poenitentiæ; 3º illorum sententiam ratam in coelis esse; 4º sacerdotes hac potestate præstare angelis et archangelis ipsis." [473] This doctrine that no real sin, committed after baptism, can be forgiven unless confessed to a priest; that the priest has the power to remit or retain; that he carries at his girdle the keys uot only of the visible Church on earth, but also of heaven and hell; and that he opens and no man shuts, and shuts and no man opens, is one of the strongest links of the chain by which the Church of Rome leads captive the souls of men. No wonder that she says that the power of a priest is above that even of angels and archangels.

Orders.

Orders or ordination is made a sacrament, because instituted or commanded by Christ, and because therein the supernatural power of consecrating the body and blood of Christ and of forgiving sin is

conferred. It is thus defined: "Ordo sacer et sacramentum divinitus institutum, quo tribuitur potestas consecrandi corpus et sanguinem Domini, nec non remittendi et retinendi peccata." On this subject the Council of Trent says: "Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra episcopos dicere: Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; aut per eam non imprimi characterem; vel eum, qui sacerdos semel fuit, laicum rursus fieri posse; anathema sit." [474]

The right and power to ordain belong exclusively to prelates, for they alone possess the apostolical prerogative of communicating the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands. The Apostles, however, had only the power of communicating miraculous gifts. They neither claimed nor pretended to exercise the power of conferring the sanctifying or saving influences of the Spirit. As the Church of Rome claims for its clergy a power far above that of angels or archangels, so it claims for its bishops powers far transcending those of the Apostles.

Matrimony.

Matrimony is declared to be a sacrament because, although not instituted by Christ, it was made by Him the symbol of the mystical union between the Church and its divine head; and because by its due celebration divine grace is conferred upon the contracting parties. It is thus defined: "Sacramentum novæ legis, quo significatur conjunctio Christi cum Ecclesia, et gratia confertur ad sanctificandam viri et mulieris legitimam conjunctionem, ad uniendos arctius conjugum animos, atque ad prolem pie sancteque in virtutis officiis et fide christiana instituendam." [475]

Extreme Unction.

This is defined to be a sacrament wherein by the anointing with oil (per unctionem olei benedicti) and prayer in the prescribed form, by the ministration of a priest, grace is conferred to the baptized

dangerously ill, whereby sins are remitted and the strength of the soul is increased. "Si quis dixerit, sacram infirmorum unctionem non conferre gratiam, nec remittere peccata, nec alleviare infirmos; sed jam cessasse, quasi olim tantum fuerit gratia curationum; anathema sit." "Si quis dixerit, presbyteros Ecclesiæ, quos B. Jacobus adducendos esse infirmum inunguendum hortatur, non esse sacerdotes ab Episcopo ordinatos, sed ætate seniores, in quavis communitate; ob idque proprium extremæ unctionis ministrum non esse solum sacerdotem; anathema sit." [476]

Reasons for fixing the Number of the Sacraments at Seven.

It is a work of supererogation for Romanists to assign any reason for making the number of the sacraments seven, and neither more nor less, other than the decision of the Church. If the Church be infallible her judgment on the question is decisive; if it be not infallible no other reason is of any avail. They admit that there is no authority from Scripture on this point, and on no subject in dispute between them and Protestants, can appeal be made with less show of reason to the testimony of tradition. Romish theologians, therefore, while they claim common consent in support of their doctrine on this subject, avail themselves of all the collateral aid they can command. Thomas Aquinas says that there is an analogy between the natural and spiritual life of man. He is born; he is strengthened; he is nourished; he needs means of recovery from illness; he needs to propagate his race; to live under the guidance of legitimate authority; and to be prepared for his departure from this world. The sacraments provide for all these necessities of his spiritual life. He is born in baptism; strengthened by confirmation; nourished by the Lord's Supper; recovered from spiritual illness by penance; the Church is continued by holy matrimony; the sacrament of orders provides for the Christian a

supernaturally endowed guide; and extreme unction prepares him for death. Thus through the seven sacraments all his spiritual wants are supplied.

Then again as there are seven cardinal virtues, there should be seven sacraments. Besides seven is a sacred number: there are seven days in the week; every seventh year was Sabbatical; and there were seven golden candlesticks, and seven stars in the right hand of Christ. It is not wonderful therefore that there should be seven sacraments. It is obvious that all this amounts to nothing. The two sacraments instituted by Christ for the definite purpose of "signifying, sealing, and applying to believers," the benefits of redemption, stand alone in the New Testament. No other ordinance has the same characteristics or the same design. Admitting, therefore, that the Fathers and the Church were unanimous in calling any number of other sacred institutions sacraments, that would not prove that they belong to the same category as baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

It is, however, notorious that no such general consent can be pleaded in support of the seven sacraments of the Romanists. The simple facts on this subject are, -- (1.) As already remarked, in the early Church every sacred rite was called a sacrament. Then their number was indefinite. (2.) The preeminence of baptism and the Lord's Supper over all other sacred rites being recognized, they were called, as by Augustine, the chief sacraments. (3.) When attention was directed to the fact that something is true of baptism and the Lord's Supper, which is true of no other sacred ordinances or rites, that they, and they only, of external ceremonies were appointed to be "means of grace," then they were declared in this light to be the only Christian sacraments. Justin Martyr, [477] Cyril of Jerusalem, [478] and Augustine, [479] so speak of them. [480] (4.) As a ritualistic spirit

increased in the Church, first one and then another rite was assumed to be a "means of grace," not always, however, the same rites, and thus the number of sacraments was increased. (5.) For centuries, however, no definite number was admitted by anything like general consent. Some made the number three; the Pseudo Dionysius in the sixth century made six. Peter Damiani, the friend of Gregory VII., made twelve. "Ratherius, Bishop of Verona (974), Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres (1028), Bruno, Bishop of Wurzburg (1045), Rupert, Abbot of Deutz (1135), admitted only baptism and the Lord's Supper; others, as Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans (821), Agobard, Bishop of Lyons (840), Lanfranc, Bishop of Canterbury (1089), Hildebert, Bishop of Tours (1134), Hugo, of St. Victor (1141), call them duo sanctæ ecclesiæ sacramenta.'" [481] (6.) It is certain, says the writer just quoted, that Peter Lombard (1164) is the first who enumerated the seven sacraments as held by the Romanists. He gives no reason for fixing on the number seven; but that which was already on hand in the traditional sanctity, attributed to that number. It was regarded as the symbol of universality and perfection. This was sufficient for deciding on an arbitrary number. What has been said is enough to show that Romanists have not even any plausible ground for their appeal to common consent in support of their doctrine on this subject. Such appeal on their theory is unnecessary. If the Church be infallible, and if the Church testifies that Christ ordained matrimony, extreme unction, etc., to be sacraments; that testimony is decisive. If, however, the Church, in the papal sense of the word, be the very reverse of infallible, then its testimony, so far as the faith of Christians is concerned, amounts to nothing.

---

[472] Sess. xiv. canon 6; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 68.

[473] Perrone, Prælectiones Theologicæ, De Poenitentia, V. i. 155; edit. Paris, 1861, vol. ii. p. 351, a.

[474] Sess. xxiii. canon 4; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 88.

[475] Perrone, ut supra, De Matrimonio, 1. vol. ii. p. 407.

[476] Conc. Trident. sess. xiv. "De sacramento extremæ unctionis," can. 2, 4; Streitwolf, vol. i. pp. 70, 71.

[477] Apologia I [II.] Ad Antoninum Pium, 65, 66; Works, edit. Commelinus, Heidelberg, 1593, p. 76.

[478] Catechesis Mystagogicoe Quinque, Schram, Analysis Patrum, Augsburg, 1789, vol. x. pp. 250-268.

[479] Enarratio in Psalmum ciii. 14; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1836, vol. iv. p. 1626, d.

[480] Perrone in his Prælectiones Theologicæ, De Sacramentis in genere, i. 14; edit. Paris, 1861, vol. ii. p. 217; refers to these and tries to explain the facts away.

[481] Herzog's Real-Encyklopädie, Art. "Sacramente," vol. xiii., p. 241. The writer of the elaborate article in Herzog refers to the thorough investigation of this question in the Dissertation by G. L. Hahn, entitled, Doctrinæ Rom. de numero Sacramentorum septenaris rationes historicæ, Vratial. 1859.

---

§ 4. The Efficacy of the Sacraments.

Zwinglian and Remonstrant Doctrine.

According to the doctrine of Zwingle afterwards adopted by the Remonstrants, the sacraments are not properly "means of grace." They were not ordained to signify, seal, and apply to believers the benefits of Christ's redemption. They were indeed intended to be significant emblems of the great truths of the Gospel. Baptism was intended to teach the necessity of the soul's being cleansed from guilt by the

blood of Christ and purified from the pollution of sin by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. They were further designed to be perpetual memorials of the work of redemption, and especially to be the means by which men should, in the sight of the Church and of the world, profess themselves to be Christians. As a heathen, when he desired to be admitted into the commonwealth of Israel, received circumcision, which was the divinely appointed seal of the Abrahamic covenant, so participation in the Christian sacraments was the appointed means for the public profession of faith in Christ. Paul presents the matter in this light in 1 Corinthians x. 15-22, where he argues that participation in the sacred rites of a religion involves a profession of that religion, whether it be Christian, Jewish, or heathen. The sacraments, therefore, are "badges of Christian men's profession." This doctrine, however, attributes to them no other than what Zwingle calls in the passage above quoted, "an objective power;" that is, the objective presentation of the truth which they signify to the mind.

"Ex quibus hoc colligitur sacramenta dari in testimonium publicum ejus gratiæ, quæ cuique privato prius adest. . . . . Ob hanc causam sacramenta, quæ sacræ sunt cerimoniæ (accedit enim verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum), religiose colenda, hoc est in precio habenda, et honorifice tractanda sunt, ut enim gratiam facere non possunt, Ecclesiæ tamen nos visibiliter sociant, qui prius invisibiliter sumus in illam recepti, quod cum simul cum promissionis divinæ verbis in ipsorum actione pronunciatur ac promulgatur, summa religione suscipiendum est."

[482] In his treatise on true and false religion, Zwingle says: "Impossibile est, ut res aliqua externa fidem hominis internam confirmet et stabiliat." [483] And again he says [484] that the sacraments as other memorials can only produce historical, but not religious faith. Zwingle in the use of such language, had doubtless

more a negative, than an affirmative object before his mind. He was more intent on denying the Romish doctrine of the inherent power of the sacraments, than of asserting anything of their real efficacy. Nevertheless it is true that Zwingle has ever been regarded as holding the lowest doctrine concerning the sacraments of any of the Reformers. They were to him no more means of grace than the rainbow or the heaps of stone on the banks of the Jordan. By their significancy and by association they might suggest truth and awaken feeling, but they were not channels of divine communication.

Doctrine of the Reformed Church.

The first point clearly taught on this subject in the Symbols of the Reformed Church is that the sacraments are real means of grace, that is, means appointed and employed by Christ for conveying the benefits of his redemption to his people. They are not, as Romanists teach, the exclusive channels; but they are channels. A promise is made to those who rightly receive the sacraments that they shall thereby and therein be made partakers of the blessings of which the sacraments are the divinely appointed signs and seals. The word grace, when we speak of the means of grace, includes three things. 1st. An unmerited gift, such as the remission of sin. 2d. The supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit. 3d. The subjective effects of that influence on the soul. Faith, hope, and charity, for example, are graces.

The second point in the Reformed doctrine on the sacraments concerns the source of their power. On this subject it is taught negatively that the virtue is not in them. The word virtue is of course here used in its Latin sense for power or efficiency. What is denied is that the sacraments are the efficient cause of the gracious effects which they produce. The efficiency does not reside in the elements, in the water used in baptism, or in the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper. It

is not in the sacramental actions; either in giving, or in receiving the consecrated elements. Neither does the virtue or efficiency due to sacraments reside in, or flow from the person by whom they are administered. It does not reside in his office. There is no supernatural power in the man, in virtue of his office, to render the sacraments effectual. Nor does their efficiency depend on the character of the administrator in the sight of God; nor upon his intention; that is, his purpose to render them effectual. The man who administers the sacraments is not a worker of miracles. The Apostles and others at that time in the Church, were endued with supernatural power; and they had to will to exercise it in order to its producing its legitimate effect.

It is not so with the officers of the Church in the administration of the sacraments. The affirmative statement on this subject is, that the efficacy of the sacraments is due solely to the blessing of Christ and the working of his Spirit. The Spirit, it is to be ever remembered, is a personal agent who works when and how He will. God has promised that his Spirit shall attend his Word; and He thus renders it an effectual means for the sanctification of his people. So He has promised, through the attending operation of his Spirit, to render the sacraments effectual to the same end.

The third point included in the Reformed doctrine is, that the sacraments are effectual as means of grace only, so far as adults are concerned, to those who by faith receive them. They may have a natural power on other than believers by presenting truth and exciting feeling, but their saving or sanctifying influence is experienced only by believers.

All these points are clearly presented in the standards of our own Church. The sacraments are declared to be means of grace, that is, means for signifying, sealing, and applying the benefits of redemption.

It is denied that this virtue is in them, or in him by whom they are administered. It is affirmed that their efficiency in conveying grace, is due solely to the blessing of Christ and the coöperation of his Spirit; and that such efficiency is experienced only by believers. Thus in the Shorter Catechism, the sacraments are said to be holy ordinances "instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." [485] In the Larger Catechism the sacraments are said to be instituted "to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of his [Christ's] mediation." [486] The word "exhibit," as here used, means to confer, or impart, as the Latin word "exhibere" also sometimes means. That such is the sense of the word in our standards, is plain because the exhibition here spoken of is confined to those within the covenant; and because this word is interchanged and explained by the word "confer." Thus in the Confession of Faith [487] it is said, "The grace which is exhibited in, or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any virtue in them." And again, [488] that by the right use of baptism "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." With this view of the sacraments as means of grace all the other leading symbols of the Reformed Churches agree. Thus the First Helvetic Confession [489] says, "Asserimus, sacramenta non solum tesseras quasdam societatis Christianæ, sed et gratiæ divinæ symbola esse, quibus ministri, Domino, ad eum finem, quem ipse promittit, offert et efficit, cooperentur." The Gallican Confession says: "Fatemur talia esse signa hæc exteriora, ut Deus per illa Sancti sui Spiritus virtute, operetur, ne quicquam ibi frustra nobis significetur." [490] In the

Geneva Catechism [491] it is said: "Quid est sacramentum? Externa divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ testificatio, quæ visibili signo spirituales gratias figurat, ad obsignandos cordibus nostris Dei promissiones, quo earum veritas melius confirmetur. . . . . Vim efficaciamque sacramenti non in externo elemento inclusam esse existimas, sed totam a Spiritu Dei manare? Sic sentio: nempe, ut virtutem suam exerere Domino placuerit per sua organa, quem in finem ea destinavit." The language of the Belgic Confession [492] is to the same effect: "Sunt enim sacramenta signa, ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur. Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt, ant vacua: nec ad nos decipiendos aut frustrandos instituta."

These symbols of the Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe agree with those of our own Church, not only in representing the sacraments as real means of grace, but also in denying that their efficacy is due to their inherent virtue, or to him who administers them, and in affirming that it is due to the attending operation of the Spirit, and is conditioned on the presence of faith in the recipient. This is plain from the quotations already made, which might be multiplied indefinitely. On this point Calvin says: "Neque sacramenta hilum proficere sine Spiritu Sancti virtute." And again: "Spiritus Sanctus (quem non omnibus promiscue sacramenta advehunt, sed quem Dominus peculiariter suis confert) is est qui Dei gratias secum affert, qui dat sacramentis in nobis locum, qui efficit ut fructificent." [493] Guerike [494] gives as one of the main points of difference between the Lutherans and Reformed on this subject, that the latter deny the inherent power of the sacraments, and insist that the "virtus Spiritus Sancti extrinsecus accidens" is the source of all their sanctifying influence.

There is, therefore, a strict analogy, according to the Reformed doctrine, between the Word and the sacraments as means of grace. (1.) Both have in them a certain moral power due to the truth which they bring before the mind. (2.) Neither has in itself any supernatural power to save or to sanctify. (3.) All their supernatural efficiency is due to the coöperation or attending influence of the Holy Spirit. (4.) Both are ordained by God to be the channels or means of the Spirit's influence, to those who by faith receive them. Nothing is said in the Bible to place the sacraments above the Word as a means of communicating to men the benefits of Christ's redemption. On the contrary, tenfold more is said in Scripture of the necessity and efficiency of the Word in the salvation of men, than is therein said or implied of the power of the sacraments.

Besides the points already referred to as characteristic of the Reformed doctrine on the sacraments, there is a fourth, which is, that the grace or spiritual benefits received by believers in the use of the sacraments, may be attained without their use. This, however may perhaps be more properly considered, when the necessity of the sacraments comes under consideration.

The Lutheran Doctrine.

There are two points specially insisted upon by Lutherans in reference to the efficacy of the sacraments. The first is, the absolute necessity of faith in order to any real sanctifying or saving benefit being derived from the use of those ordinances. On this point they are in perfect accord with the Reformed. Hase is right when he says that the idea, "That a sacrament can confer saving benefit without faith is utterly destructive of Protestantism." [495] Augustine had long ago taught the doctrine, "Unde ista tanta virtus aquæ, ut corpus tangat, et cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo: non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur."

[496] And Bernard of Clairvaux says: "Sacramentum enim sine re sacramenti sumenti mors est: res vero sacramenti, etiam, præter sacramentum, sumenti vita æterna est." [497]

The Lutheran symbols on this point are perfectly explicit. In the "Augsburg Confession" [498] it is said: "Itaque utendum est sacramentum ita, ut fides accedat, quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta, ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata."

In the "Apology for the Augsburg Confession" [499] it is said. "Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter Judaica opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide. . . . . At sacramenta sunt signa promissionum. Igitur in usu debet accedere fides. . . . . Loquimur hic de fide speciali, quæ præsenti promissioni credit, non tantum quæ in genere credit Deum esse, sed quæ credit offerri remissionem peccatoram."

The second point in the doctrine of Lutherans in regard to the efficacy of the sacraments is one in which they differ from the Reformed, and as Guerike, himself a strenuous Lutheran, correctly says, approximate to the Romanists. They hold that the efficacy of the sacraments is due to their own inherent virtue or power; a power independent, on the one hand, of the attendant influences of the Spirit (extrinsecus accidens), and, on the other hand, of the faith of the recipient. Faith, indeed, is necessary to any saving or sanctifying effect, but that is only a subjective condition on which the beneficial operation of the power, inherent in the sacraments, is suspended. Bellarmin's illustration is applicable to the Lutheran doctrine as well as to his own. Fire will

not cause wood to burn unless the wood be dry; but its dryness does not give fire its power. Luther's own favourite illustration was drawn from the case of the woman who touched the Saviour's garment. There was inherent healing virtue in Christ. Those who touched him without faith received no benefit. The woman having faith was healed the moment she touched the hem of his garment. Her faith, however, was in no sense the source of the power which resided in Christ. Guerike complains that the Reformed teach that "the visible signs do not as such convey any invisible divine grace; that without the sacraments the Christian may enjoy through faith the same divine gifts which the sacraments are intended to convey, and hence do not admit their absolute necessity, much less that they are the central point of the Christian method of salvation (der christlichen Heilsanstalt)." [500]

Luther did not at first hold this inherent power of the sacraments, but seemed disposed to adopt even the low views of Zwingle. In his work on the Babylonish Captivity he says, "Baptismus neminem justificat, nec ulli prodest, sed fides in verbum promissionis, cui additur baptismus. . . . . Nec verum esse potest, sacramentis inesse vim efficacem justificationis seu esse signa efficacia gratiæ." [501]

Melancthon uses much the same language: "Non justificant signa, ut Apostolus ait, Circumcisio nihil est: ita baptismus nihil est. Participatio mensæ Domini nihil est: sed testes sunt kai sphragides divinæ voluntatis erga te, quibus conscientia tua certa reddatur, si de gratia, de benevolentia Dei erga se dubitet. . . . . Quæ alii sacramenta, nos signa appellamus, aut si ita libet, signa sacramentalia. Nam sacramentum ipsum Christum Paulus vocat." [502] "Hinc apparet, quam nihil signa sint, nisi fidei exercendæ mnemosuna." [503]

As, however, Luther understood our Lord's words in John iii 6, as

teaching the necessity of baptism, he inferred that if the sacrament is necessary to salvation it must have saving power. But as the Bible teaches that no one can be saved without faith, he held that the sacraments could have no saving effect unless the recipient was a believer. We have thus the two essential elements of the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments; they have inherent, saving, sanctifying power; but that power takes effect for good only upon believers.

The necessity of faith is clearly stated in the passages already quoted from the "Augsburg Confession" and the "Apology;" the inherent power of the sacraments in opposition to the Reformed doctrine is as clearly taught in the Lutheran standards. Both points are included in some of the proof passages which follow. Guerike says: "It is undoubtedly the Lutheran, in opposition to the Reformed doctrine of virtus Spiritus sancti extrinsecus accedens,' that the grace is in, and not merely with or by (mit oder neben), the sacraments." [504] He refers to the language of Luther in his Larger Catechism in reference to baptism. Luther says: "Interrogatus, quid baptismus sit? ita responde: non esse prorsus aquam simplicem, sed ejusmodi, quæ verbo et præcepto Dei comprehensa, et illi inclusa sit, et per hoc sanctificata ita ut nihil aliud sit, quam Dei seu divina aqua." He adds, however, "non quod aqua hæc per sese quavis alia sit præstantior, sed quod ei verbum ac præceptum Dei accesserit. Quocirca mera sycophantia est et diaboli illusio, quod hodie nostri novi spiritus, ut blasphement et contumelia afficiant baptismum, verbum et institutionem Dei ab eo divellunt, nec aliter intuentur eum, quam aquam e putreo haustam ac deinceps ita blasphemo ore blaterant: Quid vero utilitatis manus aquæ plena præstaret animæ? Quis vero adeo vecors et inops animi est, qui hoc ignoret, divulsis baptismi partibus, aquam esse aquam? Qua vero fronte tu tibi tantum sumis, ut non verearis ab ordinatione Dei pretiosissimum

keimelion avellere, quo Deus illam constrinxit et inclusit, neque inde divelli vult aut sejungi? Quippe verbum Dei, aut præceptum, item nomen Dei, in aqua ipse solet esse nucleus, qui thesaurus ipso coelo et terra omnibus modis nobilior est et præstantior." [505]

Lutherans are wont to refer to the analogy between the Word and sacraments. The difference between them and the Reformed as to the sacraments, is analogous to the difference between the two churches as to the Word. The Reformed refer the supernatural power of the Word, not to the literal Word as written or spoken; not to the mere moral truth therein revealed, but to the coöperation, or as Paul calls it, the demonstration, of the Spirit. The Lutherans, on the other hand, teach that there is inherent in the divine Word (not in the letters or the sound but in the truth), a supernatural, divine virtue, inseparable from it, and independent of its use; and which is the same to believers and unbelievers; sanctifying and saving the former, because of their faith, and not benefiting the latter, because of their voluntary resistance. So the sacraments have an inherent, divine power, certain of producing saving effects, if they meet with faith in those who receive them. "The Lutheran Church," says Guerike, "regards the sacraments as actions, wherein God, through external signs by Him appointed, offers and confers his invisible and heavenly gifts; they see in the sacraments visible signs, which in virtue of the divine word of promise pronounced over them, in such sense contain the invisible divine gifts they signify, that they communicate them (mittheilen) to all who partake of them, although only to believers to their good." [506]

This inherent divine virtue of the sacraments does not reside in the elements; nor does it flow from him who administers them; nor is it due to the concurrent operation of the Holy Spirit; but to the Word. The

elements employed are in themselves mere elements; with the Word, they are divinely efficacious, because the divine Word, wherever it is, is fraught with this divine, supernatural, saving, and sanctifying power which always takes effect on those who have faith to receive it

Dr. Schmid of Erlangen, however, admits that there is a difference of view on this subject, between the earlier and later theologians of his Church. The former made the sacrament consist of the element and the Word, and referred its supernatural effect to the inherent divine power of the latter, agreeably to Luther's representation in his Larger Catechism, where, when speaking of baptism, he says, in words already quoted: "non tantum naturalis aqua sed etiam divina, coelestis, sancta et salutifera aqua (est) . . . . hocque nonnisi verbi gratia, quod coeleste ac sanctum verbum est." The later theologians, however, from the time of Gerhard, did not make the sacrament consist of the element and the Word; but of something terrestrial and something celestial. The former is the element or external symbol, "quod est res corporea visibilis . . . . ordinata ad hoc, ut sit rei coelestis vehiculum et medium exhibitivum." The latter, or "res coelestis," is "res invisibilis et intelligibilis, re terrena visibili, tanquam medio divinitus ordinato exhibita, a qua fructus sacramenti principaliter dependet." According to this view the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend upon the Word, but upon this "res coelestis," of which the "res terrena" is the vehicle and medium. The office of the Word is to unite the two. It is called the "aition poietikon, hoc est, efficere, ut duæ illæ partes essentiales unum sacramentum constituant in usu sacramentorum." [507] This doctrine of the later Lutherans is attended with serious difficulties. It brings them into conflict with Luther and Lutherans of the older school who are strenuous in referring the efficacy of the sacraments to the Word. The elements without the Word,

are mere elements. It is the Word in which the supernatural power resides which produces the effect the sacrament is intended to accomplish. But according to this later view there are in the sacraments two things, the sign and the thing signified; a "res terrena" and a "res coelestis." They are so united that where the one is given and received by faith, the other is received. This "res coelestis," however, is not the Word. In the case of the eucharist, for example, it is the real body and blood of Christ, and these being inseparably united with his soul and divinity, it is this marvellous gift, and not the Word, which makes the Lord's Supper the life-sustaining food of the soul.

So far as the efficacy of the sacraments is concerned, the main point of difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed is, that the latter attribute their sanctifying power to the attending influences of the Spirit; the former to the inherent, supernatural power of the Word which is an essential part of these divine ordinances. Even on this point Chemnitz expresses himself in a way to which any Reformed theologian may assent. "Recte Apologia Augustanæ confessionis dicit, eundem esse effectum, eandem virtutem, seu efficaciam, et verbi et sacramentorum, quæ sunt sigilla promissionum. . . . . Sicut igitur Evangelium est potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti: non quod magica quædam vis characteribus, syllabis, aut sono verborum inhæreat, sed quia est medium, organon seu instrumentum, per quod Spiritus Sanctus efficax est, proponens, offerens, exhibens, distribuens et applicans meritum Christi, et gratiam Dei, ad salutem omni credenti: ita etiam sacramentis tribuitur vis et efficacia: non quod in sacramentis extra sen præter meritum Christi, misericordiam Patris, et efficaciam Spiritus Sancti, quærenda sit gratia ad salutem; sed sacramenta sunt causæ instrumentales ita, quod per illa media seu organa, Pater vult

gratiam suam exhibere, donare, applicare: Filius meritum suum communicare credentibus: Spiritus Sanctus efficaciam suam exercere, ad salutem omni credenti." [508]

The Lutheran doctrine as generally presented and as stated above, stands opposed, (1.) To the doctrine of the Romanists which denies the necessity of a living faith in the recipient in order to his experiencing the efficacy of the sacraments; and which not only represents them as imbued with an inherent power, but also teaches that they confer grace "ex opere operato." (2.) To the doctrine which makes the sacraments merely badges of a Christian profession. (3.) To the doctrine which represents them as mere allegories or significant exhibitions of truth. (4.) To the doctrine which regards them as merely commemorative, as a portrait or monument may be. (5.) To the doctrine which denies to them inherent efficacy and refers their sanctifying influence to the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit; and (6.) To the doctrine which assumes that they confer nothing which may not be obtained by faith without them. In all these points, with the exception of the last two, Lutherans and Reformed are agreed.

Doctrine of the Church of Rome on the Efficacy of the Sacraments.

It has already been stated that the Romanists teach, (1.) That the sacraments contain the grace which they signify. (2.) That they convey that grace "ex opere operato." (3.) That there is a certain efficacy common to all the sacraments. They all convey grace, i.e., "gratia gratum faciens, sanctificans;" and besides this common influence, in baptism, confirmation, and orders, there is conveyed an indelible character (quoddam indelebile) in virtue of which they can never be repeated. (4.) That the conditions of the efficacy of the sacraments on the part of the administrator are, first, that he have authority (this is limited in its application to baptism); and second, that he have the

intention of doing what the Church designs to be done; and in regard to the recipient, that he does not oppose an obstacle. The sacraments are declared to be effectual "non ponentibus obicem."

In what Sense do the Sacraments contain Grace?

By this is meant that they possess in them inherent virtue of rendering holy those to whom they are administered. Their power in the sphere of religion is analogous to that of articles of the "materia medica" in the sphere of physics. Some have a narcotic power; some act on one organ and some on another; some are stimulants, and some are sedatives. Or to refer to the illustration so familiar with Bellarmin; the inherent virtue of the sacraments to confer grace, is analogous to that of fire to burn. Fire produces combustion because it is ordained by God and imbued with power to that end. The sacraments confer grace because they are endowed with grace-imparting efficacy and are ordained by God for that purpose. "Containing grace and "conferring grace" "virtute sibi insita," are explanatory forms of expression. The sacraments are said to contain grace because they confer it by their inherent virtue. This is intended as a denial that their efficacy is due to the moral, or to the supernatural power of the truth; or to the attending influences of the Spirit, or to the subjective state of those who receive them.

As to the peculiar effect ascribed to baptism, confirmation, and orders, little is said. These sacraments are never repeated. For this some reason was to be assigned, and, therefore, it was assumed that they left an indelible impression on the soul. What that is, cannot be stated further than by saying that it is a "Signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile in anima impressum. Qui eo insigniti sunt, deputantur ad recipienda vel tradenda aliis ea, quæ pertinent ad cultum Dei." [509]

The language of the Council of Trent sheds no light on the subject. It

simply says: [510] "Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit." The only passages of Scripture referred to by Perrone in support of this assumption, are 2 Corinthians i. 22, and Ephesians i. 13, in which the Apostle speaks of all believers being sealed by the Holy Spirit. In those passages there is not the slightest reference to any sacramental impression. In the second part of the Roman Catechism in answer to the question, What "character" in this connection signifies, it is said that it is something which cannot be removed, and which renders the soul fit to receive or to perform certain spiritual benefits or functions. Thus in baptism a certain something is impressed upon the soul by which it is prepared to receive the benefit of other sacraments, and by which it is distinguished from the souls of the unbaptized. In confirmation the soul is marked as a soldier of Christ and prepared to contend against all spiritual enemies. In orders something is received which fits the recipient to administer the sacraments, and which distinguishes him from all other Christians.

Ex Opere Operato.

The Council of Trent anathematizes, as we have seen, not only those who deny that the sacraments convey grace, but also those who deny that they convey it "ex opere operato." The meaning of this phrase is intelligible enough if left unexplained. It has been obscured by the explanations given by Romanists themselves, as well as by the conflicting views of Protestants on the subject. To say that the sacraments contain grace; that they convey it "virtute sibi insita," that they convey it "ex opere operato," all amount to the same thing. The simple meaning is that such is the nature of the sacraments that,

when duly administered, they produce a given effect. There is no necessity and no propriety in looking beyond them to account for the effect produced. If you place a coal of fire on a man's hand, it produces a certain effect. That effect follows without fail. It follows from the very nature of the thing done and from the act of doing it. It makes no difference, whether we say that the coal contains heat; or, that it burns in virtue of its inherent nature; or that the effect is produced "ex opere operato."

Of course there are certain conditions necessary in order to the production of the effect. The hand must be alive, otherwise it is not the hand of a man; it is simply a lump of clay. There must be no obstacle. If you interpose a porcelain plate between the coal and the hand, the hand will not be burnt. The coal must be ignited, not simply a piece of carbon. So the thing done must be a real sacrament. It must have everything essential to the integrity of the ordinance. The coal, in the case supposed, must be brought into contact with the hand; but whether it be placed there by the use of a silver spoon, or of a pair of iron tongs, makes no difference. So it makes no difference whether the priest who administers the sacrament be a good man or a bad man, whether he be orthodox or heretical. He must, however, do the thing; and he cannot do it without intending to do it. If the man's hand is to be burnt, in a given time and place, the coal must be intentionally placed upon it.

Although the doctrine of the Church of Rome as to the way in which the sacraments convey grace, seems to be thus simple, there is no little apparent diversity among the theologians of that Church in their views on the subject. This diversity, however, is really more in the mode of stating the doctrine, than in the doctrine itself. Lutherans agree with Romanists in denying that the efficacy of the sacraments is due to the

attending influences of the Holy Spirit; and they agree with them in attributing to them an inherent supernatural power. The main point of difference between them is that the Lutherans insist on the presence and exercise of faith in the recipient. According to them the sacraments convey grace only to believers. Whereas Romanists, as understood by Lutherans and indeed by all Protestants, deny this necessity of faith or of good dispositions in order to the due efficacy of the sacraments. This, however, Bellarmin pronounces a deliberate falsehood on the part of the Protestants; and he uses language on this subject which Luther himself might have employed, "Est merum mendacium," he says, "quod Catholici dicant, sacramenta prodesse peccatoribus: omnes enim Catholici requirunt poenitentiam, tanquam dispositionem ad gratiam rocipiendam" "Falsum est Catholicos non habere pro obice incredulitatem: omnes enim Catholici requirunt necessario in adultis actualem fidem, et sine ea dicunt neminem justificari." [511] "Voluntas, fides, et poenitentia in suscipiento adulto necessario requiruntur, ut dispositiones ex parte subjecti, non ut causæ activæ: non enim fides et poenitentia efficiunt gratiam sacramentalem, neque dant efficaciam sacramento; sed solum tollunt obstacula quæ impedirent, ne sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent; unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus fit justificatio." [512] Luther would not agree with this last clause about infants; but to the rest of the paragraph he could hardly object. Then follows in Bellarmin the illustration quoted above. [513] Fire does not owe its efficacy to the dryness of the wood; nevertheless the dryness is a necessary condition of combustion.

In another passage Bellarmin is still more explicit: "Igitur ut intelligamus, quid sit opus operatum, notandum est, in justificatione, quam recipit aliquis, dum percipit sacramenta, multa concurrere;

nimirum ex parte Dei, voluntatem utendi illa re sensibili; ex parte Christi, passionem ejus; ex parte ministri potestatem, voluntatem, probitatem; ex parte suscipientis voluntatem, fidem, et poenitentiam; denique ex parte sacramenti ipsam actionem externam, quæ consurgit, ex debita applicatione formæ et materiæ. Cæterum ex his omnibus id, quod active, et proxime atque instrumentaliter efficit gratiam justificationis, est sola actio illa externa, quæ sacramentum dicitur, et hæc vocatur opus operatum, accipiendo passive (operatum) ita ut idem sit sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quod conferre gratiam ex [vi] ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis vel suscipientis." [514]

Notwithstanding all this the Romanists do teach the very doctrine which the Reformers charged upon them, and which the Protestant Symbols so strenuously condemn. This is clear, --

1. Because the same words do not always mean the same thing. Bellarmin says that Romanists teach that faith on the part of the recipient is necessary in order to the efficacy of the sacraments, at least in the case of adults. Protestants say the same thing; and yet their meaning is entirely different. By faith, Protestants mean saving faith; that faith which is one of the fruits of the Spirit, which, if a man has, his salvation is certain. Romanists, however, mean by faith mere assent, which a man may have, and be in a state of condemnation, and perish forever. This is their formal definition of faith, as given by Bellarmin himself; and the Council of Trent pronounces accursed those who say that the assent given by unrenewed men to the truth, is not true faith. Romanists do not hold that sacraments convey grace to avowed atheists or professed infidels; but that they exert saving power on those having the kind of faith in the Church which the bandits of Italy profess and cherish. So also the repentance required is not the

godly sorrow of which the Apostle speaks, but that remorse which wicked men often experience. These points have been abundantly proved in the preceding pages. [515] A coal of fire will burn a man's hand; it is true the man must be alive, but whether he is a good or bad man makes no difference. The sacraments confer grace by their inherent efficacy. It is true the recipient must be a believer; but whether he has what St. Peter calls "the precious faith of God's elect," or the same kind of faith that Simon Magus had, makes no difference.

2. That this is the true doctrine of the Church of Rome is evident from the manner in which it is presented by its leading theologians. This appears from the great distinction which they make between the sacraments of the Old, and those of the New Testament. The former only signified, the latter confer grace. The latter are effectual "ex opere operato;" the former, as Thomas Aquinas says, were effectual only "ex fide et devotione suscipientis." Again, the necessity of anything good in the recipient is expressly denied. Thus Gabriel Biel (1495) says "Sacramentum dicitur conferre gratiam ex opere operato, ita quod ex eo ipso, quod opus illud, puta sacramentum, exhibitur, nisi impediat obex peccati mortalis, gratia confertur utentibus, sic quod præter exhibitionem signi foris exhibiti non requiritur bonus motus seu devotio interior in suscipiente." [516] In like manner also Duns Scotus declares, [517] "præter istam (primam causam meritoriam sc. Christum) non oportet dare aliam intrinsecam in recipiente, qua conjungatur Deo, antequam recipiat gratiam;" and Petrus de Palude, [518] "In sacramentis novæ legis non per se requiritur, quod homo se disponat: ergo per ipsum sacramentum disponitur." The later Romish theologians teach the same doctrine. Thus Klee [519] says that the sacraments, when rightly dispensed, are of necessity effectual. And Moehler says: "The Catholic Church teaches that the sacrament works in us, in virtue of its

character as an ordinance of Christ, appointed for our salvation (ex opere operato, scl. a Christo,' instead of quod operatus est Christus'), i.e., the sacraments bring from the Saviour a divine power, which can be caused by no human frame of mind (Stimmung), nor by any spiritual state or effort, but which is given by God for Christ's sake directly in the sacrament." [520] It is true, he immediately adds, "Man must receive them, and must be susceptible of their impression, and this susceptibility expresses itself in repentance, in sorrow for sin, in longing for divine help, and in trusting faith; nevertheless he can only receive them, and hence only have the requisite susceptibility." All this, however, according to the Romish system, the unrenewed man has, or may have. In the case of infants there is nothing but passivity: simple non-resistance; and this is all that is required in the case of adults.

3. One of the points of controversy between the Jansenists and Jesuits related to this very subject. The Jansenists maintained that the efficacy of the sacraments depended on the inward state of the recipient. If he were not in a state of grace, and in the exercise of faith when they were received, they availed nothing. This doctrine the Jesuits controverted, and their influence prevailed in the Church. Jansenism was condemned and suppressed.

4. Another argument is derived from the constant practice of the Romish Church. There is no pretence of her recognized ministers demanding the profession, or evidence of what Protestants understand by saving faith in order to the reception of the sacraments, or as the condition of their sanctifying influence. On the contrary, they act on the principle, that the sacraments confer grace in the first instance. They baptize crowds of uninstructed heathen, without the slightest pretence that they are penitents or believers. If faith be a fruit of

regeneration, and if, as Romanists all teach, regeneration is effected in baptism, how can the presence of faith in the recipient be a condition of the efficacy of baptism. [521]

The Administrator.

Lutherans and Reformed agree in teaching, first, that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend on anything in him who administers them; and second, that as the ministry of the Word and sacraments are united in the Scriptures, it is a matter of order and propriety that the sacraments should be administered by those only who have been duly called and appointed to that service. In the Second Helvetic Confession, [522] therefore, it is said, "Baptismus pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica." According to the Westminster Confession, [523] "There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel. That is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the Word, lawfully ordained." The doctrine of the Lutheran Church is thus stated by Hollaz: "Jus dispensandi sacramenta Deus concredidit ecclesiæ, quæ exsecutionem aut exercitium hujus juris, observandi ordinis et euschemosunes causa commendavit ministris verbi divini vocatis et ordinatis. In casu autem extremæ necessitatis, ubi sacramentum est necessarium nec nisi periculo salutis omitti potest, quilibet homo Christianus (laicus aut femina) sacramentum initiationis valide celebrare potest." [524] This is considered as not inconsistent with the Augsburg Confession, which says: [525] "De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere, aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus."

The doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is briefly stated in the canons enacted during the seventh session of the Council of Trent. [526] We read thus: "Si quis dixerit, Christianos omnes in verbo, et

omnibus sacramentis administrandis habere potestatem; anathema sit." The Council say in "all" the sacraments; for the Church of Rome, although denying the power of any but canonically ordained priests to render the administration of the sacraments efficacious, admits of the efficacy of lay baptism. Again, "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramentis conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit ecclesia; anathema sit." Intention is defined to be the purpose of doing what Christ ordained and what the Church is accustomed to do. On this subject Bellarmin says, (1.) It is not necessary (in baptism at least) that the administrator should have an intelligent intention of doing what the Church does; for he may be ignorant of the doctrine of the Church; all that is required is that he intend to administer a Church ordinance. (2.) It is not necessary that he intend to do what the Church of Rome does; but what the true Church, whatever that may be, is accustomed to do. Hence, he says, the Catholic Church does not rebaptize those who have been baptized by the Geneva churches. "Non tollit efficaciam sacramenti error ministri circa ecclesiam, sed do fectus intentionis." (3.) That not actual intention, but only virtual, is required. "Virtualis dicitur, cum actualis intentio in præsenti non adest ob aliquam evagationem mentis, tamen paulo ante adfuit et in virtute illius sit operatio." [527] On this account the Roman Catechism says, that baptism administered by a heretic, a Jew, or a heathen, is efficacious: "Si id efficere propositum eis fuerit, quod ecclesia Catholica in eo administrationis genere efficit." [528] This agrees with the popular view of the doctrine of intention. The administrator must intend to produce the effect which the sacrament was designed to accomplish. If he baptizes, he must intend to regenerate; if he absolves, he must intend to absolve; if he consecrates the bread and wine, he must intend their

transmutation; if he offers the host, he must intend it as a sacrifice; and if offered for a particular person, he must intend it to take effect for his benefit. According to this view everything depends on the will of the officiating priest.

---

[482] Zwinglii Fidei Ratio, Niemeyer, vol. i. pp. 25, 26.

[483] Works, edit. Schuler und Schultess. (?) See Strauss, Dogmatik, vol. ii. p. 519.

[484] Expositio Christianæ Fidei, 70; Niemeyer, vol. i. p. 49.

[485] Ques. 92.

[486] Ques. 162.

[487] Chap. xxvii. 3.

[488] Chap. xxviii. 6.

[489] Art. XXI.; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 120.

[490] Art. XXXIV.; Ibid. p. 337.

[491] V. De Sacramentis, 2 and 5; Ibid. pp. 160, 161.

[492] Art. XXXIII.; Ibid. p. 383.

[493] Institutio, IV. xiv. 9, 17; edit. Berlin, 1834, part ii. pp. 355, 360.

[494] Allgemeine Christliche Symbolik, von H. E. Ferdinand Guerike, D. D., Leipzig, 1839, p. 378.

[495] Evangelische Dogmatik, II. ii. 1, § 213; 3d edit. Leipzig, 1842, p. 442.

[496] In Joannis Evangelische Tractatus, LXXX. 3; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1837, vol. iii. p. 2290, a.

[497] Guigo (attributed to St. Bernard); Works of St. Bernard, edit. Migne, Paris, 1859, vol. iii. p. 327, b, c (ii. 214).

[498] I. xiii.; Hase, Libri Symbolici, Leipzig, 1846, p. 12.

[499] VII. 18-21; Ibid. p. 203.

[500] Allgemeine Christliche Symbolik, § 54, Leipzig, 1839, pp. 375, 376.

[501] Luther, Captivitas Babylonica, de Sacramento Baptismi; Works, edit. Wittenberg (Latin), 1546, vol. ii. leaf 79, p. 2.

[502] Loci Communes; De Signis; edit. Strasburg, 1523, in Dodecas Scriptorum Theologicorum, Nuremberg, 1646, pp. 774, 775.

[503] Ibid., De Baptismo, p. 778.

[504] Symbolik, Leipzig, 1839, p. 393, note.

[505] Catechismus Major par. iv., De Baptismo; Hase, Libri Symbolici, edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 537.

[506] Guerike's Symbolik, p. 372.

[507] Schmid, Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Frankfort and Erlangen, 1853, pp. 415-417.

[508] Examen Concilii Tridentini, de Efficacia et Usu Sacramentorum, edit. Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1573, 1574, part ii. p. 22, b.

[509] Perrone, Prælectiones Theologicæ, De Sacramentis in genere, cap. ii. 1, 2; edit. Paris, 1861, vol. ii. pp. 220, a, 224.

[510] Sess. vii. de Sacramentis in genere. canon 9; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 39.

[511] Bellarmin, De Sacramentis, I. 2; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, vol. iii. p. 6, b, c.

[512] Ibid. II. i.; pp. 108, d, 109, a.

[513] See. p. 490.

[514] De Sacramentis in genere, II. i.; ut supra, p. 108, c.

[515] See above, the chapter on Faith.

[516] Collectorium in IV. Libros Sententiarum, lib. iv. dis. 1, qu. 3; Basle, 1508, by count, p. 14, b, of the text of book iv.

[517] In Lib. IV. Sentent., lib. iv. dis. 4. qu. 2; Venice, 1506, by

count, p. 34, b, of book iv.

[518] In his commentary on the Sentences, lib. iv. dis. 1. qu. 1; Paris, 1514, by count, p. 4, a, b, of book iv.

[519] Dogmatik, Specielle Dogmatik, III. i. 1, § 7; Mainz, 1835, vol. iii. p. 95.

[520] Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten; von Dr. J. A. Möhler, IV. § 28; 6th ed. Mainz, 1843, p. 255.

[521] See Historischer Anhang über die Wirksamkeit der Sacramente "ex opere operato," vol. ii. § 107, p. 363, of Köllner's Symbolik. Köllner comes to the conclusion that there is no great difference between the Lutheran and Romish doctrines on the efficacy of the sacraments; a conclusion in conflict with the conviction of Luther and his associates.

[522] XX.; Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, p. 518.

[523] Chap. xxvii. 4.

[524] Examen, III. ii. 3, quæst. 6; edit. Leipzig, 1840, p. 518.

[525] I. 14; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 13.

[526] Sess. vii.; Canones de Sacramentis in genere, 10, 11; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 40.

[527] Bellarmin, De Sacramentis in genere, I. xxvii.; Disputationes, edit. Paris, 1608, vol. iii. pp. 94, d, 95.

[528] Catechismus Romanus, II. ii. 18 (xxii. 24), Streitwolf, Libri Symbolici, vol. i. p. 270.

---

§ 5. The Necessity of the Sacraments.

The distinction between the necessity of precept and the necessity of means, is obvious and important. No one would be willing to say, without qualification, that it is unnecessary to obey an explicit

command of Christ. And as He has commanded his disciples to baptize all who are received as members of his Church, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and required his disciples statedly to commemorate his death by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the strongest moral obligation rests upon his people to obey these commands. But the obligation to obey any command, such as to observe the Sabbath, to visit the sick, and to relieve the poor, depends on circumstances. No opportunity may be offered; or the discharge of the duty may be hindered by external circumstances; or we may lack the ability to render the service required. So with regard to the command to be baptized and to commemorate the Lord's death at his table, it is evident that many circumstances may occur to prevent obedience even on the part of those who have the disposition and purpose to do whatever their Lord requires at their hands. And even where obedience is not prevented by external circumstances, it may be prevented by ignorance, or by unfounded scruples of conscience.

By the necessity of means is usually understood an absolute necessity, a "sine qua non." In this sense food is a necessity of life; light is necessary to the exercise of vision; the Word is necessary to the exercise of faith, for it is its object, the thing which is to be believed; and faith is, on the part of adults, necessary to salvation, for it is the act of receiving the grace of God offered in the Bible. And therefore times almost without number, it is said in Scripture, that we are saved by faith, that he that believeth shall be saved, and that he that believeth not shall not see life.

The question between the Reformed on the one hand, and Lutherans and Romanists on the other, is in which of these senses are the sacraments necessary. According to the Reformed they have the necessity of precept. The use of them is enjoined as a duty; but they are not

necessary means of salvation. Men may be saved without them. The benefits which they signify and which they are the means of signifying, sealing, and applying to believers, are not so tied to their use that those benefits cannot be secured without them. Sins may be forgiven, and the soul regenerated and saved, though neither sacrament has ever been received. The Lutherans and Romanists, on the other hand, hold that the sacraments are necessary means of grace, in the sense that the grace which they signify is not received otherwise than in their use. There is no remission of sin or regeneration without baptism; no reception of the body and blood of Christ to our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace, without the Lord's Supper; and, according to Romanists, no forgiveness of post-baptismal sins without priestly absolution; no grace of orders without canonical ordination; and no special preparation for death without extreme unction. This question is of importance chiefly in reference to baptism, and will therefore come up when that sacrament is under consideration. At present it is only the general teachings of these several churches that need be referred to. The "Consensus Tigurinus" is the most carefully considered and cautiously worded exposition of the doctrine of the Reformed in relation to the sacraments, belonging to the period of the Reformation. It was drawn up to settle the differences on this subject between the churches of Geneva and those of Zurich. It contains the statements in reference to the sacraments to which both parties agreed. It teaches [529] (1.) That the sacraments are "notæ ac tesseræ" of Christian fellowship and brotherhood; incitements to gratitude, faith, and a holy life, and "syngraphæ" binding us thereto. They were ordained especially that therein God might testify, represent, and seal to us his grace. (2.) The things signified are not to be separated from the signs. Those who by faith receive the latter receive also the former. (3.) That

respect is to be had rather to the promise to which our faith is directed; for the elements without Christ "nihil sint quam inanes larvæ." (4.) The sacraments confer nothing "propria eorum virtute;" God alone works in us by his Spirit. They are organs or means by which God efficaciously operates. (5.) They are sometimes called seals, but the Spirit alone is properly the seal as well as the beginner and finisher of our faith. (6.) God does not operate in all who receive the sacraments, but only in his own chosen people. (7.) Hence the doctrine is to be rejected that the sacraments convey grace to all who do not oppose the obstacle of mortal sin. The grace of God is not so bound to the signs, that all who have the latter have the former. (8.) Believers receive without the sacraments the blessings which they receive in their use. "Extra eorum usum fidelibus constat, quæ illic figuratur veritas." Paul received baptism for the remission of sins; but his sins were remitted before he was baptized. Baptism was to Cornelius the layer of regeneration, but he had received the Spirit before he was thus externally washed. In the Lord's Supper we receive Christ, but Christ dwells in every believer, and we must have faith before we can acceptably approach the table of the Lord. (9.) The benefit of the sacraments is not confined to the time in which they are administered or received. God often regenerates long after baptism those baptized in infancy; some in early youth, some in old age. The benefit of baptism, therefore, continues through the whole life, because the promise signified therein continues always in force.

As to the Lutheran doctrine on this subject, Guerike says that the three churches, the Greek, Roman, and Lutheran, "are agreed in holding that in the sacraments the visible signs as such really convey the invisible divine things, and therefore, that a participation of the sacraments is necessary in order to a participation of the heavenly

gifts (göttliche Sache) therein contained. While on the contrary the Reformed Church teaches that the visible signs as such do not convey the invisible grace, and that the Christian can by faith receive the same divine benefits without the use of the sacraments, and consequently that the sacraments are not absolutely necessary, much less the middle point of the Christian plan of salvation." [530] The language of the Lutheran Symbols justifies this strong language of Guerike. Thus the signers of the Augsburg Confession, [531] "Damnant Anabaptistas qui improbant baptismum puerorum et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri." And in the comment on that article in the "Apology for the Confession," it is said, [532] "Nonus articulus approbatus est, in quo confitemur, quod baptismus sit necessarius ad salutem, et quod pueri sint baptizandi, et quod baptismus puerorum non sit irritus, sed necessarius et efficax ad salutem." The Lutheran theologians, however, in treating of the necessity of baptism, make a distinction between adults and infants. With regard to the former, regeneration should precede baptism. In reference to them, the design of baptism is to seal and confirm the grace already received. In regard to infants it is the organ or means of regeneration. Thus Baier says: [533] "Hic autem, quod ad finem proximum attinet, diversitas occurrit, respectu subjectorum diversorum. Nam infantibus quidem æque omnibus per baptismum primum confertur et obsignatur fides, per quam meritum Christi illis applicetur: Adultis vero illis tantum, qui fidem ex verbo conceperunt ante baptismi susceptionem, baptismus eam obsignat et confirmat." So also Gerhard says: "Infantibus baptismus principaliter est medium ordinarium regenerationis et mundationis a peccatis, etc. Secundario autem sigillum justitiæ et fidei confirmatio; adultis credentibus baptismus principaliter præstat usum obsignationis ac testificationis de gratia Dei, huiothesia et vita æterna; sed minus

principaliter renovationem et dona Spiritus Sancti auget. Infantes, per baptismum primitias Spiritus et fidei accipiunt: adulti qui per verbum primitias fidei et Spiritus Sancti acceperunt, per baptismum incrementa ejusdem consequuntur." [534]

The doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is, not that all tho seven sacraments are necessary to salvation, but that each is necessary to the reception of the gift or grace which it is intended to convey. There can be no "grace of orders" without canonical ordination, but it is not necessary that every man should be ordained. The sacrament of penance is necessary only in the case of post-baptismal sin, and even the eucharist, which they regard as far the greatest of their sacraments "in dignity and mystery," is not necessary to infants. Baptism, however, being the only channel through which remission of sins and regeneration are conveyed, is absolutely necessary to salvation, And priestly absolution is absolutely necessary for the remission of sins committed after baptism. Such revolting consequences would flow from carrying this principle rigorously out, that Romanists shrink from its assertion. It would exclude many confessors and martyrs from the kingdom of heaven. It is, therefore, taught that when circumstances render it impossible that these sacraments can be received, the purpose and desire to receive them secure their benefits. These cases are, however, exceptions, and are generally overlooked in the statement of the doctrine. This exception does not apply to infants, and, therefore, they cannot enjoy its benefits. It is the doctrine of the Church of Rome that all unbaptized persons fail of eternal life. This is included in their idea of the Church. None are saved who are not within the pale of the true Church. None are within the pale of the Church who have not been baptized, and who are not subject to canonical bishops, and especially to the bishop of Rome. The

unbaptized, therefore, not being in the Church, as defined by Romanists, are of necessity excluded from the kingdom of heaven. The language of the Roman standards is perfectly explicit. The Council of Trent says: [535] "Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando, et aliquibus anathema sit." And again: [536] "Si quis dixerit baptismum liberum esse, hoc est non necessarium ad salutem; anathema sit." In the Roman Catechism [537] we find the following: "Estne Baptismus ad salutem omnibus necessarius?" the answer is: "Sed cum ceterarum rerum cognitio, quæ hactenus expositæ sunt, fidelibus utillissima habenda sit, tum vero nihil magis necessarium videri potest, quam ut doceantur, omnibus hominibus baptismi legem a Domino præscriptam esse, ita ut, nisi per baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur, in sempiternam miseriam, et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fideles, sive infideles sint, procreentur." According to the Church of Rome, therefore, all the unbaptized, whether their parents be believers or infidels, are doomed to eternal misery and perdition. With regard to penance, the Council of Trent says: [538] "Est hoc sacramentum poenitentiæ lapsis post baptismum ad salutem necessarium, ut nondum regeneratis ipse baptismus." It also teaches that full confession of all sins committed after baptism is "jure divino" necessary, because our Lord Jesus Christ, about to ascend into heaven, left his priests as his vicars, as "præsides et judices," to whom all mortal sins, into which Christians may fall, are to be communicated, and who are authorized to pronounce the sentence of remission or retention. It is said, moreover, that our Lord teaches that priests, who themselves are in a state of mortal sin, in virtue of the power of the Holy Spirit given them in ordination, exercise, as ministers of Christ, this function of remitting sins, and those err who contend that

wicked priests have not this power. All this is reiterated in the canons and amplified and enforced in the Catechism. [539]

In this connection it is sufficient to remark, --

1. That the doctrine that the sacraments are necessary to salvation, on the ground that they are the only channels for conveying to men the benefits of Christ's redemption, is clearly contrary to the express teachings of the Bible. The Scriptures everywhere teach that God looks upon the heart; that He requires of fallen men simply faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and repentance toward God as the only indispensable conditions of salvation; that all men have free access to God, through the mediation of Christ, to obtain at his hands the remission of sins and all the benefits of redemption; that they need no intervention of priests to secure for them this access or the communication of those benefits; and that no external rites have power in themselves to confer grace. God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life. He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. Whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord, shall be saved. Whoso believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God. The Scripture cannot be broken. It cannot be that he who truly believes the record which God has given of his Son should fail of eternal life. We become the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ. It is true we are commanded to be baptized, as we are commanded to confess Christ before men or to love the brethren. But these are duties to which faith secures obedience; they are not the means of salvation.

2. This ritual system is utterly inconsistent with the whole genius of Christianity. God is a Spirit, and He requires those who worship Him, to worship Him in spirit and in truth. External rites are declared to

be nothing. Circumcision is nothing. and uncircumcision is nothing. "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." (Rom. ii. 28, 29.) This is not merely a fact, but a principle. What St. Paul here says of circumcision and of Jews, may be said, and is substantially said of St. Peter in reference to baptism and Christianity. A man who is a Christian outwardly only, is not a Christian; and the baptism which saves, is not the washing of the body with water, but the conversion of the soul. (1 Peter iii. 21.) The idea that a man's state before God depends on anything external, on birth, on membership in any visible organization, or on any outward rite or ceremony, is utterly abhorrent to the religion of the Bible. It did not belong to Judaism except in the corrupt form of Pharisaism. It is true, that under the old dispensation a man could not be saved unless he belonged to the commonwealth of Israel, and was one of the children of Abraham. But according to St. Paul (Rom. ix. 8; Gal. iii. 7 and 29), this only meant that they must believe in Abraham's God and the promise of redemption through his seed. If a man of heathen birth and culture came to the knowledge of the truth, believed the doctrines which God had revealed to his chosen people, relied on the promise of salvation through Christ, and purposed to obey the law of God, then he was a Jew inwardly and one of Abraham's seed. His circumcision was only "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." (Rom. iv. 11.) The doctrine that such a man, notwithstanding this thorough change in his inward state in knowledge, conviction, and character, is under the wrath and curse of God, until a little piece of flesh is cut from his body, never was a part of the religion of God. It

is part and parcel of the religion of his great adversary. Any one, therefore, who teaches that no man can be saved without the rite of baptism, and that by receiving that rite he is made a child of God and heir of heaven, is antichrist, and "even now are there many antichrists." (1 John ii. 18.)

3. This ritualistic system, which makes the sacraments the only channels of grace, and consequently absolutely necessary to salvation, naturally leads to the divorce of religion and morality. A man, according to this system, may be in the true Church a child of God, and assured of heaven, and yet utterly frivolous, worldly, and even immoral in his inward and outward life. This is illustrated on a large scale in every Roman Catholic country. In such countries some of the greatest devotees are openly wicked men. And wherever this system prevails we find its most zealous advocates among people of the world, who live at ease in full security of salvation, because they are in the Church and faithful in observing "days, and months, and times, and years;" and are punctiliously "subject to ordinances, touch not, taste not, handle not." [540] The great question at issue in the controversy with ritualism is, Whether a man's salvation depends on his inward state, or upon outward rites; or, as some would give it, Whether his state is determined by outward rites, or whether the rites depend for their value and efficacy on his inward state. In either form the question is, Are we saved by faith or by sacraments? The Apostle teaches us that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." (Gal. vi. 15.)

4. The above remarks are not intended to apply, and it fact are not applicable to the Lutheran system. Lutherans do, indeed, teach the necessity of the sacraments, but as they also teach that true, living, saving faith is the indispensable condition of their efficacy; and, as

they further teach that in the case of adults such faith produced by the Word precedes baptism, they do not make baptism the ordinary and indispensable channel for the communication of the saving influences of the Holy Spirit. They hold that all who, through the reading or hearing of the Word, are led to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour, are thereby made children of God and heirs of eternal life. They believe with the Apostle (Gal. iii. 26), that we "are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." It is this doctrine of salvation by faith, or as Luther has it, "by faith alone," that has saved the Lutheran system from the virus of ritualism.

---

[529] Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum, Leipzig, 1840, pp. 193-195.

[530] Symbolik, p. 374.

[531] Par. I. ix. 3; Hase, Libri Symbolici, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1846, p. 12.

[532] Apologia, iv. 51; Ibid. p. 156.

[533] Compendium Theologiæ Positivæ, III. x. 10; edit. Frankfort and Leipzig, 1739, p. 648.

[534] Loci Theologici, XXI. vii. § 124; edit. Tübingen, 1769, vol. ix. p. 169.

[535] Sess. vii., De Sacramentis in genere, canon 7; Streitwolf, vol. i. p. 39.

[536] Ibid., De Baptismo, canon 5; Ibid. p. 41.

[537] Par. II. cap. ii. quæst. 25 (31, xxx.); Ibid. p. 274.

[538] Sess. xiv. cap. 2; Ibid. p. 55.

[539] Sess. xiv. cap. 5, 6; Ibid.

[540] A gentleman of discrimination and candour, not long since said to a friend, "You are very pious, but you have no religion. I am religious, but I have no piety."

§ 6. Validity of the Sacraments.

That is valid which avails for the end intended. The question, therefore, as to the validity of the sacraments is a question as to what is necessary to their being that which they purport to be. The answer to this question is that they must conform to the prescriptions given in the Bible concerning them. The elements employed must be those which Christ ordained. The form, or the manner in which those elements are given and received, must be in accordance with his directions; and the ordinance must be administered with the intention of doing what He has commanded. Thus if baptism be a washing with water, then it is necessary that water should be the element employed in its administration. If it be a washing with water in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then those words, or that form, must be used; and the ordinance must be administered and received in the faith of the Trinity. The general faith of the Church has been in favour of the validity of heretical baptism; but heresy was made to include other departures from the standard of faith, than the denial of the essential doctrines of the Gospel. Baptism is a Christian ordinance. It involves on the part of both the administrator and the recipient the profession of the Christian religion. It is perfectly evident that the same service, as to matter and form, performed by a heathen to a. heathen, who attached an entirely different meaning to what was done, could not be regarded as a Christian ordinance.

The other condition necessary to the validity of the sacraments concerns the intention of those engaged in the service. They must intend to do what Christ commanded. If a man receives the ordinance of baptism he must intend to profess his faith in the Gospel and to accept the terms of salvation therein presented. And the administrator must

have the purpose to initiate the recipient into the number of the professed disciples of Christ. A sacrament, therefore, administered by an idiot, or a maniac, or in sport, or in mockery, is utterly null and void. It has no meaning and is entirely worthless.

The only question on which there is much diversity of opinion on this subject, is, Whether the validity of the sacraments depends on the official standing of the person by whom they are administered? We have seen that Romanists make canonical ordination or consecration absolutely essential. If any man but a bishop (in their sense of the word) should confirm or ordain, nothing is done. The service in either case is an empty one, conveying neither grace nor authority. If any other than a priest should absolve a penitent, no absolution takes place; and so of the Lord's Supper, the words of consecration pronounced by any lips but those of a canonically ordained priest, produce no change in the elements. The reason of this is, not merely that the officiator acts in such cases disorderly and improperly, but that he has neither the prerogative nor the power to render the sacraments effectual. They are invalid, because they do not avail to accomplish the end for which they were appointed. Romanists are guilty of a benevolent inconsistency in making baptism an exception to this rule. There is the same logical or theoretical reason that baptism should be invalid when administered by an unordained person, as that confirmation, ordination, or absolution, when thus administered, should be null and void. But as baptism is held to be essential to salvation, souls must often perish, when a priest is inaccessible, unless lay baptism be allowed. In cases of such emergency the Church of Rome, therefore, pronounces baptism to be valid (i.e., efficacious) when administered by a layman, a woman, or even by a pagan, provided the administrator really intends to baptize, i.e., to do what the Church

contemplates in the administration of that ordinance.

The standards of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches place preaching the Word and the administration of the sacraments on the same ground. They teach (1.) That Christ has appointed certain officers in his Church. (2.) That by his Spirit he calls and qualifies certain men for the discharge of the duties of those offices. (3.) That those who aspire to them are to be examined as to their call and qualifications. (4.) That if found competent they are to be set apart or ordained in an orderly manner to the office to which they deem themselves called. (5.) That the special functions of one class of these officers, are preaching and the administration of the sacraments. (6.) It follows from all this that for any one not thus called and ordained to undertake the exercise of either of these functions of the ministry, in a settled state of the Church, is wrong; it is a violation of the divinely constituted order of Christ's Church. According to this view, lay preaching and lay administration of the ordinances (in ordinary circumstances) are equally wrong. But are they invalid? That is a very different question. We know that Romanists, when they pronounce a sacrament invalid, mean that it is powerless. We know that when the old English law pronounced any marriage invalid if not solemnized by a man in holy orders, the meaning was, that the ceremony was null and void; that the parties were not married. But what can be meant by lay preaching being invalid? Is the Gospel invalid? Does it lose its truth, authority, or power? This cannot be. Neither its authority nor its power depend upon the clay lips by which it is proclaimed. Again, if a number of pious Christians assemble, where no minister can be had, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, in what sense is such a service invalid? Do they not commemorate the death of Christ? Are not the bread and wine to them the symbols of his body and blood? If faith be in exercise, may they not receive those

symbols to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace? Again, if baptism be a washing with water in the name of the Holy Trinity, to signify and seal our engrafting into Christ, does it cease to be, or to signify this if not administered by an ordained minister? Does not the man thus baptized make a profession of his faith in Christ? and does he not thereby become a member of that great body which confesses Him before men? Can it, therefore, be any more invalid than the Gospel, when preached by a laymen?

What the Bible, therefore, seems to teach on this subject is, that Christ having appointed certain officers in his Church to preach his Word and to administer his ordinances, for any man, under ordinary circumstances not duly appointed, to assume the functions of the ministry, is irregular and wrong, because contrary to the order of Christ's Church. Further than this the Reformed and Lutheran standards do not appear to have gone.

---

§ 7. Baptism.

"Baptism is a sacrament, wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our engrafting into Christ and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's." [541]

The Mode of Baptism.

According to the definition given above, baptism is a washing with water. By washing is meant any such application of water to the body as effects its purification. This may be done by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling. The command, therefore, to baptize is simply a command to wash with water. It is not specifically a command to immerse, to affuse, or to sprinkle. The mode of applying water as the purifying medium is unessential. The only necessary thing is to make such an

application of water to the person, as shall render the act significant of the purification of the soul.

The first argument in favour of this view of the ordinance is an à priori one. As by common consent the design of the institution is either to symbolize or to effect the cleansing of the soul from the guilt and pollution of sin, by the blood and spirit of Christ, it would seem to follow that washing with water, however done, is all that is necessary to the integrity of the ordinance. The idea of purification is as clearly and as frequently signified by affusion as by immersion. Besides, to make anything so purely circumstantial as the manner in which water is used in the act of cleansing, essential to a Christian sacrament, which, according to some, is absolutely necessary to salvation, and, according to others, is essential to membership in the visible Church of Christ, is opposed to the whole nature of the Gospel. It is to render Christianity more Judaic than Judaism, even as understood by the Pharisees; for they purified themselves, their offerings, and holy places and utensils, by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling as was most appropriate or convenient.

Use of the Word in the Classics.

The second argument on this subject, is drawn from the usage of the word. In the Classics; in the Septuagint and the Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament; in the New Testament and in the writings of the Greek fathers, the words bapto, baptizo and their cognates, are used with such latitude of meaning, as to prove the assertion that the command to baptize is a command to immerse, to be utterly unauthorized and unreasonable.

Ever since the Reformation and the rise of the Baptists as a distinct denomination, who hold that "baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing," the meaning of the Greek words in question has been a

matter of dispute, on which hundreds of volumes have been written. It is evidently impossible to enter on that discussion in these pages. All that can be attempted is a brief statement of the conclusions believed to be established, while the proofs on which those conclusions rest must be sought in works devoted to the subject. As to the classic use of the words in question, it is clear that bapto means (1.) To dip. (2.) To dye by dipping. (3.) To dye without regard to the mode in which it is done; as a lake is said to be baptized (i.e., dyed) by the blood shed in it; a garment is spoken of as baptized by colouring matter dropping on it. (4.) It also means to gild; also to glaze, as when earthenware is covered with any vitreous matter. (5.) To wet, moisten, or wash. (6.) To temper, as hot iron is tempered; this may be done by plunging or pouring. "Tempered, hupo elaiou," does not mean plunged into oil. (7.) To imbue. The mind is said to be baptized with fantasies; not plunged into them, for it is hupo ton phantasion. [542] A man is said to be "imbued with righteousness." This cannot mean "dipped." It is obvious, therefore, that a command to baptize, made in the use of the word bapto, cannot be limited to a command to dip, plunge, or immerse.

As to the classic use of baptizo, it means, (1.) To immerse, or submerge. It is very frequently used when ships are spoken of as sunk or buried in the sea. They are then said to be baptized. (2.) To overflow or to cover with water. The sea-shore is said to be baptized by the rising tide. (3.) To wet thoroughly, to moisten. (4.) To pour upon or drench. (5.) In any way to be overwhelmed or overpowered. Hence men are said to be baptized with wine (hoi bebaptismenoi are the intoxicated), with opium, with debts, with puzzling questions. Wine is said to be baptized by having water poured into it. [543]

The word baptizo, as Dr. Dale so strenuously argues, belongs to that

class of words which indicate an effect to be produced without expressing the kind of action by which that effect is to be brought about. In this respect it is analogous to the word "to bury." A man may be buried by being covered up in the ground; by being placed in an empty cave; by being put into a sarcophagus; or even, as among our Indians, by being placed upon a platform elevated above the ground. The command to bury, may be executed in any of these ways. So with regard to the word baptizo, there is a given effect to be produced, without any specific injunction as to the manner; whether by immersion, pouring, or sprinkling.

Use of the Words in the Septuagint and Apocrypha.

These words are of rare occurrence in the Greek version of the Old Testament. In the fifth chapter of Second Kings we have the history of Naaman the Syrian, who came to the prophet to be healed of his leprosy. And "Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in Jordan seven times" (ver. 10). "Then went he down and dipped himself (ebaptisato) seven times in Jordan" (ver. 14). The only special interest in this passage is the proof it affords that baptism and washing are identical. The command to wash was obeyed by baptizing himself. The Vulgate does not change the words in the two passages, "Vade et lavare septies in Jordane" (ver. 10). "Descendit et lavit in Jordane septies" (ver. 14). The Septuagint has lousai in verse 10, and ebaptisato in verse 14.

In Daniel iv. 33, it is said that the body of Nebuchadnezzar "was wet (baptized, ebaphe, [LXX. ver. 30]) with the dew of heaven." Here the idea of dipping is absolutely precluded.

The word bapto, when meaning to dip, does not necessarily include the idea of entire immersion. A mere touch or partial immersion is often all the word is intended to express; as in Leviticus iv. 17: "The

priest shall dip (bapsei) his finger in some of the blood." Leviticus xiv. 6: "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and shall dip (bapsei) them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water." All these things could not be immersed in the blood of a bird. Boaz said to Ruth, at meal-time "dip (bapseis) thy morsel in the vinegar." (Ruth ii. 14.) Joshua iii. 15. "The feet of the priests that bare the ark were dipped (ebaphesan) in the brim of the water." 1 Samuel xiv. 27: Jonathan "dipped" (ebapsen) the end of the rod which was in his hand "in an honey-comb." Psalm lxviii. 23 (24), "That thy foot may be dipped (baphe) in the blood of thine enemies." These examples prove that even bapto, as used in the Septuagint, does not, when it means to dip, include the idea of complete immersion.

baptizo (according to Trommius), besides the passage already quoted from 2 Kings v. 14, occurs in the Septuagint only in Isaiah xxi. 4, where the Greek is he anomia me baptizei, "iniquity baptizes (or overwhelms) me." The English version, adhering to the Hebrew, reads, "Fearfulness affrighted me." The Vulgate has "Tenebræ stupefecerunt me." The word occurs twice in the Apocrypha, Judith xii. 7, and Sirach xxxiv. 27 [xxxi. 25]. Wahl, [544] referring to these two passages, defines "baptomai, me lavo = niptomai, "I wash myself." In Sirach the expression is, baprizomenos apo nekrou, "baptized from a dead body," i.e., purified from the uncleanness contracted by touching a dead body. Or, as Fritzsche translates it, "Der sich wäscht von einem Todten, einer Leiche, sich reinigt von der Befleckung, die ihm die Berührung des Leichen aus zugezogen, vrgl. 4 Moses xix. 11." [545] That is, "He that washes from a corpse purifies himself from the defilement occasioned by touching it." We learn from the passage referred to for illustration (Numbers xix. 11-13), that this purification was effected

by sprinkling the ashes of a heifer. (See ver. 9, and compare Heb. ix. 13.) In Numbers xix. 13, it is said, "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any one that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him." The water of separation was the water in which the ashes of a red heifer had been mingled as described in the preceding part of the chapter. And it was the sprinkling of that water which effected the baptism, or purification, of the defiled person.

The passage in Judith determines nothing either way as to the meaning of the word. It merely says, ebaptizeto en te parembole epi tes peges tou hudatos," she baptized herself in the camp at a fountain of water." If it be a settled point that baptizo always means to immerse, then this passage asserts that Judith immersed herself in the fountain. But if, as the vast majority of Christians believe, the word often means to wash, or purify, without regard to the way in which the purification is effected, then the passage cannot be proved to assert anything more than that Judith washed herself at the fountain. The circumstances of the case are all in favour of the latter interpretation. According to the narrative, the land had been invaded by an immense host of Assyrians under the command of Holofernes. Resistance seemed hopeless, and utter destruction was imminent. In this emergency Judith, a young, beautiful, and rich woman, inflamed with zeal for her country and her religion, determined to make a desperate effort for the salvation of her people. For this purpose, arrayed to the best advantage, she made her way into the enemies camp and presented herself to Holofernes and promised to aid him in the conquest of the land. The Assyrian general, captivated by her charms, treated her with great favour. She remained

undisturbed in her tent for three days, but was permitted at night to resort to the fountain for purification. On the fourth day she was invited to a great feast, at which Holofernes drank to excess, so that when the guests had retired and the general was in a state of helpless intoxication, Judith, with the assistance of her maid, cut off his head and carried it to the camp of her own people. This led to the overthrow of the Assyrians and the deliverance of the land.

The circumstances in this case which favour the assumption that Judith went to the fountain not for immersion, but for ablution, are, (1.) It was within the camp, necessarily, for such a host, of large dimensions. But a camp filled with soldiers does not seem to be an appropriate bathing-place for a lady of distinction even at night. (2.) Dr. Conant says: "There was evidently no lack of water for the immersion of the body, after the Jewish manner, namely by walking into the water to the proper depth, and then sinking down till the whole body was immersed." [546] The probability, however, seems all the other way. It must have been an extraordinary fountain, if it allowed of immersion in any such way. If the word baptizo can only mean "to immerse," these considerations amount to nothing. But if the word means to wash or to purify as well as to immerse, then they are of sufficient weight to turn the scale in favour of the former explanation. Of itself, however, the passage proves nothing.

The New Testament Usage.

The word baptein is used four times in the New Testament, in no one of which does it express the idea of entire immersion. In Luke xvi. 24, "That he may dip (bapse) the tip of his finger in water." The finger, when dipped in water, is not submerged. When placed horizontally on the water and slightly depressed, it retains more of the moisture than if plunged perpendicularly into it. John xiii. 26, speaks twice of dipping

the sop (bapsas and embapsas). But a morsel held in the fingers, is only partly immersed. In Revelation xix. 13, the words peribeblemenos himatioi bebammenon haimati obviously mean clothed with a vesture stained or dyed with blood.' The allusion is probably to Isaiah lxiii. 1 ff. "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? . . . . Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat? I have trodden the wine-press alone; . . . . and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment." In this case, therefore, the baptism was by sprinkling. Battizo occurs in the New Testament about eighty times; baptisma some twenty times; and baptismos four times. As every one admits that baptism may be effected by immersion, and as the purifications under the Old Testament (called by the Apostle, Hebrews ix. 10, in Greek, "diverse baptisms") were effected by immersion, affusion, and sprinkling, it would not be surprising if in some of these numerous passages, the baptism spoken of necessarily implied immersion. It so happens, or, it has been so ordered, however, that there is no such passage in the whole of the New Testament. The places in which these words occur may be arranged in the following classes: (1.) Those in which, taken by themselves, the presumption is in favour of immersion. (2.) Those in which the idea of immersion is necessarily excluded. (3.) Those which in themselves are not decisive, but where the presumption is altogether in favour of affusion.

To the first class belong those passages which speak of the persons baptized going into (eis) the water, and "coming up out of the water." (Matt. iii. 16; Acts viii. 38, 39.) Such passages, however, must be isolated in order to create a presumption in favour of immersion. According to ancient accounts, the common way of baptizing was for the person to step into water, when water was poured on his head, and then

he came up out of the water, not in the least incommoded by dripping garments. And when we remember that it is said concerning John, that "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region around about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matt. iii. 5, 6), it seems physically impossible that he should have immersed all this multitude. When all the circumstances are taken into view, the presumption in favour of immersion, even in this class of passages, disappears.

2. The second class of passages, those from which the idea of immersion is excluded, includes all those which relate to the baptism of the Spirit. The Spirit is frequently said to be poured out on men; but men are never said to be dipped or immersed into the Holy Spirit. Such an idea is altogether incongruous. When, therefore, it is said that men are baptized by the Holy Spirit, as is so often done, the reference must be to effusion, or affusion of the Spirit by which the soul is cleansed from sin. As the Holy Spirit is a person, and not a mere influence or force, the preposition en used in this connection (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; John i. 33; Acts i. 5, xi. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 13) must have its instrumental force. The work performed in us by the Holy Spirit is a baptism. As water in the hands of John was the purifying medium for the body, so the Holy Spirit, as sent or given by Jesus Christ, purifies the soul. Some of the modern commentators are such purists that they are unwilling to allow of the slightest departure from classic usage in the Greek of the New Testament. They speak as though the sacred writers were Greek grammarians, instead of, as was in most cases the fact, unlettered men writing in what to them was a foreign language. Thus because the particle hina in classic Greek has always a telic force, they deny that it is ever used ecbatically in the New Testament, even in such cases as Luke xxii. 30, "I appoint unto you

a kingdom, ... in order that ye may eat and drink at my table." John vi. 7, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, in order that every one of them may have a little." Romans xi. 11, "Have they stumbled with the design that they should fall?" 1 Corinthians xiv. 13, "Let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray in order that he may interpret," etc., etc. Thus, also, because the words pisteuo, pistis, and pistos in the classics are rarely found in construction with the preposition en they give the most unnatural interpretation to many passages in order to avoid admitting that construction in the New Testament. This is done in the face of such passagee as Mark i. 15, pisteuete en to euangeli'o. Galatians iii. 26, "Ye are all the children of God, dia tes pisteos en Christo Iesou." Ephesians i. 15, "After I heard of your, pistin en to Kurio Iesiou," and many others of like kind. In like manner because the instrumental force of en is rare in the classics, it is avoided as much as possible in the Scriptures. Baptism en pneumati, instead of being understood as meaning a baptism by, or with the Spirit, is made to mean "in the sphere of the Spirit," and baptism en puri, baptism "in the sphere of fire." What this means, it would be difficult for most of those for whom the Bible is intended to understand. The baptism of John and that of Christ are contrasted. The one baptized with water; the other with the Holy Spirit. In Acts i. 5, it is said, "John truly baptized with water (hudati, the simple instrumental dative); but ye shall be baptized (en Pneumati hagio) with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." As to baptize hudati, cannot mean to immerse in water, so neither can baptising en to Pneumati mean immersing in the Spirit. The fact is baptizein does not express any particular mode of action. As to dye, expresses any kind of action by which an object is coloured; to bury, any kind of action by which an object is hidden and protected; so to

baptize, expresses any act by which a person or thing is brought into the state of being wet, purified, or even stupefied, as by opium or wine.

Another passage in which this word occurs where the idea of immersion is precluded, is 1 Corinthians x. 1, 2, "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The people went through the sea dry shod. As far as known not a drop of water touched them. The cloud referred to was doubtless the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night which guided the people through the wilderness. The simple and generally accepted meaning of the passage is, that as a man is brought by Christian baptism into the number of the professed and avowed disciples of Christ, so the Hebrews were brought by the supernatural manifestations of divine power specified, into the relation of disciples and followers to Moses. There is no allusion to immersion, affusion, or sprinkling in the case.

Another passage belonging to this class is Mark vii. 4, "When they come from the market, except they wash (baptisontai), they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables (klinon, couches)." To maintain that beds or couches were immersed, is a mere act of desperation. Baptism means here, as it does everywhere when used of a religious rite symbolical purification by water, without the slightest reference to the mode in which that purification was effected.

3. The third class of passages includes all those in which the idea of immersion, though not absolutely precluded, is to the last degree improbable. The late Dr. Edward Robinson, than whom there is no higher authority on all that relates to the topography and physical geography of Palestine and the habits of its inhabitants, so far as they are

determined by the nature of the country, says: (1.) "The idea of private baths in families in Jerusalem and Palestine generally is excluded." (2.) "In Acts ii. 41, three thousand persons are said to have been baptized at Jerusalem apparently in one day at the season of Pentecost in June; and in Acts iv. 4, the same rite is necessarily implied in respect to five thousand more. Against the idea of full immersion in these cases there lies a difficulty, apparently insuperable, in the scarcity of water. There is in summer no running stream in the vicinity of Jerusalem, except the mere rill of Siloam a few rods in length; and the city is and was supplied with water from its cisterns and public reservoirs. [547] From neither of these sources could a supply have been well obtained for the immersion of eight thousand persons. The same scarcity of water forbade the use of private baths as a general custom; and thus also further precludes the idea of bathing" in such passages as Luke xi. 38; Mark vii. 28. He confirms his conclusion by further remarking, (3.) "In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as, for example, the Itala, which Augustine regarded as the best of all, [548] which goes back apparently to the second century and to usage connected with the apostolic age, the Greek verb, baptizo, is uniformly given in the Latin form, "baptizo," and is never translated by "immergo," or any like word, showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond. [549] (4.) The baptismal fonts still found [550] among the ruins of the most ancient Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Gophna, and going back apparently to very early times, are not large enough to admit of the baptism of adult persons by immersion, and were obviously never intended for that use." [551]

It is, therefore, to the last degree improbable that the thousands mentioned in the early chapters of Acts were baptized by immersion. The

same improbability exists as to the case of the centurion in Cæsarea and the jailer at Philippi. With regard to the former, Peter said, "Can any man forbid water?" which naturally implies that water was to be brought to Cornelius, and not he be taken to the water. As to the jailer, it is said (Acts xvi. 33) that he and all his were baptized within the prison, as the narrative clearly implies, at midnight. There is the same improbability against the assumption that the eunuch, mentioned in Acts viii. 27-38, was baptized by immersion. He was travelling through a desert part of the country towards Gaza, when Philip joined him, "And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water (epi ti hudor, to some water)." There is no known stream in that region of sufficient depth to allow of the immersion of a man. It is possible, indeed, that there might have been a reservoir or tank in that neighbourhood. But that is not a fact to be assumed without evidence and against probability. It is said they "went down both into the water," and came "up out of the water." But that might be said, if the water were not deep enough to cover their ankles.

The presumption is still stronger against immersion in the case mentioned in Mark vii. 4. It is there said of "the Pharisees and all the Jews," that "when they come from the market, except they baptize themselves (ean me baptisontai) they eat not." Let it be here considered, (1.) That private baths were in Jerusalem very rare, from the necessity of the case. (2.) That what is said, is not said merely of men of wealth and rank who might be supposed to have conveniences and luxuries which the common people could not command. It is said of the "Pharisees," a large class, and not only of that class, but of "all the Jews" It is wellnigh incredible, under such circumstances, that "all the Jews" should immerse themselves every time they came from the agora, i.e., "a place of public resort in towns and cities; any open

place, where the people came together either for business or to sit and converse. In oriental cities such open places were at the inside of the gates; and here public business was transacted, and tribunals held, as also markets." [552] That all the Jews immersed themselves every time they came from such a place of public resort, is very hard to believe, considering that the facilities for such immersion were not at their command. (3.) The words baptize and wash are interchanged in this whole connection in such a way as to show that, in the mind of the writer, they were synonymous expressions. The Pharisees complained that the disciples ate with unwashen (aniptois) hands; for they eat not unless they wash (nipsontai) their hands; and when they come from the market they do not eat unless they wash (baptisontai), and they hold to the washing (baptismous) of cups, and pots, of brazen vessels, and of tables or couches. To baptize the hands was to wash the hands, and the usual mode of ablution in the east is by pouring water on the hands (see 2 Kings iii. 11).

It is notorious that the various ablutions prescribed by the Mosaic law were effected sometimes by immersion, sometimes by affusion, and sometimes by sprinkling. And it is no less true that all these modes of purification are called by the sacred writers diaphoroi baptismoi, as in Hebrews ix. 10, and Mark vii. 4.

So far, therefore, as the New Testament is concerned, there is not a single case where baptism necessarily implies immersion, there are many cases in which that meaning is entirely inadmissible, and many more in which it is in the highest degree improbable. If immersion were indispensable, why was not the word katadu,w used to express the command? If sprinkling were exclusively intended, why was not rhaino or rhantizo used? It is simply because the mode is nothing and the idea everything, that a word was chosen which includes all the modes in

which water can be applied as the means of purification. Such a word is baptizo, for which there is no legitimate substitute, and therefore that word has been retained by all the Churches of Christendom, even by the Baptists themselves.

The Patristic Usage.

This is a wide and densely wooded field, in which a man may find anything he chooses to look for, unless it be for proof that the fathers always used the word baptizo in the sense of immersion. They speak of the waters of chaos as baptized by the Spirit of God brooding over them; they were thereby sanctified and a sanctifying power was imparted to the waters. The only point of interest here is, that Tertullian, for example, regarded this as "baptismi figura," a figure of baptism. The point of resemblance assuredly was not immersion. But besides this, Suicer gives and copiously illustrates, from the writing of the fathers, no less than eight "significations of the word baptism (vocis baptisma significationes)." (1.) The deluge was a baptism, not only for the world, purging away its sins, but also for Noah and his family, as a means of salvation. As they were saved by the waters buoying up the ark, so are we saved by baptism. (2.) The baptism of Moses when he passed through the Red Sea. The sea was the symbol of the water of baptism; the cloud, of the Holy Spirit. (3.) That of the Hebrews, as among them any person or thing impure, eloueto hudati, was washed with water. This washing, however done, was baptism. (4.) The baptism of John, which was regarded as introductory, not spiritual, or conferring the Spirit, but simply leading to repentance. (5.) The baptism of Jesus. Baptizei Iesous, all' en tneumati. Here immersion is precluded. (6.) Of tears, dia dakruon. "I know a fifth," says Gregory Nazianzen, [553] "by tears, but very laborious, when a man washes (ho louon) his pillow and his bed every night with his tears." (7.) Of

blood. The martyrs were baptized with blood. Christ's cross and death were called his baptism, because thereby purification was made for the sins of men. (8.) The baptism of fire. This is sometimes understood of the Holy Spirit, who purifies as fire does; at others of the final conflagration when the earth is to be purified by fire. With the fathers, therefore, the act of purification, and not simply or only the act of immersion, was baptism. [554]

It is not denied that baptizein means to immerse, or that it is frequently so used by the fathers as by the classic authors; it is not denied that the Christian rite was often administered, after the apostolic age, by immersion; it is not even denied that during certain periods of the history of the Church, and in certain regions, immersion was the common method in which baptism was administered. But it is denied that immersion is essential to baptism; that it was the common method in the apostolic Churches; that it was at any time or in any part of the Church the exclusive method; and more especially is it denied that immersion is now and everywhere obligatory or necessary to the integrity of Christian baptism. [555]

The Catholicity of the Gospel.

The third general argument on this subject is derived from the fact that the Gospel is designed for all classes of persons and for all parts of the earth. It is not intended exclusively for the strong and robust, but also for the weak, the sick, and the dying. It is not to be confined to the warm or temperate regions of the earth, but it is to be preached and its ordinances are to be administered wherever fallen men can be found. Baptism by immersion would be to many of the sick certainly fatal; to the dying impossible. To the inhabitants of Greenland, if possible, it would be torture and to those dwelling in the deserts of Arabia or Africa, it could be administered only at long

intervals or at the end of a long pilgrimage. Yet baptism is an imperative duty. The command of Christ is, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is not to be believed that our blessed Lord would have enjoined an external rite as the mode of professing his religion, the observance of which, under many circumstances, would be exceedingly difficult, and sometimes impossible.

Argument from the Design of the Ordinance.

This argument was adverted to in the beginning of this section. It requires, however, a more particular consideration. (1.) It is admitted that baptism is a sign, and that the blessing which it signifies is purification from sin. (2.) It is admitted that the theocratical purifications, having the same general import, were effected by immersion, affusion, and sprinkling. (3.) It is admitted that the soul is cleansed from the guilt of sin by the blood of Christ. (4.) It is admitted that under the Old Testament the application of the blood of the sacrifices for sin was expressed by the act of sprinkling. It was sprinkled on the people (Ex. xxiv. 8) for whose benefit the sacrifices were offered; it was sprinkled upon the altar; and, by the High Priest, upon the mercy seat. In the New Testament the application of the blood of Christ is expressed by the same word. "Elect . . . . unto . . . . sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. i. 2.) "The blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." (Heb. xii. 24.) (5.) It is admitted, further, that the purification of the soul from the moral pollution of sin is effected by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. (6.) It is admitted that the communication of the sanctifying influences of the Spirit is expressed in the use of two familiar figures, that of anointing with oil, and that of the pouring of water. Kings, priests, and prophets were anointed. The people of God are

called his "anointed." The Apostle John says to believers: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. . . . . The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you." (1 John ii. 20 and 27.) The other figure is no less familiar. (Is. xxxii. 15; Joel ii. 28.) The Spirit's influences are compared to rain which waters the earth, and to the dew which falls on the mown grass. From all this it appears that the truth symbolized in baptism may be signified by immersion, affusion, or sprinkling; but that the ordinance is most significant and most conformed to Scripture, when administered by affusion or sprinkling.

---

[541] Westminster Shorter Catechism, Ques. 94.

[542] There are two recent American writers whose works contain all that most students would be disposed to read on this subject. The one is the Rev. Dr. Conant, in his book, Meaning and Use of the Word Baptizein, New York, 1868; and the other the Rev. James W. Dale, in his Classic Baptism; Judaic Baptism; and Johannic Baptism; to be followed by Christian Baptism.

[543] Illustrations of some of these uses of the word may be found in Stephen's Thesaurus and Scapula's Lexicon, and of all the works of Dr. Conant and Dr. Dale, who discuss the bearing of each on the matter in debate from their respective stand-points.

[544] Clavis Librorum V. T. Apocryphorum Philologica, Auctore Christ. Abrah. Wahl, Philos. et Theol. Doctore, Leipzig, 1853.

[545] Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes, von Otto Fridolin Fritzsche, Leipzig, 1859, vol. v. p. 195.

[546] Meaning and Use of Baptizein. New York, 1868, p. 85.

[547] See Biblical Researches in Palestine, vol. i. pp. 479-516.

[548] De Doctrina Christiana, ii. 22 [xv.]; Works, edit. Benedictines, Paris, 1836, vol. iii. p. 54, d.

[549] See Blanchini, Evangeliorum Quadruplex, etc., Rom. 1749.

[550] See Robinson's Biblical Researches in Palestine, edit. Boston, 1841, vol. ii. p. 182; vol. iii. p. 78.

[551] See Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, word baptizo, New York, 1850.

[552] Robinson, sub voce.

[553] Oratio, xxxix.; Opera, Cologne, 1680, vol. i. p. 634.

[554] Joh. Caspari Suiceri, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus e Patribus Græcis ordine alphabetico exhibens Quæcunque Phrases, Ritus, Dogmata, Hæreses, et hujusmodi alia spectant. Opus viginiti annorum indefesso labore adornatum, 2d edit., Amsterdam, 1728.

[555] See Hermann Cremer, Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräsität, Gotha, 1866. After referring to the Old Testament ablutions the authors says, on p. 87: "We must, therefore, by baptizein understand a washing, the design of which, as of the theocratical washings and purifications, was the purification of the soul from sin (Entsündigung)." On p. 89 it is said, "We find the secondary meaning of baptizein in Matthew iii. 11: Bapt. en pneumati hagio kai puri, opp. en hudati eis metanoian. comp. Luke iii. 16, John i. 33. That is not the meaning of immersion, but of washing with the design of purification,' that is transferred, is plain from the antithesis between en hud. and en pn. whereby the two baptisms are distinguished."

---

§ 8. The Formula of Baptism.

This is authoritatively prescribed in Matthew xxviii. 19. Christ gave a command perpetually binding on his Church to baptize men "in the name

of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In this passage the preposition eis (eis to onoma) means unto, or, in reference to. Paul asks the Corinthians, "were ye baptized eis to onoma Paulou;" (1 Cor. i. 13. Did your baptism make you the disciples of Paul?) He tells them (1 Cor. x. 2) that the fathers, "were baptized unto Moses" eis to Mosen, they were made and professed to be the disciples of Moses. So in Romans vi. 3, it is said we "were baptized eis Christon Iesoun unto Jesus Christ." Galatians iii. 27, "Baptized into (eis) Christ."

According to this formula, he who receives baptism as a Christian rite, thereby professes to stand in that relation to the Father, Son, and Spirit which those who receive the religion of Christ sustain. That is, he professes to receive God the Father, as his father; God the Son, as his Saviour, and God the Holy Ghost as his teacher and sanctifier; and this involves the engagement to receive the Word, of which the Spirit is the author, as the rule of his faith and practice. [556]

There are several cases in which baptism is said to have been administered en to onomati in, or on, the name of Christ, instead of eis to onoma into, or, in reference to. And in Acts ii. 38, the preposition epi is used, epi to onomati. It is doubtful whether anything materially different was intended to be expressed by this change of the prepositions and cases. To baptize, epi, or en onomati, means to baptize "upon the name," sc., of Christ, that is, upon the authority of Christ. The rite is administered in obedience to his command, in the form in which he prescribed, said with the intent for which he ordained it.

In the Acts it is repeatedly said that the Apostles baptized their converts in "the name of Christ." It is not to be inferred from this fact that they departed from the form prescribed in Matthew xxviii. 19, and administered the ordinance in the use of the words, I baptize thee

in the name of Christ;' or, I baptize thee eis Christon unto Christ.' Such inference is unnecessary; as baptism administered in the way prescribed in Matthew xxviii. 19, is a baptism both in the name, or, by the authority of Christ, and unto or in reference to Him. As this inference is unnecessary so it is improbable. It is in the highest degree improbable that the Apostles would have departed from the form so solemnly prescribed by their Divine Master; and it is moreover improbable that any such departure took place from the fact that the form prescribed in Matthew has been used in all ages and parts of the Church.

---

[556] Fritzsche on Romans vi. 3, says: Loquutio, baprizo tina eis tina (eis ti) per se non minus late patet, quam vernacula Jemandem auf Jemanden (aut etwas) taufen. Non enim nisi hanc generalem notionem complectitur: aliquem aquæ ita immergere, ut ejus cogitationes in aliquem (aliquod) dirigas, Jemanden unter Beziehung, Hindeutung auf jemanden (etwas) taufen. At multis de causis ei qui lavatur res memorabilis monstrari potest, v. c., ut in aliquo fidem collocet, ut aliquem ducem sequatur, ut aliquid pie revereatur, ut aliquid effectum reddat, ut aliquid sibi evenisse sciat et sic porro. . . . . Sic dubitare non potest quin baptizo tina eis Christon (Gal. iii. 27), aquæ aliquem sic immergere, ut animum ad Christum applicare eum jubeas, valeat ita aliquem aqua lustrare ut Christo fidem habendam esse ei significes (Act. xix. 4), et baptizo tina eis to onoma tou Patros, ktl. . . . . notet lustro aliquem reverentia, quæ Patris -- nomini debeatur, eum obstringens." Edit Halle, 1836, vol. i. pp. 359, 360.

---

§ 9. The Subjects of Baptism.

"Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the risible

Church, till they profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him: but the infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized." [557]

The question, Who are the proper subjects of baptism? is determined by the design of the ordinance and the practice of the Apostles. It has been shown that, according to our standards, the sacraments (and of course baptism) were instituted, to signify, seal, and apply to believers the benefits of the redemption of Christ. The reception of baptism, so far as adults are concerned, is an intelligent, voluntary act, which from its nature involves, (1.) A profession of faith in Christ, and (2) A promise of allegiance to Him.

This is clear, --

1. From the command of Christ to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. A disciple, however, is both a recipient of doctrines taught, and a follower. Every one, therefore, who is made a disciple by baptism, enrolls himself among the number of those who receive Christ as their teacher and Lord, and who profess obedience and devotion to his service.

2. This is further clear from the uniform practice of the Apostles. In every case on record of their administering the rite, it was on the condition of a profession of faith on the part of the recipient. The answer of Philip to the eunuch who asked, What doth hinder me to be baptized? "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest," discloses the principle on which the Apostles uniformly acted in this matter.

3. This has in all ages been the practice of the Church. No man was admitted to baptism without an intelligent profession of faith in Christ, and a solemn engagement of obedience to Him. The practice of

Romanist missionaries in baptizing the heathen in crowds, can hardly be considered as invalidating this statement.

Although this has been the principle universally admitted, there has been no little diversity as to its application, according to the different views of the nature of the faith, and of the character of the obedience required by the Gospel. In some points, however, there has ever been a general agreement.

Qualifications for Adult Baptism.

1. Faith supposes knowledge of at least the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. Some may unduly enlarge, and some unduly restrict the number of such doctrines; but no Church advocates the baptism of the absolutely ignorant. If baptism involves a profession of faith, it must involve a profession of faith in certain doctrines; and those doctrines must be known, in order to be professed. In the early Church, therefore, there was a class of catechumens or candidates for baptism who were under a regular course of instruction. This course continued, according to circumstances, from a few months, to three years. These catechumens were not only young men, but often persons in mature life, and of all degrees of mental culture. Where Christian churches were established in the midst of large heathen cities, the Gospel could not fail to excite general attention. The interest of persons of all classes would be more or less awakened. Many would be so impressed with the excellence of the new religion, as to desire to learn its doctrines and join themselves to the company of believers. These candidates for baptism, being in many cases men of the highest culture, it was necessary that their teachers should be men thoroughly instructed and disciplined. We accordingly find such men as Pantænus, Clemens, and Origen successively at the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. [558] These schools, although primarily designed for

converts from among the Jews and heathen, on account of their high character, soon began to be frequented by other classes, and especially by those who were in training for the ministry. When Christianity became the prevalent religion, and the ranks of the Church were filled up, not by converts of mature age, but by those born within its pale and baptized in their infancy, the necessity for such schools no longer existed. Their place, however, was supplied by the systematic instruction of the young in preparation for their confirmation or their first communion.

2. All churches are agreed in demanding of adults who are candidates for baptism, a profession of their faith in Christ and the Gospel of his salvation.

3. They agree in requiring of those who are baptized the renunciation of the world, the flesh, and the devil. This involves a turning from sin, and a turning to God.

Although these principles are, as just remarked, generally admitted, there is, in practice, great diversity in their application. Where the Church was pure and its ministers faithful, these requisitions were strenuously enforced; but where the reverse was the case, the most formal, and often evidently insincere, assent to the creed of the Church was taken for a profession of faith; and a renunciation of the world compatible with devotion to its pleasures and its sins, was accepted in the place of genuine repentance. It is well, however, to have a clear idea of what the Church has a right to demand of adults when they apply for baptism. It is evident from the teachings of Scripture, and from the avowed principles of all Christian churches, that we are bound to require of all such candidates, (1.) A competent knowledge of the Gospel. (2.) A credible profession of faith. (3.) A conversation void of offence.

The question, although thus simple in its general statement, in nevertheless one of great difficulty. As it is almost universally the fact that, so far as adults are concerned, the qualifications for baptism are the same as those for admission to the Lord's table, the question, What are the qualifications for adult baptism? resolves itself into the question, What are the qualifications for church-membership? The answer to that question, it is evident, must be determined by the views taken of the nature and the prerogatives of the Church. We accordingly find that there are three general views of the qualifications for adult baptism, founded on the three generic views of the nature of the Church.

Romish Theory of the Church.

First, the theory derived from the ancient theocracy and from the analogy between the Church and a civil commonwealth. The theocracy, or the Church, under the old dispensation, was essentially an externally organized body. All the natural descendants of Abraham, through Isaac, were, in virtue of their birth, members of the "Commonwealth of Israel." As such, independently of their own moral character or that of their parents, they were entitled to all the privileges of the economy under which they lived. They were freely admitted to the services of the Temple, to the Passover, and to all the sacred festivals, and typical institutions of the Mosaic dispensation, even to those which were truly of a sacramental character. The Hebrews were, of course, subject to the laws of the theocracy under which they lived; for minor offences they forfeited this or that privilege, or were subjected to some specified penalty; and for graver offences they were excommunicated or cut off from among the people. All this finds a parallel in the kingdoms of this world. All native born Englishmen are subjects of the crown, and are entitled to all the privileges of

Englishmen; they may be good or bad citizens, but their citizenship does not depend upon their character, they may be punished for their offences, but they cannot be deprived of their rights as citizens unless they are outlawed.

This theory has, by Romanists and Romanizers, been transferred bodily to the Church. The Church, according to them, is essentially an externally organized society. All born within its pale are "ipso facto" its members, and entitled to all its privileges. They are entitled to all its sacraments and ordinances, not in virtue of their character, but in virtue of their birthright. Thus Mr. Palmer, [559] of the Oxford Anglican School, says that the Scriptures make no mention of regeneration, sanctity, or real piety visible or invisible, as prerequisites for admission to the sacrament of baptism. [560] No doubt a pious Hebrew priest would exhort those who came to offer sacrifices or to celebrate the Passover, that they should attend on those services in a devout spirit and in the exercise of faith, assuring them that the mere external service was of no account. The Romanist, with his "ex opere operato" theory of the sacraments, could hardly go as far as that, but he would doubtless exhort the candidate for baptism, and all who come to the sacraments of the Church, to perform those duties in a proper spirit. But this has nothing to do with the right of approach. We may exhort citizens to exercise their civil rights conscientiously, and with a due regard to the interests of the country, but the rights themselves are not to be disputed.

The same result is reached, although on a different theory, in all those countries in which Church and State are so united that the head of the State is the head of the Church; and that membership in the Church is a condition of citizenship in the State. This was the case for centuries in England, and is so to a great extent to the present

day. The reigning sovereign is still the head of the Church, the supreme authority in administering its government. The laws of the Church are acts of Parliament; every Englishman, unless he voluntarily makes himself an exception, has a right to all the services of the Church, including the right to be buried as a Christian "in the sure hope of a blessed resurrection." Until of late years no man could hold any important office, especially in the army or navy, who was not in communion with the established Church. So also in Prussia, the head of the State governs the Church. No man, unless a Romanist or a Hebrew, can marry, become an apprentice, or enter on the practice of a profession without producing a certificate of baptism and confirmation.

Puritan Theory of the Church.

The second general theory of the nature of the Church is that, which for convenience sake, may be called the Puritan. The word Puritan has in history a much wider sense than that assigned to it in modern usage. In English history the designation Puritan was applied to all those, who under the reigns of Elizabeth and Charles I. were desirous of a further reformation of the Church. Many prelates, and thousands of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, were included in that class. Modern usage has confined the term to the Independents or Congregationalists, the followers of Brown and Robinson. They were, therefore, often called Brownists. According to them the visible Church consists of the regenerate; and it is the duty and the prerogative of the Church to sit in judgment on the question whether the applicant for admission to the sacraments is truly born of God. Hence in New England, there was a broad distinction made between the Church and the parish. The former consisted of the body of communicants; the latter of those who, though not communicants, frequented the same place of worship and contributed to the support of the minister and to other congregational expenses.

"To join the Church," thus came to mean joining the number of those who were admitted to the Lord's Supper. This of course implies, that communicants only are in the Church. This view has gained ascendancy in this country even, to a great extent, among Presbyterians.

The Common Protestant Theory.

According to our standards the visible Church consists of all those who profess the true religion together with their children. The common Protestant theory of the Church agrees with that of the Puritans in the following points. (1.) That the true or invisible Church as a whole consists of the elect. This is the Church which Christ loved, for which He gave Himself, that He might sanctify it, and present it to Himself a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle. (Eph. v. 25-27.) (2.) That the true or invisible Church on earth consists of all true believers. (3.) That the profession of faith made by those who are baptized, or come to the table of the Lord, is a profession of true faith. That is, those baptized profess to be Christians. The point of difference between the theories concerns the duty and prerogative of the Church in the matter. According to the one view the Church is bound to be satisfied in its judgment that the applicant is truly regenerate; according to the other, no such judgment is expressed or implied in receiving any one into the fellowship of the Church. As Christ has not given his people the power to search the heart, He has not imposed upon them the duty which implies the possession of any such power. Both parties require a credible profession of faith on the part of the applicant for membership. But the one means by credible, that which constrains belief; the other, that which may be believed, i.e., that against which no tangible evidence can be adduced. If such applicant be a heretic, or if his manner of life contradicts his profession, he ought not to be received; and if already in the Church, he ought, as the Apostle says,

to be rejected. The common Protestant doctrine is that nothing authorizes us to refuse a man admission to the Church, which would not justify his exclusion if already a member of it. If guilty of any "offence" or "scandal," he ought to be excluded; and if chargeable with any such "offence" or "scandal," he ought not to be admitted to membership, no matter what his profession or detail of experience may be. The late Dr. John M. Mason clearly and forcibly expresses the common doctrine on this subject, when he says: "A credible profession of Christianity, is all that she [the Church] may require in order to communion. She may be deceived; her utmost caution may be, and often has been, ineffectual to keep bad men from her sanctuary. And this, too, without her fault, as she is not omniscient. But she has no right to suspect sincerity, to refuse privilege, or inflict censure, where she can put her finger upon nothing repugnant to the love or the laws of God." [561] And on the following page he says: "A profession of faith in Christ, and of obedience to Him, not discredited by other traits of character, entitles an adult to the privileges of his Church."

This is not the place for the discussion of the question concerning the nature of the Church. These theories are simply mentioned here because of their bearing on the subject of adult baptism. According to all these theories believing adults are, by the command of Christ, entitled to Christian baptism. Much more difficulty attends the question concerning

---

[557] Westminster Shorter Catechism, quest. 95.

[558] H. E. F. Guerike, De Schola quæ Alexandriæ floruit catechetica, Halle, 1824.

[559] Palmer, On the Church, New York, 1841, vol. i. p. 377.

[560] This is not inconsistent with what was said above of all churches requiring as the conditions of adult baptism, competent knowledge, a profession of faith, and the renunciation of the world. What was there said concerned the reception of members into the Church ab extra. What is here said concerns those who are members of the Church by birth.

[561] Essays on the Church of God, by John M. Mason, D. D., New York, 1843, Essay III, p. 57.

---

§ 10. Infant Baptism.

The difficulty on this subject is that baptism from its very nature involves a profession of faith; it is the way in which by the ordinance of Christ, He is to be confessed before men; but infants are incapable of making such confession; therefore they axe not the proper subjects of baptism. Or, to state the matter in another form: the sacraments belong to the members of the Church; but the Church is the company of believers; infants cannot exercise faith, therefore they are not members of the Church, and consequently ought not to be baptized.

In order to justify the baptism of infants, we must attain and authenticate such an idea of the Church as that it shall include the children of believing parents. The word Church is used in Scripture and in common life, in many different senses, (1.) It means the whole body of the elect, as in Ephesians v. 25, and when the Church is said to be the body, or the bride of Christ, to be filled by his Spirit, etc. (2.) It means any number of believers collectively considered; or the whole number of believers residing in any one place, or district, or throughout the world. In this sense we use the word when we pray God to bless his Church universal, or his Church in any particular place. (3.) It is used as a collective term for the body of professed believers in any one place; as when we speak of the Church of Jerusalem, of Ephesus,

or of Corinth. (4.) It is used of any number of professed believers bound together by a common standard of doctrine and discipline; as the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Lutheran Church, and the Reformed Church. And (5.) It is used for all the professors of the true religion throughout the world, considered as united in the adoption of the same general creed and in common subjection to Christ.

It is evident that no one definition of the Church can include all the senses in which the word is legitimately used; and, therefore, that we may affirm of the Church in one sense of the word, what must be denied of it in a different sense; and the same person may be said to be, or not to be a member of the Church according to the meaning attached to the word. In the present discussion, by the Church is meant what is called the visible Church; that is, the whole body of those who profess the true religion, or, any number of such professors united for the purpose of the public worship of Christ, and for the exercise of mutual watch and care. With regard to infant baptism the following propositions may be maintained.

First Proposition. The Visible Church is a Divine Institution.

Concerning the Church in this sense, it is clearly taught in Scripture, that it is the will of God that such a Church should exist on earth.

This no Christian denies. God has imposed duties upon his people which render it necessary for them thus to associate in a visible organized body. They are to unite in him worship; in teaching and propagating his truth; in testifying for God in all ages and in all parts of the world.

He has prescribed the conditions of membership in this body, and taught who are to be excluded from its communion. He has appointed officers, specified their qualifications, their prerogatives, and the mode of their appointment. He has enacted laws for its government. Its rise, progress, and consummation are traced in history and prophecy, from the

beginning to the end of the Bible. This is the kingdom of God of which our Lord discourses in so many of his parables, and which it is predicted is ultimately to include all the nations of the earth.

Second Proposition. The Visible Church does not consist exclusively of the Regenerate.

It is no less clearly revealed that it is not the purpose of God that the visible Church on earth should consist exclusively of true believers. This is plain, (1.) Because the attainment of such a result in any society or government administered by men is an impossibility. It would require that the officers of the Church or the Church itself should have the power to read the heart, and be infallible in judgments of character. (2.) The conditions which, under both dispensations, He has prescribed for admission into this visible society of his professed worshippers, are such as men not truly regenerated may possess. Those qualifications, as we have seen, are competent knowledge, and a credible profession of faith and obedience. (3.) Our Lord expressly forbids the attempt being made. He compares his external kingdom, or visible Church, to a field in which tares and wheat grow together. He charged his disciples not to undertake to separate them, because they could not, in all cases, distinguish the one from the other. Both were to be allowed to grow together until the harvest. (4.) Christ, to whom all hearts are known, admitted Judas to the number of his most favoured disciples, and even made him an Apostle. (5.) All attempts to make a Church consisting exclusively of the regenerate, have failed. So far as known, no such Church has ever existed on the face of the earth. This of itself is proof that its existence did not enter into the purpose of God.

Third Proposition. The Commonwealth of Israel was the Church.

(1.) It is so called in Scripture. (Acts vii. 38.) (2.) The Hebrews

were called out from all the nations of the earth to be the peculiar people of God. They constituted his kingdom. (3.) To them were committed the oracles of God. They were Israelites to them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises. (Rom. ix. 4.) Nothing more can be said of the Church under the new dispensation. They were selected for a Church purpose, namely, to be witnesses for God in the world in behalf of the true religion; to celebrate his worship; and to observe his ordinances. Their religious officers, prophets, and priests, were appointed by God and were his ministers. No man could become a member of the Commonwealth of Israel, who did not profess the true religion; promise obedience to the law of God as revealed in his Word; and submit to the rite of circumcision as the seal of the covenant. There is no authorized definition of the Church, which does not include the people of God under the Mosaic law.

Fourth Proposition. The Church under the New Dispensation is identical with that under the Old.

It is not a new Church, but one and the same. It is the same olive-tree. (Rom. xi. 16, 17) It is founded on the same covenant, the covenant made with Abraham. It has, indeed, often been said that it is to belittle the truth to put the idea of a covenant between God and man in the place of a general law or economy. It is, however, to be remembered that God is a person, capable of speaking with other persons, of promising and threatening. These promises are not merely announcements of the results of cosmical laws, physical or moral. That Christ should be born of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and of the house of David, is not to be attributed to the working of any general law. Nothing pertaining to his advent, his person, his work, or to the application of his redemption, is to be accounted for

in any such way. Our Lord gives us an infinitely higher idea of God's relation to the world when He tells us that He feeds the young ravens when they cry; and that the hairs of our heads are all numbered; than when He is regarded as merely the author or source of the physical and moral order of the universe. A covenant is a promise suspended upon a condition. It is beyond controversy that God did make such a promise to Adam, to Abraham, and to the Hebrew nation through Moses; and these transactions are in Scripture constantly called covenants. It does not, therefore, seem very reverent to speak of God as belittling his truth by the form in which He presents it.

God, then, did enter into covenant with Abraham. In that covenant He promised that Abraham, although nearly a hundred years old, should have a son. He promised that his descendants, through Isaac, should be as numerous as the stars in heaven; that He would give them the land of Canaan for a possession; that He would be their national God, and that the Hebrews as a nation should be His peculiar people; and above all He promised the patriarch that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. By seed was not meant his descendants collectively, but one person, that is, Christ. (Gal. iii. 16.) The blessing promised, therefore, was the blessing of redemption through Christ, his promise to Abraham was a repetition of the promise made to our first parents after the fall, this promise was the Gospel. The Gospel or euangelion has a definite meaning in the Scriptures. It means the announcement of the plan of salvation through Christ, and the offer of that salvation to every one that believes. This Gospel, Paul says, was preached before unto Abraham. The pious Hebrews are, therefore, described as (tous proelpikotas en to Christo) those who hoped in Christ before his advent. (Eph. i. 12.) This promise of redemption made to Abraham was that "unto which," Paul says, "our twelve tribes, instantly servmng God

day and night, hope to come." (Acts xxvi. 7.) The condition of all these Abrahamic promises was faith. This the Apostle abundantly teaches, especially in the fourth chapter of Romans and the third

CHAPTER I: STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

---

§ 1. Protestant Doctrine.

THE Protestant doctrine on the state of the soul after death includes, first of all, the continued conscious existence of the soul after the dissolution of the body. This is opposed, not only to the doctrine that the soul is merely a function of the body and perishes with it, but also to the doctrine of the sleep of the soul during the interval between death and the resurrection.

The former doctrine belongs to the theory of materialism, and stands or falls with it. If there be no substance but matter, and no force but such as is the phenomenon of matter; and if the form in which physical force manifests itself as mind, or mental action, depends on the highly organized matter of the brain, then when the brain is disorganized the mind ceases to exist. But if the soul and body are two distinct substances, then the dissolution of the latter does not necessarily involve the end of the conscious existence of the former.

There is another view on this subject adopted by many who are not materialists, but who still hold that mind cannot act or manifest itself without a material organ. Thus, for example, the late Isaac Taylor says that as extension is an attribute of matter, the soul without a body cannot be extended. But extension is a relation to space; what is not extended is consequently nowhere. "We might as well," he says, "say of a pure spirit that it is hard, heavy, or red, or that it is a cubic foot in dimensions, as say that it is here or there, or that it has come, and is gone." "When we talk of absolute

immateriality, and wish to withdraw mind altogether from matter, we must no longer allow ourselves to imagine that it is, or that it can be, in any place, or that it has any kind of relationship to the visible and extended universe." In like manner, he argues that mind is dependent upon its corporeity, or union with matter, for its relationship to time. A pure spirit could not tell the difference between a moment and a century; it could have no perception of the equable flow of duration, for that is a knowledge drawn from the external world and its regular motions. To its union with matter, mind is indebted also for its sensibility or sensations, for its power over matter, for its imaginative emotions, and for its "defined, recognizable individuality," and of course for its personality. The soul after death, therefore, must either cease its activity, at least in reference to all out of itself, or be furnished at once with a new body. The latter assumption is the one commonly adopted. "Have the dead ceased to exist?" he asks, "Have those who are fallen asleep perished? No; -- for there is a spiritual body, and another vehicle of human nature, as well as a natural body; and, therefore, the dissolution of this animal structure leaves the life untouched. The animal body is not itself the life, nor is it the cause of life; nor again is the spiritual body the life, nor the cause of it; but the one as well as the other are the instruments of the mind, and the necessary medium of every productive exercise of its faculties." [746]

On this theory of the dependence of mind on matter, "for every productive exercise of its faculties," for its individuality, and its susceptibilities, it may be remarked, (1.) That the theory is admitted to be untrue in relation to God. He has no body; and He can act and be acted upon, and his activity is productive. If such be the case with God who is a pure spirit, it is altogether arbitrary to deny that it is

true with regard to the human soul. Man as a spirit is of the same nature with God. He is like Him in all that is essential to the nature of a spirit. (2.) The theory has no support from Scripture, and, therefore, has no right to intrude itself into the explanation of Scriptural doctrines. The Bible never attributes corporeity to angels; yet it ascribes to them a "ubi"; speaks of their coming and going;. and of their being mighty in power to produce effects in the material and spiritual worlds. It never speaks of man's having any other body besides his earthly tabernacle, and the body which he is to have at the resurrection. And yet it speaks of the soul as active and conscious when absent from the body and present with the Lord. (3.) If the soul is a substance it has power, power of self-manifestation, and productive power according to its nature. Electricity may be a force in nature manifested to us, in our present state, only under certain conditions. But that does not prove that it is active only under those conditions, or that beings constituted differently from what we are, may not be cognizant of its activity. It is enough, however, that the theory in question is extra-scriptural, and therefore has no authority in matters of faith.

It is no less evident that according to the pantheistic theory, in all its phases, which regards man as only one of the transient forms of God's existence, there is no room for the doctrine of the conscious existence of the soul after death. The race is immortal, but the individual man is not. Trees and flowers cover the earth from generation to generation; yet the same flower blooms but once. The mass of men whose convictions, on such subjects, are founded on their moral and religious nature, have in all ages believed in the continued existence of the soul after death. And that universality of belief is valid evidence of the truth believed. But men whose opinions are under

the control of the speculative understanding, have never arrived at any settled conviction on this subject. To be, or not to be? was a question speculation could not answer. The dying Hume said he was about to take a leap in the dark. The continued existence of the soul after death is a matter of divine revelation. It was part of the faith of the Church before the coming of Christ. The revelation of all the great doctrines which concern the destiny and salvation of men has been indeed progressive. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the doctrine of the future state is much less clearly unfolded in the Old Testament than in the New. Still it is there. When the Apostle Paul (2 Tim. i. 10) speaks of "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," he is not to be understood as saying that the future life was unknown, as Archbishop Whately argues, before the coming of Christ. This would be inconsistent with the most explicit declarations elsewhere. It is often said that Christ came to preach the Gospel, to make propitiation for sin, and to reveal the way of reconciliation with God. Paul says in Galatians iii. 23, "before faith came we were kept under the law." Yet he strenuously insists that the Gospel, or plan of salvation which he taught, was taught by the law and prophets (Rom. iii. 21); and that the patriarchs were saved by faith in the same promise on which sinners are now called upon to rely. What was imperfectly revealed under the old economy, is clearly revealed under the new. This is all that those passages which speak of the Gospel bringing new truths to light, are intended to teach. Christ shed a flood of light on the darkness beyond the grave. Objects before dimly discerned in that gloom, now stand clearly unveiled; so that it may well be said He brought life and immortality to light, he revealed the nature of this future state, and showed how, for the people of God,

that state was one of life. It may be observed in passing, that many Christian writers who speak of the doctrine of a future life being unknown, at least to the patriarchs, and to the writers of the Psalms, mean "the Christian doctrine" on that subject. They do not intend to deny that the people of God from the beginning believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death. This Hengstenberg, for example, distinctly asserts concerning himself. [747]

Doctrine of a Future Life revealed under the Old Testament.

1. The first argument on this subject is an à priori one. That the Hebrews, God's chosen people, the recipients and custodians of a supernatural revelation, should be the only nation on the face of the earth, in whose religion the doctrine of a future state had no place, would be a solecism. It is absolutely incredible, for it supposes human nature in the case of the Hebrews to be radically different from what it is in other men.

2. Instead of the Hebrews having lower views of man than other nations, they alone were possessed of the truth concerning his origin and nature. They had been taught from the beginning that man was created in the image of God, and, therefore, like God, of the same nature as a spirit, and capable of fellowship with his maker. They had also been taught that man was created immortal, that the death even of the body, was a punishment; that the sentence of death (in the sense of dissolution) concerned only the body. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The soul is not dust, and therefore, according to the earliest theology of the Hebrews, was not to return to dust; it was to return to God who gave it.

3. We accordingly find that throughout the Old Testament Scriptures the highest views are presented of the nature and destiny of man. He is the child of God, destined to enjoy his fellowship and favour; the

possessions and enjoyments of earth are always represented as temporary and insignificant, not adapted to meet the soul's necessities; they were taught not to envy the wicked in their prosperity, but to look to God as their portion they were led to say, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee;" and "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." In the Old Testament, the righteous are always represented as strangers and pilgrims upon the earth, whose home and whose reward are not in this world; that their portion is in another world, and, therefore, that it is better to be the humblest and most afflicted of God's people than to be the most prosperous of the wicked. The judgments of God are represented as falling on the wicked in a future state, and thus effectually vindicating the justice of God in his dealings with men. The Psalmist said, he was envious at the foolish, when he saw the prosperity of the wicked, until he went into the sanctuary of God and understood their end. In contrasting his own state and prospects with theirs, he said, "I am continually with thee. . . . . Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." (Ps. lxxiii. 23, 24.) Such is the drift and spirit of the Old Testament Scriptures. Their whole tendency was to raise the thoughts of the people from the present and turn them towards the future; to make men look not at the things seen, but at the things unseen and eternal.

4. The dead in the Old Testament are always spoken of as going to their fathers, as descending into "Sheol," i.e., into the invisible state, which the Greeks called Hades. Sheol is represeated as the general receptacle or abode of departed spirits, who were there in a state of consciousness; some in a state of misery, others in a state of happiness. In all these points the pagan idea of Hades corresponds to

the Scriptural idea of Sheol. All souls went into Hades, some dwelling in Tartarus, others in Elysium. That the Hebrews regarded the souls of the dead as retaining their consciousness and activity is obvious from the practice of necromancy, and is confirmed by the fact of the appearance of Samuel to Saul, as recorded in 1 Samuel xxviii. The represennation given in Isaiah xiv. of the descent of the King of Babylon, when all the dead rose to meet and to reproach him, takes for granted and authenticates the popular belief in the continued conscious existence of departed spirits.

5. In several passages of the Old Testament, the doctrine of a future life is clearly asserted. We know upon the authority of the New Testament that the Sixteenth Psalm is to be understood of the resurrection of Christ, with which, the Apostle teaches us that of his people is inseparably connected. His soul was not to be left in Sheol; nor was his body to see corruption. In Psalm xvii. 15, after having described the cruelty and prosperity of the wicked, the Psalmist says, in regard to himself: "I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." Isaiah xxvi. 19, says: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust, for my dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." (Dan. xii. 2.) "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." These prophetic declarations are indeed often explained as referring to the restoration of the nation from a state of depression to one of prosperity and glory. But the language employed, the context in which there is clear reference to the Messianic period, and the sanction

given by Christ and his Apostles to the doctrine taught by the literal sense of the words here used, are considerations decisive in favour of the ordinary interpretation, which is adopted by Delitzsch, [748] Hengstenberg, [749] Oehler, [750] and many others of the modern interpreters. Even Mr. Alger, in his elaborate work on the doctrine of a future life, concedes the point so far as the passage in Daniel is concerned. "No one," he says, "can deny that a judgment, in which reward and punishment shall be distributed according to merit, is here clearly foretold." [751] Those German writers whose views of inspiration are so low as to enable them to interpret each book of the Bible as the production of an individual mind, and to represent the several writers as teaching different doctrines, in many cases take the ground that in the early books of the Scriptures, the simple fact of a future life is taken for granted, but not taught, and that nothing was made known as to the nature of that life. Thus Schultz says, "That all the books of the Old Testament assume that men are in some way or other to live after death. Even in the Pentateuch this is taken for granted. It is not taught, but assumed as a self-evident truth, immanent in the consciousness of the people." [752]

6. It is to be remembered that we have in the New Testament an inspired, and, therefore, an infallible commentary on the Old Testament Scriptures. From that commentary we learn that the Old Testament contains much which otherwise we should never have discovered. Not only is the compass of the truths revealed to the fathers shown to be far greater than the simple words would suggest, but truths are declared to be therein taught, which, without divine assistance, we could not have discovered. There is another thing concerning the faith of the Old Testament saints to be taken into consideration. They may have understood, and probably did understand their Scriptures far better

than we are disposed to think possible. They had the advantage of the constant presence of inspired men to lead them in their interpretation of the written word, and they enjoyed the inward teaching of the Holy Spirit. What that spiritual illumination availed in their case, we cannot tell; but we know that now the humble Christian who submits himself to the teachings of the Spirit, understands the Bible far better than any mere verbal critic.

We have then in the New Testament the most explicit declarations, not only that the doctrine of a future state was revealed in the Old Testament, but that from the beginning it was part of the faith of the people of God. Our Lord in refuting the Sadducees, who denied not only the resurrection of the body, but also the conscious existence of man after death, and the existence of any merely spiritual beings, appeals to the fact that in the Pentateuch, the authority of which the Sadducees admitted, God is familiarly called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but as He is the God not of the dead but of the living, the designation referred to proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are now living, and living too in the fellowship and enjoyment of God.

"Christ," says Mr. Alger, whom we quote the rather because he belongs to the class of men who call themselves liberal Christians, [753] "Christ once reasoned with the Sadducees as touching the dead, that they rise;' in other words, that the souls of men upon the decease of the body pass into another and an unending state of existence: -- Neither can they die any more; for they are equal with the angels, and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection.' His argument was, that God is the God of the living, not of the dead; that is, the spiritual nature of man involves such a relationship with God as pledges his attributes to its perpetuity. The thought which supports this reasoning penetrates far into the soul and grasps the moral

relations between man and God. It is most interesting, viewed as the unqualified affirmation by Jesus, of the doctrine of a future life which shall be deathless." [754] The reasoning of Christ, however, is not only an affirmation of the truth of the doctrine of a future deathless life, but an affirmation also that that doctrine is taught in the Old Testament. The words which He quotes are contained in the book of Exodus; and those words, as explained by Him, teach the doctrine of the blessed and unending life of the righteous.

That the Jews when Christ came, universally, with the exception of the sect of the Sadducees, believed in a future life, is beyond dispute. The Jews at this period were divided into three sects: the Sadducees, who were materialistic skeptics, believing neither in the resurrection, nor in angels, nor in spirits; the Essenes, who were a philosophical and ascetic sect, believing that the souls of the just being freed at death from the prison of the body, rejoice and are borne aloft where a happy life forever is decreed to the virtuous; but the wicked are assigned to eternal punishment in a dark cold place; [755] and the Pharisees, who, as we know from the New Testament, believed in the resurrection of the body in the sense in which Paul believed that doctrine (Acts xxvi. 6), for he claimed in his controversy with the Sadducees, that the Pharisees were on his side. They believed that the soul was in its nature immortal; that the righteous only are happy after death, and that the wicked are eternally miserable. That the Jews derived their doctrine from their own Scriptures is plain, (1.) Because they admitted no other source of religious knowledge. The Scriptures were their rule of faith, as those Scriptures had been understood and explained by their fathers. (2.) There is no other known source from which the doctrine of a future state as held by the Jews in the time of Christ, could have been obtained. The doctrines, whether religious or

philosophical, of their heathen neighbours were antagonistic to their own. This is true even of the doctrines of Zoroaster, which in some points had most affinity with those of the Jews. (3.) The inspired writers of the New Testament teach the same doctrines. and affirm that their knowledge was derived not from men, but from the revelation of God as contained in the Old Testament, and as made by Christ.

A few of the passages in which the Apostles teach that the doctrine of a future life was known to the patriarchs before the coming of Christ, are the following: Paul was arraigned before the council in Jerusalem, and "when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." (Acts xxiii. 6.) He here declares that in the dispute between these two parties, on the question whether the doctrine of a future life and of the resurrection of the dead was taught in the Scriptures which both parties acknowledged, he sided with the Pharisees. Again in his speech before Agrippa, be said: "I stand, and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" (Acts xxvi. 6-8.) The promise to which he refers is the promise of redemption through the Messiah, which redemption includes the deliverance of his people from the power of death and other evil consequences of sin. This was the promise to which the twelve tribes hoped to come. The belief, therefore, in a future life is thus declared to have been a part of the religion of the whole Hebrew nation.

In Galatians iii. 8, the Apostle says, God "preached before the gospel

unto Abraham." The Gospel, however, in the Apostle's sense of the term, is the glad tidings of salvation; and salvation is deliverance from the penalty of the law and restoration to the image and favour of God. This of necessity involves the idea of a future life; of a future state of misery from which the soul is delivered, and of a future state of glory and blessedness into which it is introduced. In teaching, therefore, that men before the coming of Christ needed and desired salvation, in the Christian sense of the word, the Apostle assumed that they had a knowledge of the evils which awaited unpardoned sinners in the world to come. The evidence, however, that the New Testament affords of the fact that the Hebrews believed in a future state, is not found exclusively in direct assertions of that fact, but in the whole nature of the plan of salvation therein unfolded. The New Testament takes for granted that all men, since the apostasy of Adam, are in a state of sin and condemnation; that from that state no man can be delivered except though the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only Saviour of men. It is, therefore, taught that the knowledge of this Redeemer was communicated to our race from the beginning, and in express terms in the promise made to Abraham; that the condition of salvation was then, as it is now, faith in Christ; that the blessings secured for believers were enjoyed before the advent of the Son of God in the flesh, as well as since. The heaven of believers is called the bosom of Abraham. All this of course assumes that the truths made known in the New Testament are in their germs revealed in the Old; just as all the doctrines unfolded in the Epistles are contained in the words of Christ as recorded in the Gospels.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is specially devoted to the object of unfolding the relation between the Old Dispensation and the New. The former was the shadow, or image, of the latter. What in the New is

taught in words, in the Old, was taught through types. That men are sinners, and as such under condemnation; that sin can only be cleansed by blood, or that the expiation of guilt by a vicarious sacrifice is necessary in order to forgiveness; that men therefore are saved by a priest appointed to draw near to God in their behalf and to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin; and that the effect of this priestly intervention is eternal salvation, are said to be the truths which underlie the religion of the Old Testament, as they constitute the life of the religion of the New. Faith was to the saints of old as it is to us, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." They walked by faith, and not by sight. They lived with their eyes fixed on the unseen and eternal. It was the future that filled their vision and elevated them above the present. They "died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned; but now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." (Heb. xi. 13-16.) Moses by faith chose rather "to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." It was through faith, the belief and hope of a better life hereafter, that the saints of old "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting

deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented (of whom the world was not worthy); they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth." Nothing more than this can be said of Christian confessors and martyrs. The faith of the Old Testament saints in the unseen and eternal was, therefore, as strong as that of any set of men since the creation. It has been said that the opinion of the New Testament writers is of no weight in a matter of criticism, and, therefore, it is of no consequence what they thought about the teachings of the Old Testament. This is true, if those writers were ordinary men; but if they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, then what they said, God said. We have, therefore, the sure word of inspiration that the people of God from the beginning of the world have believed in a state of conscious existence beyond the grave. That such is the doctrine of the New Testament is not disputed, and therefore need not be argued.

The Intermediate State.

As all Christians believe in the resurrection of the body and a future judgment, they all believe in an intermediate state. That is, they believe that there is a state of existence which intervenes between death and the resurrection; and that the condition of the departed during that interval is, in some respects, different from that which it is to be subsequent to that event. It is not, therefore, as to the fact of an intermediate state, but as to its nature, that diversity of opinion exists among Christians.

The common Protestant doctrine on this subject is that "the souls of

believers are at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection." According to this view the intermediate state, so far as believers are concerned, is one of perfect freedom from sin and suffering, and of great exaltation and blessedness. This is perfectly consistent with the belief that after the second coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead, the state of the soul will be still more exalted and blessed.

In support of the Protestant doctrine as thus stated, it may be remarked,

1. That it is simply a question of fact. What do the Scriptures teach as to the state of the soul of a believer immediately after death? It is not legitimate to decide this question on psychological grounds; to argue that such is the nature of the soul that it cannot retain its individuality, or personality, when separated from the body; or, that it is a mere function of the brain; or, that it cannot act or be acted upon -- can neither perceive nor be perceived except through and by means of the senses; or, that as vegetable and animal life are only manifest and active in connection with some form of matter, in other words, as there must be a physical basis of life, so the soul necessarily requires a material basis for its manifestation and activity. All these speculations, or theories, are, for the Christian, of no account, if the Bible teaches the fact of the continued, personal, individual existence of the soul after the death and dissolution of the body. The Bible does not formally teach anthropology in either of the branches of physiology or psychology, as a department of human science, but it assumes a great deal that falls under these several heads. It assumes that soul and body in man are two distinct substances united in a vital union so as to constitute the man, in the

present state of existence, one individual person. It assumes that the seat of this personality is the soul. The soul is the self, the Ego, of which the body is the organ. It assumes that the soul continues its conscious existence, and its power of acting and of being acted upon after its separation from the body. This we have seen to be the doctrine of the whole Bible. The dead, according to the Scriptures, do not cease to be; they do not cease to be conscious and active. There is, therefore, nothing in the psychology of the Scriptures, which is that of the vast majority of men, learned or unlearned, inconsistent with the doctrine that the souls of believers do, at death, immediately pass into glory.

2. According to the Scriptures and the faith of the Church, the probation of man ends at death. As the tree falls, so it lies. He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that is righteous let him be righteous still. When the bridegroom comes, they that are ready enter in, and the door is shut. According to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, there is no passing after death from one state to another; there is a great gulf between the righteous and the wicked from that time for evermore. It is appointed unto all men once to die, and after that the judgment The destiny of the soul is decided at death.

3. There is no satisfaction to be rendered in the future life for the sins done in the body. The Romish doctrine of satisfactions renders necessary the assumption of a purgatorial state after death for those who have not in this life made full expiation for their sins. But if the one offering of Christ forever perfects them that believe; if his sacrifice be a perfect satisfaction for our sins, then there is no reason why believers should be kept out of blessedness until they have expiated their sins by their own sufferings.

4. There is nothing contrary to Scripture, or to analogy, in the

assumption of a sudden and immediate change from imperfect to perfect holiness. The Protestant doctrine is that the souls of believers are at death made perfect in holiness. But it is asked, what sanctifying power is there in death? Progress in moral excellence is gradual; as no one becomes thoroughly evil by one act, or in a moment, so, it is said, it is unreasonable to suppose that a sudden change from imperfect to perfect moral excellence takes place at the moment of death. This objection supposes that the salvation of men is a natural process; if it be a supernatural work, the objection has no force. Curing a man of leprosy was a slow process; but when Christ said to the leper "I will be thou clean." he was healed in a moment. The change which takes place in a believer at death, can hardly be much greater than that instantaneously produced in Paul on his journey to Damascus. Paul, in Galatians i. 16, attributes that change to the revelation of the Son of God to him. If the momentary vision of the divine glory of Christ produced such an effect upon the Apostle, is it strange that the Scriptures should teach that the souls of believers, when separated from the world and the flesh, and redeemed from the power of the devil, and bathed in the full brightness of the glory of the blessed Redeemer, should in a moment be purified from all sin?

If, therefore, there be nothing in the nature of the soul inconsistent with its separate existence; if the body be not a necessary condition of its consciousness or activity; if its probation terminates at death; if the perfection of Christ's work precludes all necessity of future satisfaction for sin; and if the immediate change from imperfect to perfect holiness be consistent with the analogy of faith, then there is no à prioriobjection to the doctrine that the souls of believers at death do immediately pass into glory.

5. That such is the doctrine of Scripture may be argued from the

general drift of the sacred volume, so far as this subject is concerned. The Bible constantly speaks of the present life as a state of conflict, of labour, and of suffering; and of death as the entrance into rest. There remains a rest for the people of God. That rest follows the state of labour and trial. Believers then cease from their works. The rest on which they enter is not merely a rest from conflict and sin, but a rest which arises from the attainment of the end of their being, from their restoration to their proper relation to God, and all their capacities being satisfied and filled.

6. Besides these general considerations the doctrine in question is taught in many passages of Scripture with more or less distinctness. Thus, in Revelation xiv. 13, the Apostle says, "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." The simple meaning of this passage is that those who die in the Lord are, from that moment onward, in a state of blessednesss; because they cease from their labours, and enter on the reward of the righteous. Death is for them emancipation from evil, and the introduction into a state of happiness. Our Lord constantly teaches concerning those who believe in Him, (1.) That they are not condemned. They are no longer under the sentence of the law. (2.) That they have eternal life. That the effect of the union between Himself and them, consummated by faith, is that they partake of his life in a sense analogous to that in which the branch partakes of the life of the vine. As He lives always, those who partake of his life can never perish. And as He lives unto God, so the life of his people is a holy and divine life. That life, from its nature, is an unfailing source of blessedness. It purifies, exalts, and glorifies. It is impossible that the souls in which Christ thus lives should remain is a

state of misery and degradation, or in that dreamy state of existence in "the under-world" which so many of the fathers imagined to be the abode of the departed spirits of believers, awaiting the second coming of Christ. (3.) Our Lord promised that He would raise his people from the dead on the last day. It would seem, therefore, to be involved in the nature of the redemption of Christ, and of the union between Him and his people, that when absent from the body they are present with the Lord. It is inconceivable that with the Spirit of God dwelling in them, which is the Spirit of holiness and of glory, they should sink at death into a lower state of existence than that which they enjoyed in this world. We accordingly find that in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Christ says: "The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." (Luke xvi. 22.) The implication is undeniable that in his case the transition was immediate from earth to heaven. Still more explicit is the declaration of our Lord to the penitent thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii. 43.) The word paradise occurs in two other places in the New Testament. In 2 Corinthians xii. 4, Paul says he was caught up into paradise, which he explains by saying that he was caught up into the third heaven. And in Revelation ii. 7, Christ says: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches: To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." There can, therefore, be no doubt that paradise is heaven, and consequently when Christ promised the dying thief that he should that day be in paradise, he promised that he should be in heaven. It would, therefore, seem impossible that any who do not rest their faith on the fathers rather than on the Bible, should deny that the souls of believers do at death immediately pass into heaven. The fathers made a distinction between paradise and heaven which is not found in the

Scriptures. Some of them regarded the former as one division of Hades, corresponding to the Elysium of the pagans; others located it somewhere on the earth, while others regarded it as a locality high up above the earth, but below the dwelling-place of God. These are mere fancies. The word heaven is indeed a term of wide application in the Bible as it is in common life. We speak of the fowls of heaven; of the stars of heaven; of our Father who is in heaven; and of believers being the citizens of heaven. In each of these cases the word has a different sense. Whether paradise and heaven are the same is a mere dispute about words. If the word heaven be taken in one of its legitimate senses, they are the same; if it be taken in another of its senses, they are not the same. It would not be in accordance with Scriptural usage to say that believers are now in, paradise; but the Apostle does say they are now en tois epouraniois (Eph. ii. 6), i.e., in heaven. Paradise, as the word is used by Christ and his Apostles, is the place where Christ now is, and where He manifests his presence and glory. Whether it is the place where He will finally establish his kingdom; and whether all the redeemed, clothed in their resurrection bodies, shall there be gathered together, is a matter of which we have no knowledge, and in which we need take no interest. All we need know is that it is where Christ is; that it is a place and state in which there is neither sin nor sorrow, and where the saints are as exalted and happy as, in the existing circumstances of their being, it is possible for them to be. Whether any, in obedience to patristic usage, choose to call this paradise a department of Hades, is a matter of no concern. All that the dying believer need know is that he goes to be with Christ. That to him is heaven.

In 2 Corinthians v. 2, the Apostle says: "We know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an

house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." There are three ways in which these words, in connection with those which follow, are interpreted. (1.) According to one view, the house not made with hands into which the believer is received at death, is heaven. (2.) According to another view the meaning of the Apostle is, that when our present body is dissolved the soul will not be found naked, but will be immediately clothed with another and more spiritual body suited to the altered state of its existence. (3.) That the new house or body intended is the resurrection body. The second of these interpretations is founded on a gratuitous assumption. It assumes that the soul is furnished with a body of which the Scriptures make no mention, and of the existence of which we have no evidence. The Bible knows nothing of any human body save that which we now have, and that which we are to have at the resurrection; the one natural, the other spiritual. The third interpretation assumes that the Apostles erred not only in their own convictions, but in their teaching. It assumes that what they taught could be true only on the condition that the second coming of Christ was to occur while the men of that generation were alive. The point, however, in which all these views of this passage agree, is the only one which concerns the question under consideration. They all suppose that the soul is received into a state of blessedness immediately after death. This the Apostle clearly teaches. As soon as our earthly house is destroyed, the soul, instead of being left houseless and homeless, is received in that house which is eternal in the heavens. "We are always confident," he says, "knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord."

In Philippians i. 23, he expresses the same confidence: "For," he says,

"I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." Two things are here perfectly plain; first, that Paul regards the state of the soul after death as more exalted than its condition while in the flesh. This he distinctly asserts. And, secondly, that this change for the better takes place immediately after death. He was confident that as soon as he departed he would be with Christ. Both these points are conceded, even by those who deny the doctrine which they evidently involve. Some say that Paul, finding that Christ did not come as soon as he expected, changed his opinion, and held that the souls of believers were admitted at death into heaven, instead of awaiting the second advent in the underworld. The fathers said that while the great body of believers at death went into Hades, some few, especially the martyrs, were admitted at once into heaven. Mr. Alger conjectures that "we may assume . . . . that Paul believed there would be vouchsafed to the faithful Christian during his transient abode in the under world a more intimate and blessed spiritual fellowship with his Master than he could experience while in the flesh." [756] All this is floundering. The simple fact is that the inspired Apostle confidently anticipated for himself, and evidently for his fellow-believers, immediate admission at death to the presence of Christ. The ancients regarded the "under-world" or Hades, as "a gloomy prison," as Mr. Alger himself calls it. That Paul should have desired death in order that he should be thrust into a dungeon, no man can believe.

The Scriptures represent Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as being in heaven. The good, at death, are carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. Moses and Elijah appeared in glory on the mount of transfiguration, conversing with Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is said, "Ye are come

unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Nothing can be more utterly inconsistent with the nature of the Gospel, than the idea that the fire of divine life as it glows in the hearts of God's elect, is, at death, to be quenched in the damp darkness of an underground prison, until the time of the resurrection.

---

[746] Physical Theory of Another Life. By Isaac Taylor. New York, 1852, p. 23, and the whole of chap. ii.

[747] Commentar über die Psalmen, von G. W. Hengstenberg.Abhandlung No. 7. Zur Glaubenslehre der Psalmen, edit. Berlin, 1847, vol. iv. part 2. On p. 321, he says, "When we deny the doctrine of immortality to the writers of the Psalms, it is in the Christian sense" of the word.

[748] Commentar über den Psalter, Leipzig, 1860, vol. ii. p. 420.

[749] Commentar über die Psalmen, Abhandlung No. 7. Berlin, 1847, vol. iv. part 2, p. 273 ff.

[750] Veteris Testamenti Sententia de Rebus post Mortem Futuris. G. A. Oehler, Stuggart, 1846, p. 50.

[751] A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, with a Complete Bibliography of the Subject. By William Rounseville Alger. Philadelphia, 1846, p. 149. The Appendix is an instructive volume, being "A Catalogue of Works relating to the Nature, Origin, and Destiny of the Soul. The Titles classified and arranged chronologically, with Notes and indices of Authors and Subjects. By Ezra Abbot," is a marvel of ability and learning.

[752] Die Voraussetzungen der christlichen Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit dargestellt, von Hermann Schultz, Dr. der Philosophie, Licent. der Theologie, etc. Göttingen, 1861, p. 207.

[753] On page 438, he says: "The essence of rationalism is the affirmation that neither the fathers, nor the Church, nor the Scriptures, nor all of them together, can rightfully establish any proposition opposed to the logic of sound philosophy, the principles of reason, and the evident truth of nature. Around this thesis the battle has been fought and the victory won; and it will stand with spreading favour as long as there are enslaved and cultivated minds in the world. This position is, in logical necessity, and as a general thing in fact, that of the large though loosely-cohering body of believers known as Liberal Christians;' and it is tacitly held by still larger and evergrowing numbers nominally connected with sects that officially eschew it with horror." Mr. Alger doubtless considered this as simply a declaration of independence of human authority in matters of religion. To other, and perhaps to wiser men, it sounds like a declaration of independence of God, the Infinite Reason; as an assertion that the Infinite God can teach him nothing; or, at least, the He cannot so authenticate his teachings as to render them authoritative. The men are to be pitied who have no better knowledge of the mysteries of the present and the future than is to be found in themselves.

[754] Alger, ut supra, p. 340.

[755] Josephus, De Bello Judaico, II. viii. 11; Works, edit. Leipzig, 1827, vol. v. pp. 215, 216, [165.]

[756] Alger, ut surpa, p. 290.

---

§ 2. The Sleep of the Soul.

The doctrine that the soul exists, during the interval between death

and the resurrection, in a state of unconscious repose, properly supposes the soul to be a distinct substance from the body. It is therefore to be distinguished from the materialistic theory, which assumes that as matter in certain states and combinations exhibits the phenomena of magnetism or light, so in other combinations it exhibits the phenomena of life, and in others the phenomena of mind, and hence that vital and mental activity are as much the result or effect of the molecular arrangements of matter, as any physical operations in the external world. As in this view it would be absurd to speak of the sleep or quietude of magnetism or light when the conditions of their existence are absent, so it would be equally absurd, on this theory, to speak of the sleep of the soul after the dissolution of the body.

The doctrine of the sleep of the soul, moreover, is not identical with that which assumes that, although matter is in none of its combinations the cause of mental activity, yet that it is the necessary condition (so far as man is concerned) of its manifestation. The best of scientific men teach with regard to life, or vital force, that it is not the result of material combinations, but that such combination is necessary to its manifestation. "We recognize that these [vital] phenomena," says Professor Nicholson, "are never manifested except by certain forms of matter, or, it may be, by but a single form of matter. We conclude, therefore, that there must be an intimate connection between vital phenomena and the matter of life;' but we can go no further than this, and the premises do not in any way warrant the assertion that life is the result of living matter, or one of its properties." "The more philosophical view as to the nature of the connection between life and its material basis, is the one which regards vitality as something superadded and foreign to the matter by which vital phenomena are manifested. Protoplasm is essential as the

physical medium through which vital action may be manifested; just as a conductor is essential to the manifestation of electric phenomena, or just as a paint-brush and colours are essential to the artist. Because metal conducts the electric current, and renders it perceptible to our senses, no one thinks of therefore asserting that electricity is one of the inherent properties of a metal, any more than one would feel inclined to assert that the power of painting was inherent in the camel's hair or in the dead pigments. Behind the material substratum, in all cases, is the active and living force; and we have no right to assume that the force ceases to exist when its physical basis is removed, though it is no longer perceptible to our senses. It is, on the contrary, quite conceivable theoretically that the vital forces of an organism should suffer no change by the destruction of the physical basis, just as electricity would continue to subsist in a world composed universally of non-conductors. In neither case could the force manifest its presence, or be brought into any perceptible relation with the outer world; but in neither case should we have the smallest ground for assuming that the power was necessarily non-extant." [757]

This view when transferred to the soul, or mental phenomena, may be applied in three different forms to the doctrine of the state of man after death. First, God may be regarded as the universal mind-force which manifests itself through the human brain as electricity does through a conductor. When the brain is disintegrated, the mind-force remains, but not the individual man. Secondly, we may assume the realistic doctrine of generic humanity, manifesting itself in connection with proper corporeal organizations. Here again, it would seem to follow that when any individual human body is dissolved, the generic human life remains, but not the man. This is nearly the doctrine of Olshausen, before referred to. He held that the

individuality of man depends on the body; so that without a body there can be no soul; that the only existence of the soul of man possible between death and the resurrection must be the scattered dust of its human frame. Thirdly, we may take the doctrine of Swedenborg, who taught that man has two bodies, an exterior and interior, a material and spiritual, and that it is the former only that dies; the latter remains as the organ of the soul. Or, as others believe, the new, or spiritual, or resurrection body is provided at the moment of death, so that the soul passes from ifs earthly to its heavenly tabernacle in a moment. In none of these forms, however, is this theory of the absolute dependence of the soul for its power of self-manifestation properly applicable to the doctrine of the sleep of the soul after death. It is nevertheless probable that those who advocated this doctrine, in different periods in the history of the Church, had some such theory underlying their views.

Eusebius [758] mentions a small sect of Christians in Arabia who held that the soul remained unconscious from death to the resurrection. At the time of the Reformation there was such a revival of that doctrine that Calvin deemed it expedient to write an essay devoted to its refutation. Socinus also taught that the soul after death perceived and received nothing out of itself, although it remained self-conscious and self-contemplative. Archbishop Whately [759] says that, so far as the Scriptures are concerned, it is an open question whether the soul remains in a conscious state after death or not. In the third lecture he gives reasons which favour the view of continued consciousness; and in the fourth, those which seem to teach the opposite doctrine. To the understanding, he says, there is no difference between the two views; although to the imagination, the difference is great. In the consciousness of the soul of the believer, in either case, entrance

into heaven would instantaneously succeed death. An interval of which the soul was unconscious, would, for it, have no existence. The archbishop for himself thinks that the arguments on the one side are as strong as those on the other. The two considerations which seem to him to favour the doctrine of the sleep of the soul between death and the resurrection, are, first the fact that death is so often called a sleep. The dead are those who are asleep. (1 Thess. xiv. 4.) This expression cannot properly be understood of the body. A dead body can no more be said to sleep than a stone. The fair intimation, therefore, is, as the Archbishop thinks, that the soul sleeps when the body dies. The second consideration is that the New Testament clearly teaches that there is a solemn final judgment at the last day, when the destiny of each soul will be decided for eternity. But this appears inconsistent with the doctrine that the fate of the soul is decided immediately after it leaves the body. He admits that, according to the Scriptures, probation ends with this life, and therefore if the righteous at death pass into a state of happiness and the wicked into a state of misery, they are thereby judged; and there is no apparent necessity for a future judgment. It is obvious that these arguments have little force against the clear teachings of the Bible, and the faith of the Church universal, and indeed of all mankind. As to the first of the above mentioned arguments, it is enough to say, that as a dead body and a body asleep are so much alike in appearance, it is the most natural thing in the world to speak of death as an unending sleep. This is done continually by those who are firm believers in the continued conscious activity of the soul after death. The other argument has, if possible, still less weight. Although the fate of every man should be decided for himself and to his knowledge at the moment of death, there may be important and numerous reasons why there should be a public, solemn

adjudication at the last day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made known, and the justice of God revealed in the presence of men and angels.

---

[757] Introduction to the Study of Biology, by H. Alleyne Nicholson, M. D., D. Sc., Ph. D., F. R. S. E., F. G. S., etc. Professor of Natural History and Botany in University College, Toronto, etc., etc. Edinburgh and London, 1872, pp. 8 and 11.

[758] Ecclesiastica Historia, VI. xxxvii.; edit. Cambridge, 1720, p. 299.

[759] A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State, by Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. Philadelphia, 1856.

---

§ 3. Patristic Doctrine of the Intermediate State.

Although the true doctrine concerning the state of the dead was, as has been shown, revealed in the Old Testament, it was more or less perverted in the minds of the people. The prevalent idea was that all souls after death descended into Sheol, and there remained in expectation of the coming of the Messiah. When He came it was expected that the Jews, or at least, the faithful, would be raised from the dead, and made partakers of all the glories and blessedness of the Messiah's reign. The views presented in the writings of the Rabbins of the condition of the souls in Sheol are not only diverse but inconsistent. The common representation was that Sheol itself was a gloomy, subterraneous abode, whose inhabitants were shades, weak and powerless, existing in a dreamy state; the best of them not in a state of suffering, and yet with no other enjoyment than the anticipation of deliverance when the Messiah should come. At other times, however, more life was attributed to the souls of the departed; and Sheol was

represented as divided into two departments, Paradise and Gehenna. In the former were, according to some, all Jews, according to others only those who had faithfully observed the law; and in the other, the Gentiles. The common opinion was that all the Jews would be raised from the dead, when the Messiah came, and all the Gentiles left forever in the abode of darkness. Paradise, according to this view, was a place of positive enjoyment, and Gehenna a place of positive suffering. It is evident that there is no great difference between this Jewish doctrine in its essential features, and the true doctrine as presented by our Lord in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Both are represented as going into Sheol or Hades. The one was comforted, the other tormented. There was an inseparable barrier between the two. So far both doctrines agree. When the Rabbi Jochanan was dying, he said, "Two paths open before me, the one leading to bliss, the other to torments; and I know not which of them will be my doom." [760] "Paradise is separated from hell by a distance no greater than the width of a thread." [761]

According to many modern interpreters the New Testament writers adopted this Jewish doctrine not only in substance but in its details. (1.) They are represented as teaching that all the people of God who died before the advent of Christ, were confined in Sheol, or the under-world. Sheol or Hades, as stated above, is constantly spoken of "as the gloomy realm of shades, wherein are gathered and detained the souls of all the dead generations." The soul at death is said to be dismissed "naked into the silent, dark, and dreary region of the under-world." (2.) That when Christ died upon the cross, He descended "ad inferos," into Hades, or Hell, for the purpose of delivering the pious dead from their prison; and that they were the redeemed captives of whom the Apostle speaks in Ephesians iv. 8-l0, as led by Christ into

heaven. (3.) That those who die in the Lord since his advent, instead of being admitted into heaven, pass into the same place and the same state into which the patriarch passed at death before his coming. (4.) And as the Old Testament saints remained in Sheol until the first coming of the Messiah, so those who die under the New Testament, are to remain in Hades, until his second coming. Then they are not only to be delivered from Sheol, but their bodies are to be raised from the dead, and soul and body, reunited and glorified, are to be admitted into heaven.

Such is the scheme of doctrine said to be taught in the New Testament. Our Lord is regarded as giving it his sanction in the parable concerning Lazarus. Paul is made to teach it when he speaks of Christ as descending to "the lower parts of the earth," which is said to mean "the parts lower than the earth," that is, the under-world. His object in thus descending was, according to the theory, to deliver the souls confined in the gloomy prison of Sheol. Christ's triumph over principalities and powers is referred to the same event, his descent into Hades. Mr. Alger, representing a large class of writers, says that according to Paul's doctrine, "Christ was the first person clothed with humanity and experiencing death, admitted into heaven. Of all the hosts who had lived and died, every one had gone down into the dusky under-world. They were all held in durance waiting for the Great Deliverer." [762] The fate of those who die since the advent is no better, for they, as Paul is made to teach, are "all to remain in the under-world" until the second coming of Christ, "when they and the transformed living shall ascend together with the Lord." [763]

St. Peter is made to teach the same doctrine in still more explicit terms. In his discourse delivered on the day of Pentecost, he argued that Jesus is the Christ from the fact that God raised Him from the

dead. That He was thus raised he argued from the sixteenth Psalm, where it is written, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." That these words cannot refer to David, Peter argued, because he did see corruption, and his sepulchre remained until that day. The words of the Psalmist, therefore, must be understood of Christ, whose soul was not left in hell (Sheol), neither did his flesh see corruption. As for David, he "is not ascended into heaven." (Acts ii. 34.) Something, therefore, happened to Christ that did not happen to David or to any other man. Christ was not left in hell; David and all other men were thus left. Christ did ascend to heaven; David did not; and if David did not, then other saints of his time did not. Thus it is that Peter is made to teach that the souls of the pious dead do not ascend to heaven, but descend to the gloomy abode of Sheol, Hades, or Hell, all these terms being equivalent. This exposition of the Apostle's teaching is plausible, and if consistent with other parts of Scripture, might be accepted. But as it contradicts what the Bible clearly teaches in many other places, it must be rejected. Peter's object was to prove the Messiahship of Christ from the fact of the resurrection of his body. The essential idea of "rising from the dead" was the restoration of the body to life. The soul does not die, and is not raised. The Apostle proved that Christ's body did not see corruption, but was restored to life; first, because it was a historical fact of which he and his brethren were witnesses; and secondly, from the prediction of the Psalmist that the Messiah was not to remain in the grave. That the sixteenth Psalm does not refer to David, he argued, because David died and was buried; his body did see corruption; his sepulchre remained among them; he, his body, he, as a man composed of soul and body, had not ascended to heaven. The whole argument concerns the body; because

it is true only of the body, that it dies, is buried, sees corruption, and does not ascend to heaven. The simple meaning of Psalm xvi. 10, is that the person there spoken of was not to remain under the power of death. He was to rise from the dead before his body had time to see corruption. This is all that the passage teaches. This is true of Christ; it was not true of David or of any of the saints who died before the advent; and it is not true of those who have died since the advent. In this respect, as in so many others, Christ stands gloriously alone.

The difficult passage 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, however it may be interpreted, proves nothing against the Protestant doctrine that the souls of believers do at death immediately pass into glory. What happens to ordinary men happened to Christ when He died. His cold and lifeless body was laid in the tomb. His human soul passed into the invisible world. This is all that the creed, commonly called the Apostles', means, when it says Christ was buried, and descended into Hell, or Hades, the unseen world. This is all that the passage in question clearly teaches. Men may doubt and differ as to what Christ did during the three days of his sojourn in the invisible world. They may differ as to who the spirits in prison were to whom he preached, or, rather, made proclamation (ekeruxen); whether they were the antediluvians; or, the souls of the people of God detained in Sheol; or, the mass of the dead of all antecedent generations and of all nations, which is the favorite hypothesis of modern interpreters. They may differ also as to what the proclamation was which Christ made to those imprisoned spirits; whether it was the gospel; or his own triumph; or deliverance from Sheol; or the coming judgment. However these subordinate questions may be decided, all that remains certain is that Christ, after his death upon the cross, entered the invisible

world, and there, in some way, made proclamation of what He had done on earth. All this is very far from teaching the doctrine of a "Limbus Patrum," as taught by the Jews, the Fathers, or the Romanists.

It is a great mistake in interpretation of the New Testament, to bring down its teachings to the level of Jewish or Pagan ideas. Because the Jews expected the Messiah to establish an earthly kingdom, it is inferred that the kingdom of God, as proclaimed by Christ and his Apostles, was to be realized in this life. Because they expected that the Messiah was to deliver the souls of their fathers from Sheol, it is assumed that this was the work actually effected by Christ. Because the Jews regarded imprisonment in the under-world as the special penalty of sin, it is inferred that deliverance from that imprisonment was the redemption our Lord actually effected. This is to interpret the Scriptures by the Talmud and Cabala, and not Scripture by Scripture. This is historical interpretation "en oûtre." It is true that Christ proclaimed that the kingdom of God was at hand; but his kingdom was not of this world. It is true that He came to open the prison doors and proclaim liberty to the captives; but his prison was not Sheol, and the captives were not the souls of departed patriarchs. It is true that He came to redeem his people; but the redemption which He effected was from the curse of God's violated law, and not deliverance from the gloomy land of Shades.

We all know that the great evil with which the Apostles had to contend in the early Church, and the great source of corruption in the Church in after ages, was a Judaizing spirit. Most of the early Christians were Jews, and most of the converts from the Gentiles were proselytes imbued with Jewish doctrines. These doctrines, moreover, were congenial with what the Apostle calls "the carnal mind." It is not wonderful, therefore, that they were transferred to the Christian Church, and

proved in it a permanently corrupting leaven. Modern critics are going back to the beginning, and doing in our day what the Judaizers did in the age of the Apostles. They are eliminating Christianity from the Gospel, and substituting Judaism, somewhat spiritualized, but still essentially Judaic.

It is notorious that the Jewish doctrines of the merit of works; of the necessity and saving efficacy of external rites; of a visible kingdom of Christ of splendour and worldly grandeur; of an external church out of whose pale there is no salvation; of the priestly character of the ministry; and of a church hierarchy, soon began to spread among Christians, and at last became ascendant. This being the case it would be strange if the Jewish doctrine of Sheol, or of an intermediate state, had not been adopted by many of the fathers, together with the other elements of the corrupt Judaism of the apostolic age. We accordingly find that as the Jews, contrary to the teaching of their own Scripture, held that the souls of those who died before the coming of the Messiah descended into Sheol, and there awaited the advent of the Redeemer, so the Christians began to believe, contrary to the teaching of their Scriptures, that the souls of believers at death, instead of passing into glory, are shut up in Hades, awaiting the second coming of Christ. It is true there were varying and inconsistent notions entertained of the nature of this intermediate state; and the same is true also with regard to the views on this subject which long prevailed in the Church. There are two facts which stand out so plainly in the New Testament Scriptures that they could not be always overlooked or denied. The one is that Christ, forty days after his resurrection, ascended into heaven, and is now seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The other is that the souls of believers when absent from the body are present with the Lord. As many of the Jews,

therefore, assumed that in Sheol there were two departments, Paradise and Gehenna, the one the abode of the righteous, the other of the wicked; so the Christians, in many cases, made the same distinction with regard to the intermediate state; the souls of believers went to paradise; the souls of the wicked into hell. And they often so exalted the blessedness of the former as to make it a mere dispute about words whether they went to heaven or into an intermediate state. The real controversy. so far as any exists, is not as to whether there is a state intermediate between death and the resurrection in which believers are less glorious and exalted than they are to be after the second advent of Christ, but what is the nature of that state. Are believers after death with Christ? Do their souls immediately pass into glory? or, are they in a dreamy, semi-conscious state, neither happy nor miserable, awaiting the resurrection of the body. That this latter view was for a long time prevalent in the Church may be inferred, (1.) From the fact that this was the view of the intermediate state commonly adopted by the Jews. (2.) It is the view attributed to the writers of the New Testament. (3.) It is the doctrine avowed by many of the patristic and mediæval writers. (4.) There would otherwise be no ground for the opposition manifested to the doctrine of Protestants on this subject. Daillé says, "The doctrine that heaven shall not be opened till the second coming of Christ, -- that during that time the souls of all men, with few exceptions, are shut up in the under-world, -- was held by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Augustine, Origen, Lactantius Victorinus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, OEcomenius, Aretas, Prudentius, Theophylact, Bernard, and many others, as is confessed by all. . . . . This doctrine is literally held by the whole Greek Church at the present day; nor did any of the Latins expressly deny any part of it until the Council of Florence, in the year of our

Lord 1439." [764]

Flügge [765] says in reference to the early fathers, that they "were not in doubt as to the fate of the soul when separated from the body until the resurrection, because they rested on the Jewish doctrine on that subject." Justin Martyr speaks in this way: [766] [Phemi:] Tas men [psuchas] ton eusebon en kreittoni poi choro menein, tas de adikous kai poneras en cheironi, ton tes kriseos ekdechomenas chronon tote, that is, "I say, that the souls of the pious dwell in some better place, and ungodly and wicked souls in a worse place, thus awaitng the time of judgment."

The fathers say but little about Hades. Hippolytus, however, gives an account of it which is in substance as follows: [767] Hades, in which the souls of the righteous and unrighteous are detained, was left at the creation in a state of chaos, to which the light of the sun never penetrates, but where perpetual darkness reigns. This place is the prison of souls, over which the angels keep watch. In Hades there is a furnace of unquenchable fire into which no one has yet been cast. It is reserved for the banishment of the wicked at the end of the world, when the righteous will be made citizens of an eternal kingdom. The good and the bad, although both in Hades, are not in the same part of it. They enter the under-world by the same gate. When this gate is passed, the guardian angels guide the souls of the departed different ways; the righteous are guided to the right to a region full of light; the wicked are constrained to take the left hand path, leading to a region near the unquenchable fire. The good are free from all discomfort, and rejoice in expectation of their admission into heaven. The wicked are miserable in constant anticipation of their coming doom. An impassable gulf separates the abode of the righteous from that of the wicked. Here they remain until the resurrection, which he goes on to explain and

defend.

Flügge admits that there was no uniformity of representation on this subject in the early Church. The same general idea, however, is constantly reproduced; the Latins agreeing substantially with the Greeks. Tertullian represents the under-world as the general receptacle of departed spirits who retain their consciousness and activity. In this unseen world there are two divisions, both called "Inferi." "Nobis inferi non nuda cavositas, nec subdivalis aliqua mundi sentina creduntur: sed in fossa terræ et in alto vastitas, et in ipsis visceribus ejus abstrusa profunditas." [768] In this region there are two divisions; the one called "infernum," by way of eminence, or Gehenna, "quæ est ignis arcani subterraneus ad poenam thesaurus;" the other is the bosom of Abraham or paradise, "divinæ amoenitatis recipiendis sanctorum spiritibus destinatum, materia [maceria] quadam igneæ illius zonæ a notitia orbis communis segregatum." [769] According to this mode of representation, the intermediate state was itself a state of reward and punishment; at other times, however, this was denied; all retribution being reserved to the day of judgment. In the early Greek Church, this latter view was the more prevalent; [770] but later both the Greeks and Latins agreed in regarding the state of the righteous after death as far more favourable than that of the wicked.

The common views on this subject are perhaps fairly represented in the elaborate work of the Honourable Archibald Campbell, on "the doctrine of a middle state between death and the resurrection." [771] He thus sums up the points which he considers himself to have proved to be the doctrine of the Bible, of the Fathers, and of the Church of England.

"First. That the souls of the dead do remain in an intermediate, or middle state between death and the resurrection."

"That the proper place appointed for the abode of the righteous during

the interim between death and the resurrection, called paradise, or Abram's bosom, is not the highest heavens where alone God is at present, fully to be enjoyed, but it is, however, a very happy place, one of the lower apartments or mansions of heaven, a place of purification and improvement, of rest and refreshment, and of divine contemplation. A place whence our Blessed Lord's humanity is sometimes to be seen, though clouded or veiled if compared with the glory He is to appear with, and be seen in, at, and after his second coming. Into which middle state and blessed place, as they are carried by the holy angels, whose happy fellowship they there enjoy; so afterward at the resurrection, after judgment, they are led into the beatific vision by the captain of our salvation, Jesus Christ Himself, where they shall see Him fully as He is, and there they shall enjoy God forever and ever, or sempiternally."

The souls of the wicked at death do not go into hell, but into a middle state, "which state is dark, dismal, and uncomfortable, without light, rest, or any manner of refreshment, without any company but that of devils and such impure souls as themselves to converse with, and where these miserable souls are in dismal apprehensions of the deserved wrath of God."

"Secondly, That there is no immediate judgment after death, no trial on which sentence is pronounced, of neither the righteous nor the wicked, until Christ's second coming. And that, therefore, none of any age or class from the beginning of the world to the glorious appearing of our blessed Saviour at his second coming, are excepted from continuing in their proper middle state, from their death until their resurrection, whether they be patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, or martyrs."

"Thirdly, That the righteous in their happy middle state, do improve in holiness, and make advances in perfection, and yet they are not for all

that carried out of that middle state into glory, or into the beatific vision, until after their resurrection."

"Fourthly, That prayers for those who are baptized according to Christ's appointment, and who die in the pale and peace of his Church, which the ancients called dying with the sign of faith, I say that prayers for such are acceptable to God as being fruits of our ardent charity, and are useful both to them and to us, and are too ancient to be popish."

"Lastly, That this doctrine for an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, as I have proved it, does effectually destroy the popish purgatory, invocation of the saints departed, popish penances, commutations of those penances, their indulgences, and treasures of merits purchased by supererogation."

As an example of the prayers for the dead he gives the following extract from the Office to be used at the Burial of the Dead in the first Liturgy of King Edward the Sixth: [772] "O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and in whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh be in joy and felicity; grant unto this thy servant that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible."

Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down and Connor, says: [773] Paradise is distinguished from the heaven of the blessed; being itself a receptacle of holy souls, made illustrous with visitation of angels, and happy by

being a repository for such spirits, who, at the day of judgment, shall go forth into eternal glory."

Again, he says: [774] "I have now made it as evident as questions of this nature will bear, that in the state of separation, the spirits of good men shall be blessed and happy souls, -- they have an antepast or taste of their reward; but their great reward itself, their crown of righteousness, shall not be yet; that shall not be until the day of judgment. . . . . This is the doctrine of the Greek Church unto this day, and was the opinion of the greatest part of the ancient Church both Latin and Greek; and by degrees was, in the west, eaten out by the doctrine of purgatory and invocation of saints; and rejected a little above two hundred years ago, in the Council of Florence."

It appears, therefore, that there is little difference between the advocates of an intermediate state and those who are regarded as rejecting that doctrine. Both admit, (1.) That the souls of believers do at death pass into a state of blessedness. (2.) That they remain in that state until the resurrection. (3.) That at the second coming of Christ, when the souls of the righteous are to be clothed with their glorified bodies, they will be greatly exalted and raised to a higher state of being. Bishop Hickes in his highly commendatory review of the work of the Honourable Archibald Campbell just referred to, which is appended to that volume, although he lays great stress on the doctrine in question, says that those who call the state into which the righteous enter, heaven; and that into which the wicked are introduced when they die, hell, may continue to do so, provided they mean by heaven a state which is less perfect than that which awaits them after the coming of Christ; and by hell, a condition less miserable than that which will be assigned to the wicked.

The Church of England agrees with other Protestant churches in its

teachings on this subject. In the Liturgy of Edward VI. just quoted, it is said, (1.) That the spirits of all the dead live after the dissolution of the body. (2.) That the righteous are with God in a state of joy and felicity. (3.) That they have escaped the gates of hell and the pains of eternal darkness into which, as is necessarily implied, the souls of those who die unreconciled to God immediately enter. All the members of that Church are taught to say daily: "The glorious company of the Apostles praise thee. The goodly fellowship of the Prophets praise thee. The noble army of Martyrs praise thee." These, therefore, are all with God, and engaged in his service. In one of the prayers appointed to be used in the visitation of the sick, these words occur: "O Almighty God, with whom do live the souls of just men made perfect, after they are delivered from their earthly prisons." The souls of the just, therefore, are made per fect when they are delivered from the body.

---

[760] Talmud, Tract. Barachoth; quoted by Alger, p. 167.

[761] Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, Königsberg, 1711; II. cap. v. p. 315.

[762] Alger, ut supra, p. 284.

[763] Ibid. p. 288.

[764] De Usu Patrum, II. iv.; edit. Geneva, 1656, pp. 290, 291.

[765] Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, Auferstehung, Gericht und Vergeltung, von W. Flügge, Universitätsprediger in Göttingen, III. i. 3; Leipzig, 1799, vol. iii. part 1, p. 87.

[766] Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, 5; edit. Commelinus, Heidelberg, 1593, p. 172, 16-19.

[767] Against Plato on the Cause of the Universe, (fragment): Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Edinburgh, 1869, vol. ix. Hippolytus,

vol. ii. p. 46 ff.

[768] Tertullian, De Anima, 55; Works, edit. Basle, 1562, p. 685.

[769] Tertullian, Apologeticus, 47; ut supra, p. 892.

[770] Flügge, III. i. 4; ut supra, pp. 215, 216.

[771] The Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and Resurrection, of Prayers for the Dead, etc., etc., by Honourable Archibald Campbell, London, 1721, folio, p. 44.

[772] Published at London in the year 1549, folio, cxlix. p. 2.

[773] Life and Death of Jesus Christ, III. xvi. ad. 1; 3d edit. London, 1657, p. 533.

[774] Sermon at Funeral of Sir George Dalston; Works, edit. London, 1828, vol. vi. pp. 553, 557.

---

§ 4. Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

Although Romanists reject the doctrine of an intermediate state in the sense of the ancient Church, they nevertheless divide the world into which the souls of men enter at death, into many different departments.

The Limbus Patrum.

They hold that the souls of the righteous before the coming of Christ descended into Sheol, where they remained in a state of expectancy awaiting the coming of the Messiah. When Christ came and had accomplished his work of redemption by dying upon the cross, He descended into Hades, or the under-world, where the souls of the patriarchs were confined, delivered them from their captivity, and carried them in triumph to heaven. In other words they hold the common Jewish doctrine as to the state of the dead, so far as the saints of the Old Testament period are concerned. Their views on that subject have an intimate relation, whether causal or inferential is uncertain and unimportant, with their doctrine of the sacraments. Holding, first,

that the sacraments are the only channels by which the saving blessings of redemption are conveyed to men; and, secondly, that the sacraments of the Old Testament signified but did not communicate grace, they could not avoid the conclusion that those who died before the coming of Christ were not saved. The best that could be hoped concerning them was that they were not lost, but retained in a salvable state awaiting the coming deliverer. Whether they inferred that the Old Testament saints were not saved because they had no grace-bearing sacraments, or concluded that their sacraments were ineffectual, because those who had no others were not saved, it is not easy to determine. The latter is the more probable; as most naturally they received the doctrine of Sheol from the Jews, as they did so many other doctrines; and being led to believe that the patriarchs were not in heaven, they could not avoid the conclusion that circumcision and the passover were very far inferior in efficacy to the Christian sacraments.

The Limbus Infantum.

This is the name given to the place and state pertaining to the departed souls of unbaptized infants. As this class includes, perhaps, a moiety of the whole human race, their destiny in the future world is a matter of the deepest interest. The doctrine of the Church of Rome on this subject is that infants dying without baptism are not at death, or ever after it, admitted into the kingdom of heaven. They never partake of the benefits of redemption. This doctrine is explicitly stated in the symbols of that Church, and defended by its theologians. Cardinal Gousset, for example, says that original sin, of which all the children of Adam are partakers, is the death of the soul. Its consequences in this life are ignorance or obscuration of the understanding, feebleness of the will which can do nothing spiritually good without the assistance of divine grace, concupiscence or revolt of our lower

nature, infirmities, sorrow, and the death of the body. Its consequences in the life to come are exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, privation of life eternal, of the beatific vision; "no one can enter into the kingdom of God unless he be born again in Jesus Christ by baptism; Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' This is what faith teaches, but it goes no further. The Church leaves to the discussions of the schools the different opinions of theologians touching the fate of those who are excluded from the kingdom of heaven on account of original sin; infants, for example, who die without having received the sacrament of baptism." [775]

Perrone speaking on this subject says, "We must distinguish the certain from the uncertain. What is certain, yea, a matter of faith, we have from the decisions of the Second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence, both of which declare concerning infants and idiots: Credimus . . . . illorum animas, qui in mortali peccato vel cum solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas.' Ita quidem Florentinum in decreto Unionis,' quod descripsit verba Lugdunensis in fidei professione. De fide igitur est, (1.) parvulos ejusmodi in infernum descendere seu damnationem incurrere; (2.) poenis puniri disparibus ab illis quibus puniuntur adulti. Quæ proinde spectant ad hunc inferni locum, ad poenarum disparitatem, seu in quo hæc disparitas constituenda sit, ad parvulorum statum post judicii diem incerta sunt omnia, nec fidem attingunt. Hinc variæ de his sunt patrum ac theologorum sententiæ." [776] Perrone goes on to show that the Latin fathers represent infants as suffering "poenam sensus;" while most of Greek fathers say that they incur only "poenam damni," a sense of loss in being deprived of the blessedness of heaven. What that involves, however, he says is much disputed among theologians.

The Scriptural proof of this doctrine, as argued by Romanists is principally twofold; the first is derived from the doctrine of original sin. They admit that the sin of Adam brought guilt and spiritual death upon all mankind. Baptism is the only means appointed for the deliverance of men from these dreadful evils. Hence it follows that the unbaptized remain under this guilt and pollution. The second great argument is founded upon John iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This Romanists understand as an explicit declaration that the unbaptized cannot be saved. On this, however, as on all other subjects, their main dependence is upon the decision of Councils and the testimony of the fathers. Besides the Councils of Lyons and Florence, both regarded as ecumenical by Romanists, appeal is made to the canons of the Council of Trent, "Si quis parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, etiam si a baptizatis parentibus orti; aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro necesse sit expiari ad vitam æternam consequendam.. . . . . anathema sit." [777] The Synod of Carthage, A. D. 416, is also quoted, which decided: [778] "Quicunque negat, parvulos per baptismum Christi a perditione liberari, et salutem percipere posse; anathema sit." Although the councils declare that the souls of unbaptized infants descend immediately into hell, Cardinal Gousset remarks, it is to be remembered that there are many departments in hell. There was one for the impenitent who died before the coming of Christ, and another for the souls of the righteous who awaited the advent of the Messiah; so there is no reason for denying that there is still another for the souls of unbaptized infants. "We repeat," he says, [779] "that neither the Council of Florence nor that of Lyons pronounces on the nature of the punishment of those who die with only

the guilt of original sin, except to show that they are forever excluded from the kingdom of heaven." We can, therefore, without going counter to the decisions of the Church, maintain the sentiment which exempts such unfortunates from the punishment of hell, and the rather because the opposite opinion is generally abandoned, and this abandonment is in accord with Pope Innocent III., who, distinguishing between the punishment of original and of actual sin, makes the latter to be the pain of eternal fire; the former, the simple loss of the beatific (or intuitive) vision: "Poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis Dei, actualis vero poena peccati est gehennæ perpetuæ cruciatus." [780] On the following page he says, "We will go still further, and say with St. Thomas, that although unbaptized infants are deprived forever of the happiness of the saints, they suffer neither sorrow nor sadness in consequence of that privation." It is a matter of rejoicing that the doctrine of Romanists on the condition of unbaptized infants in a future life has admitted of this amelioration, although it is hard to reconcile it with the decisions of councils which declare that the souls of such infants do at death immediately descend into hell, if that word be understood according to the sense in which it was generally used when those decisions were made. The current representations of the theologians of the Latin Church are against this modified form of the doctrine. The Council of Trent anathematizes those who say that baptism is not necessary for the expiation of original sin; as that of Carthage those who affirm that it does not save infants from perdition. Romanists, however, of our day, have the right to state their doctrine in their own way, and should not be charged with holding sentiments which they repudiate.

Hell.

Hell is defined by Romanists as the place or state in which the fallen

angels and men who die in a state of mortal sin, or, as it is also expressed, of final impenitence, suffer forever the punishment of their sins.

That the punishment of the wicked is unending they prove from the express declarations of Scripture, from the faith of the Church universal, and from the general belief of men. As to the nature of the sufferings of those who perish, they say they are those of loss; they are deprived of the favour, vision, and presence of God; and those "of sense," or of positive infliction. To this latter class are to be referred such sufferings as arise from wicked passions, from remorse and despair, as well as those which spring from the external circumstances in which the finally condemned are placed. Whether the unquenchable fire of which the Bible speaks, is to be understood literally or figuratively, is a question about which Romanists differ. Gousset proposes the question, and says that it is one on which the Church has given no decisions. "It is of faith," he says, "that the condemned shall be eternally deprived of the happiness of heaven, and that they shall be eternally tormented in hell; but it is not of faith that the fire which causes their suffering is material. Many doctors, whose opinion has not been condemned, think that as the worm which never dies' is a figurative expression, so also is the fire that is never quenched;' and that the fire means a pain analogous to that by fire rather than the real pain produced by fire. Nevertheless the idea that the fire spoken of is real material fire is so general among Catholics, that we do not venture to advance a contrary opinion." [781]

Into this place and state of endless misery do pass, at death, all who die out of the pale of the Catholic Church; all the unbaptized (at least among adults); all schismatics; all heretics; all who die impenitent, or in a state of mortal sin, that is, sin the penalty of

which is eternal death, which has not been remitted by priestly absolution.

Heaven.

Heaven, on the other hand, is the place and state of the blessed, where God is; where Christ is enthroned in majesty, and where are the angels and the spirits of the just made perfect. Those who enter heaven are in possession of the supreme good. "The happiness of the saints above is complete; they possess God, and in that possession they find perfect rest, and the enjoyment of all good." Their blessedness is perfect because it is everlasting. They see God face to face. They will eternally love Him and be loved by Him. "Beatitudo, quæ etiam summum bonum aut ultimus finis nuncupatur, a Boetio [782] definitur: status bonorum omnium congregatione perfectus;' a S. Augustino, [783] Bonorum omnium summa et cumulus;' a scholasticis autem: 'summum bonum appetivus rationalis satiativum.'" [784] It is, therefore, heaven in the highest sense of the term, into which the saints are said to enter.

There are, however, degrees in this blessedness. "The elect," says Cardinal Gousset, "in heaven, see God in a manner more or less perfect, according as they have more or less of merit, pro meritorum diversitate,' as it is expressed by the Council of Florence, which agrees with the words of our Lord, who says, In my Father's house are many mansions.'" [785] Into this only a few, however, even of true believers, according to Romanists, enter at death. The advocates of the doctrine of an intermediate state, as has been shown, assert that none of the human family, whether patriarch, prophet, Apostle, or martyr, is admitted to the vision of God when he leaves the body; and that none of the wicked goes into the place of final retribution. Both the righteous and the wicked remain in a middle state, awaiting their final doom and location at the second coming of Christ. As to both these points,

Romanists are more nearly agreed with the great body of Protestants. On this point the Council of Florence says: "Credimus . . . . illorum animas, qui post baptismum susceptum nullam omnino peccati maculam incurrerunt, illas etiam animas quæ post contractam peccati maculam vel in suis corporibus, vel eisdem exutæ corporibus sunt purgatæ in coelum mox recipi, et intueri clare ipsum Deum trinum et unum sicuti est." This doctrine Romanists assert not only in opposition to those who teach that the soul dies with the body and is revived at the resurrection, but also to those who say that the souls even of the perfectly purified "in aliqua requie degere, donec post corporum resurrectionem adipiscantur æternam beatitudinem, quam interim expectant." This error, Perrone says, widely disseminated among the Greeks, was adopted by Luther and Calvin. [786]

Two classes of persons, therefore, according to this view, enter heaven before the resurrection; first, those who are perfectly purified at the time of death; and second, those who, although not thus perfect when they leave this world, have become perfect in purgatory.

Purgatory.

According to Romanists, all those who die in the peace of the Church, but are not perfect, pass into purgatory; with regard to which they teach, (1.) That it is a state of suffering. The commonly received traditional, though not symbolical, doctrine on this point is, that the suffering is from material fire. The design of this suffering is both expiation and purification. (2.) That the duration and intensity of purgatorial pains are proportioned to the guilt and impurity of the sufferers. (3.) That there is no known or defined limit to the continuance of the soul in purgatory, but the day of judgment. The departed may remain in this state of suffering for a few hours or for thousands of years. (4.) That souls in purgatory may be helped; that

is, their sufferings alleviated or the duration of them shortened by the prayers of the saints, and especially by the sacrifice of the Mass. (5.) That purgatory is under the power of the keys. That is, it is the prerogative of the authorities of the Church, at their discretion, to remit entirely or partially the penalty of sins under which the souls there detained are suffering.

This doctrine is deeply rooted in the whole Romish system. According to that system, (1.) Christ delivers us only from the "reatus culpæ," and exposure to eternal death. (2.) For all sins committed after baptism the offender must make satisfaction by penance or good works. (3.) This satisfaction must be complete and the soul purified from all sin, before it can enter heaven. (4.) This satisfaction and purification, if not effected in this life, must be accomplished after death. (5.) The eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice intended to secure the pardon of post-baptismal sins, and takes effect according to the intention of the officiating priest. Therefore, if he intends it for the benefit of any soul in purgatory, it inures to his advantage. (6.) The pope, being the vicar of Christ on earth, has full power to forgive sin; that is, to exempt offenders from the obligation to make satisfaction for their offences.

Moehler, and other philosophical defenders of Romanism, soften down the doctrine by representing purgatory simply as a state of gradual preparation of the imperfectly sanctified for admission into heaven, making no mention of positive suffering, much less of material fire. Cardinal Gousset does not go so far as this, yet he says: [787] " It is of faith, (1.) That the righteous who die without having entirely satisfied divine justice, must make satisfaction after this life by temporary pains, which are called pains of purgatory; (2.) That the souls in purgatory are relieved by the prayers of the Church. This is

what the faith teaches; but it stops there. Is purgatory a particular place rather than a state, or a state rather than a particular place? Are the pains of purgatory due to fire, or are the pains those which arise from the consciousness of having offended God? What are the severity and duration of those pains? These and other questions of like kind, are not included in the domain of Catholic doctrine. These are questions about which there exists no decision or judgment of the Church. Nevertheless it should be known that in the opinion of the majority of theologians the torments of purgatory consist in part on those of fire, or, at least, in such as are analogous to the pain produced by fire. We will add that, according to Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas, whose opinion is generally adopted (dont le sentiment est assez suivi), the pains of purgatory surpass those of this life: "Poena purgatorii," says the angelic Doctor, [788] "quantum ad poenam damni et sensus, excedit omnem poenam istius vitæ."

Cardinal Wiseman, [789] in his lecture on this subject, speaks in the mildest terms. He says nothing of the pains of purgatory except that they are pains. The satisfaction for sin demanded by the Church of Rome, to be rendered in this world, consists of prayers, fastings, almsgiving, and the like; and we are told that if this satisfaction be not made before death, it must be made after it. This is all that the Cardinal ventures to say. He has not courage to lift the veil from the burning lake in which the souls in purgatory are represented as suffering, according to the common faith of Romanists. Although it is true that the Church of Rome has wisely abstained from any authoritative decision as to the nature and intensity of purgatorial sufferings, it does not thereby escape responsibility on the subject. It allows free circulation with ecclesiastical sanction, expressed or implied, of books containing the most frightful exhibitions of the

sufferings of purgatory which the imagination of man can conceive. This doctrine, therefore, however mildly it may be presented in works designed for Protestant readers, is nevertheless a tremendous engine of priestly power. The feet of the tiger with the claws withdrawn are as soft as velvet; when those claws are extended, they are fearful instruments of laceration and death.

Arguments used in favour of the Doctrine.

1. Romanists make comparatively little use of Scripture in defence of their peculiar doctrines. [790] Their main support is tradition and the authority of the Church. Cardinal Wiseman cites but two passages from the New Testament in favour of the doctrine of purgatory. The first is our Lord's saying that the sin against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven either in this world or in the world to come. This is said to imply that there are sins which are not forgiven in this life which may be forgiven hereafter; and therefore that the dead, or at least a part of their number, are not past forgiveness when they die. This is a slender thread on which to hang so great a weight. The words of Christ contain no such implication. To say that a thing can never happen either here or hereafter, in this world or in the world to come, is a familiar way of saying that it can never happen under any circumstances. Our Lord simply said that blasphemy of the Holy Ghost can never be forgiven. The other passage is from Revelation xxi. 21, where it said that nothing that defileth shall enter heaven. But as very few, if any of the human family, are perfectly pure when they die, it follows that, if there be no place or process of purification after death, few if any of the sons of men could be saved; or, as Cardinal Wiseman puts the argument, "Suppose that a Christian dies who had committed some slight transgression; he cannot enter heaven in this state, and yet we cannot suppose that he is to be condemned forever.

What alternative, then, are we to admit? Why, that there is some place in which the soul will be purged of the sin, and qualified to enter into the glory of God." [791] But does not the blood of Christ cleanse from all sin? Were not the sins of Paul all forgiven the moment he believed? Did the penitent thief enter purgatory instead of paradise? To minds trained under the influence of evangelical doctrine, such arguments as the above cannot have the slightest weight.

2. Great stress is laid upon the fact that the custom of praying for the dead prevailed early and long in the Church. Such prayers take for granted that the dead need our prayers; and thin supposes that they are not in heaven. But if not in heaven where can they be except in a preparatory or purgatorial states To this it may be answered, (1.) That praying for the dead is a superstitious practice, having no support from the Bible. It was one of the corruptions early introduced into the Church It will not do to argue from one corruption in support of another. (2.) Those who vindicate the propriety of praying for the dead are often strenuous opposers of the doctrine of purgatory. Dr. Pusey, or example, says: "Since Rome has blended the cruel invention of purgatory with the primitive custom of praying for the dead, it is not in communion with her that any can seek comfort from this rite." [792] The early Christians prayed for the souls of Apostles and martyrs, whom they assuredly believed were already in heaven. It was not, therefore, for any alleviation of their sufferings, as Dr. Pusey argues, that such prayers were offered, but for the augmentation of their happiness, and the consummation of their blessedness at the last day.

3. The argument of most logical force to those who believe the premises whence it is derived, is drawn from the doctrine of satisfaction. The Romish doctrine on this subject includes the following principles:

"(1.) That God, after the remission of sin, retains a lesser

chastisement in his power, to be inflicted on the simmer. (2.) That penitential works, fasting, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power of averting that punishment. (3.) That this scheme of God's justice was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying ordinance of his dispensation, anterior to the Mosaic ritual, and amply confirmed by Christ in the gospel. (4.) That it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try to satisfy this divine justice by the voluntary assumption of such penitential works as his revealed truth assures have efficacy before Him." [793] In connection with this is to be taken the doctrine of indulgences. This doctrine, we are told, rests on the following grounds: (1.) "That satisfaction has to be made to God for sin remitted, under the authority and regulation of the Church. (2.) That the Church has always considered herself possessed of the authority to mitigate, by diminution or commutation, the penance which she enjoins; and she has always reckoned such a mitigation valid before God, who sanctions and accepts it. (3.) That the sufferings of the saints, in union with, and by virtue of Christ's merits, are considered available towards the granting this mitigation. (4.) That such mitigations, when prudently and justly granted, are conducive toward the spiritual weal and profit of Christians." [794] We have thus a broad foundation laid for the whole doctrine of purgatory. God in the forgiveness of sin remits only the penalty of eternal death. There remain temporal pains to be endured in satisfaction of divine justice. If such satisfaction be not made in this world, it must be rendered in the next. The Church has the power of regulating these satisfactions, of directing what they shall be, of mitigating or commuting them in this life, and of lessening their severity or duration in the life to come. The infinite merit of Christ, and the superfluous merits of all the saints, gained by works of

supererogation, form an inexhaustible treasury, from which the Pope and his subordinates may draw at discretion for the mitigation, or plenary dispensation, of all the satisfaction due for sin in the way of penance in this life, or the pains of purgatory in the life to come. Now when it is considered that the pains of purgatory are authoritatively and almost universally represented by Romanists to be intolerably severe, it will be seen that no such engine of power, no such means of subjugating the people, or of exalting and enriching the priesthood has ever been claimed or conceded by man. Men really invested with this power, of necessity, and of right, are the absolute masters of their fellow men; and those who wrongfully claim it, who assume without possessing it, are the greatest impostors (consciously or unconsciously) and the greatest tyrants the world ever saw.

4. With Romanists themselves the greatest argument in favour of the doctrine of purgatory is tradition. They claim that it has always been held in the Church; and in support of that claim they quote from the fathers all passages which speak of purification by fire, or of praying for the dead. They usually begin with the Second Book of Maccabees xii. 43, where it is said that Judas Maccabeus sent "2,000 drachmas of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins" of the dead. They cite Tertullian [795] who advised a widow to pray for her husband, and to offer oblations for him on the anniversary of his death; Cyprian, [796] who says that if a man committed a certain offence, "no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose;" Basil, who says of Isaiah ix. 19, "The people shall be as the fuel of the fire," ouk aphanismon apeilei, alla ten kaitharsin hupophainei, that is, "it does not threaten extermination, but denotes purification;" [797] Cyril of Jerusalem, who says: "Deinde et pro defunctis sanctis patribus et episcopis, et omnibus generatim, qui

inter nos vita functi sunt, oramus, maximum hoc credentes adjumentum illis animabus fore, pro quibas oratio defertur, dum sancta et tremenda coram jacet victima;" [798] that is, "Then we pray for the holy fathers and the bishops that are dead; and, in short, for all those who are departed this life in our communion; believing that the souls of those for whom the prayers are offered, receive very great relief while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar;" Gregory of Nyssa, [799] who says that in this life the sinner may "be renovated by prayers and by the pursuit of wisdom;" but when he has quitted his body, "he cannot be admitted to approach the Divinity till the purging fire shall have expiated the stains with which his soul was infected;" Ambrose, [800] who thus comments upon 1 Corinthians iii. 15, "He . . . . shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The Apostle says, "Yet so as by fire,' in order that his salvation be not understood to be without pain. He shows that he shall be saved indeed, but he shall undergo the pain of fire, and be thus purified; not like the unbelieving and wicked man, who shall be punished in everlasting fire;" Jerome, [801] who says: "As we believe the torments of the devil, and of those wicked men, who said in their hearts, There is no God,' to be eternal; so, in regard to those sinners, impious men, and even Christians, and whose works will be proved and purged by fire, we conclude that the sentence of the judge will be tempered by mercy;" and Augustine, [802] who says: "The prayers of the Church, or of good persons, are heard in favour of those Christians who departed this life not so bad as to be deemed unworthy of mercy, nor so good as to be entitled to immediate happiness. So, also, at the resurrection of the dead, there will some be found to whom mercy will be imparted, having gone through those pains to which the spirits of the dead are liable. Otherwise it would not have been said of some with truth, that their

sin shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come, unless some sins were remitted in the next world." And again: "If they had built gold and silver, and precious stones, they would be secure from both fires; not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished forever, but likewise from that fire that purifies those who shall be saved by fire. But because it is said shall be saved, that fire is thought lightly of; though the suffering will be more grievous than anything man can undergo in this life." "These passages," says Cardinal Wiseman, "contain precisely the same doctrine as the Catholic Church teaches;" they may be found in great abundance in all the standard works of Catholic theologians.

With regard to this argument from the fathers, it may be remarked, (1.) That if any one should quote Döllinger, Dupanloup, Wiseman, and Manning in favour of any Christian doctrine, it would have more weight with Protestants than the same number of these early writers; not only because they are, speaking generally, men of far more ability and higher culture, but because they are in more favourable circumstances to learn the truth. The fathers looked at everything through an atmosphere filled with the forms of pagan traditions and ideas. The modern leaders of the Church of Rome are surrounded by the light of Protestant Christianity. (2.) All the ancient writers, quoted in support of the doctrine of purgatory, held doctrines which no Romanist is now willing to avow. If they discard the authority of the fathers when teaching a Jewish millennium, or sovereign predestination, once the doctrine of the universal Church, they cannot reasonably expect Protestants to bow to that authority when urged in favour of the pagan idea of a purification by fire. (3.) The witnesses cited in support of the doctrine of purgatory come very far short of proving the universal and constant belief of the doctrine in question. And. according to

Romanists themselves, no doctrine can plead the support of tradition that cannot stand the crucial test, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." (4.) That purgatory is, what Dr. Pusey calls it, "a modern invention," has been demonstrated by tracing historically its origin, rise, and development in the Church.

Arguments against the Doctrine.

1. The first, most obvious, and, for Protestants, the most decisive argument against the doctrine is, that it is not taught in the Bible. This is virtually admitted by its advocates. The most that is pretended is, that having adopted the doctrine on other grounds, they can find in Scripture here and there a passage which can be explained in accordance with its teachings. There is no passage which asserts it. There is no evidence that it formed a part of the instructions of Christ or his Apostles.

2. It is not only destitute of all support from Scripture, but it is opposed to its clearest and most important revelations. If there be anything plainly taught in the Bible, it is that if any man forsakes his sins, believes in the Lord Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God, trusts simply and entirely to Him and his work, and leads a holy life, he shall certainly be saved. This the doctrine of purgatory denies. It rests avowedly on the assumption that notwithstanding the infinitely meritorious sacrifice of Christ, the sinner is bound to make satisfaction for his own sins. This the Bible declares to be impossible. No man does or can perfectly keep the commandments of God, much less can he not only abstain from incurring new guilt, but also make atonement for sins that are past.

The doctrine moreover assumes the merit of good works. Here again it is clearer than the sun that the New Testament teaches that we are saved by grace and not by works; that to him that worketh, the reward is a

matter of debt; but to him who simply believes, it is a matter of grace; and that the two are incompatible. What is of grace is not of works; and what is of works is not of grace. There is nothing more absolutely incompatible with the nature of the Gospel than the idea that man can "satisfy divine justice" for his sins. Yet this idea lies at the foundation of the doctrine of purgatory. If there be no satisfaction of justice, on the part of the sinner, there is no purgatory, for, according to Romanists, purgatory is the place and state in which such satisfaction is rendered. As the renunciation of all dependence upon our own merit, of all purpose, desire, or effort to make satisfaction for ourselves, and trusting exclusively to the satisfaction rendered by Jesus Christ, is of the very essence of Christian experience, it will be seen that the doctrine of purgatory is in conflict not only with the doctrines of the Bible but also with the religious consciousness of the believer. This is not saying that no man who believes in purgatory can be a true Christian. The history of the Church proves that Christians can be very inconsistent; that they may speculatively adhere to doctrines which are inconsistent with what their hearts know to be true.

It is, however, not only the doctrine of satisfaction, but also the absolutely preposterous doctrine of supererogation which must be admitted, if we adopt the creed of the Church of Rome in this matter. The idea is that a man may be more than perfect; that he may not only do more than the law requires of him, but even render satisfaction to God's justice so meritorious as to be more than sufficient for the pardon of his own sins. This superfluous merit, is the ground on which the sins of those suffering in purgatory may be forgiven. This is a subject which does not admit of argument. It supposes an impossibility. It supposes that a rational creature can be better than he ought to be;

i.e., than he is bound to be. Romanists moreover strenuously deny the possibility that Christ's righteousness can be imputed to the believer as the ground of his justification; and yet they teach that the merits of the saints may be imputed to sinners in purgatory as the ground of their forgiveness.

Another antiscriptural assumption involved in the doctrine is that the pope, and his subordinates, have power over the unseen world; power to retain or to remit the sins of departed souls; to deliver them from purgatorial fire or to allow them to remain under its torments. This is a power which could not be trusted in the hands of an angel. Nothing short of infinite knowledge and infinite rectitude could secure it from fatal abuse. No such power we may be assured has ever been committed to the hands of sinful men.

There are two entirely different things involved in this priestly power to forgive sins. There are two kinds of punishment denounced against sin. The one is the sentence of eternal death; the other is the temporary punishment to which the sinner remains subject after the eternal penalty is remitted. [803] With regard to both the priest interferes. Neither can be remitted without his intervention. The eternal penalty is remitted in the sacrament of penance The latter is exacted, mitigated, or dispensed with at the discretion of the Church, or its organs. As to the remission of the eternal penalty the intervention of the priest is necessary because he alone can administer the sacrament of penance, which includes contrition, confession, and satisfaction. All are necessary. It is not enough that the sinner be penitent in heart and truly turn from sin unto God; he must confess his sins to the priest. The Church "maintains that the sinner is bound to manifest his offences to the pastors of his Church, or, rather, to one deputed and authorized by the Church for that purpose; to lay open to

him all the secret offences of his soul, to expose all its wounds, and in virtue of the authority vested by our Blessed Saviour in him, to receive through his hands, on earth, the sentence which is ratified in heaven, of God's forgiveness." Christ also "gave to the Church power of retaining sins, that is, of withholding forgiveness, or delaying it to more seasonable time." [804] "Here is a power, in the first place, truly to forgive sin. For this expression to forgive sins,' in the New Testament, always signifies to clear the sinner of guilt before God." "The Apostles, then, and their successors, received this authority; consequently, to them was given a power to absolve, or to cleanse the soul from its sins. There is another power also: that of retaining sins What is the meaning of this? clearly the power of refusing to forgive them. Now, all this clearly implies -- for the promise is annexed, that what sins Christ's lawful ministers retain on earth, are retained in heaven -- that there is no other means of obtaining forgiveness, save through them. For the forgiveness of heaven is made to depend upon that which they forgive on earth; and those are not to be pardoned there, whose sins they retain. [805] This is sufficiently explicit. It is to be remembered the power of forgiveness here claimed has reference, not to the temporary punishment imposed in the way of penance or satisfaction, but to the remission of "the eternal debt." Now, as to the temporary punishment, which, as we have seen, may last thousands of years and exceed in severity any sufferings on earth, Romanists teach, (1.) That "they are expiatory of past transgression." [806] (2.) That they are of the same nature with the penances imposed by the discipline of the early Church. That discipline was naturally, perhaps necessarily, very severe; the Church was then surrounded by heathenism, and many of its members were heathen converts. What tendencies, and what temptations to unchristian conduct, were unavoidable under such

circumstances, may be learned from the state of the Church in Corinth as depicted in Paul's epistles. The great danger was that Christians should be involved, intentionally or unintentionally, in the idolatrous services to which they had been accustomed. As the worship of idols in any form, was a renunciation of the Gospel, it was against that offence the discipline of the Church was principally directed. One party contended that the "lapsed" ought never to be restored to Christian fellowship; another, which allowed their readmission to the Church, insisted that they should be restored only after a long and severe course of penance. Some were required "to lay prostrate for a certain period of months or years before the doors of the Church, after which they were admitted to different portions of the divine service; while others were often excluded through their whole lives from the liturgical exercises of the faithful, and were not admitted to absolution until they were at the point of death." These penances Romanists pronounce "meritorious in the sight of God," they "propitiate his wrath." This is the doctrine of satisfaction; and such satisfaction for sin is the necessary condition of its forgiveness. (3.) As these penances or satisfactions are imposed by the Church, they can be mitigated or remitted by the Church. (4.) As the pains of purgatory are of the nature of satisfactions, "expiatory," "meritorious," and "propitiatory," they are as much under the control of the Church, as the penances to be endured in this life

This is the true, and it may be said, the virtually admitted genesis of the doctrine of purgatory in the Church of Rome. It is a perversion of the ecclesiastical discipline of the early Christians. To be sure, the genesis, or birth, is spurious; there is no legitimate connection between the premises and the conclusion. Admitting the fact that the early Church imposed severe penances on offenders before restoring them

to fellowship; admitting that this was right on the part of the Church; admitting that such penances were of the nature of satisfactions, so far as they were designed to satisfy the Church that the repentance of the offender was sincere; and admitting that these penances being matters of Church discipline were legitimately under the power of the Church, how does all this prove that they were "expiatory in the sight of God, that "they satisfied divine justice," or that they were the necessary conditions of forgiveness at his bar? Satisfactory to the Church as evidences of repentance, and satisfactory to God's justice, are two very different things, which Romanists have confounded. Besides, how does it follow, because the visible Church has control of the discipline of its members, in this life, that it has control of the souls of men in the life to come? Yet Romanists reason from the one to the other.

3. Another decisive argument against the doctrine of purgatory is drawn from the abuses to which it has led, and which are its inevitable, being its natural consequences. It is à priorievident that a power committed to weak and sinful men which is safe in no other hands but those of God Himself, must lead to the most dreadful abuses. The doctrine, as we have seen, is, (1.) That the priest has power to remit or retain, the penalty of eternal death denounced against all sin. (2.) That he (or the appropriate organ of the Church) has power to alleviate, to shorten, or to terminate, the sufferings of souls in purgatory. That this power should fail to be abused, in the hands of the best of men, is impossible. Vested in the hands of ordinary men, as must be generally the case, or in the hands of mercenary and wicked men, imagination can set no limit to its abuse; and imagination can hardly exceed the historical facts in the case. This is not a matter of dispute. Romanists themselves admit the fact. Cardinal Wiseman

acknowledges that "flagrant and too frequent abuses, doubtless, occurred through the avarice, and rapacity, and impiety of men; especially when indulgence was granted to the contributors towards charitable or religious foundations, in the erection of which private motives too often mingle." [807] The reader must be referred to the pages of history for details on this subject. The evils which have in fact flowed from this doctrine of purgatory and of the priestly power of retaining or remitting sin, are such as to render it certain that no such doctrine can be of God.

4. Romanists, however, confidently appeal, in support of their doctrine, to the express declaration of Christ, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 23.) To the same effect it is said, in Matthew xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt Loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The first remark to be made on these passages is, that whatever power is granted in them to the Apostles, is granted in Matthew xviii. 18 to all Christians, or, at least, to every association of Christians which constitutes a Church. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This power, therefore, of binding and loosing, whatever it

was, was not vested exclusively in the Apostles and their successors, but in the Church. But the true Church to which the promises and prerogatives of the Church belong, consists of true believers. This is not only the doctrine of the Bible and of all Protestants at the time of the Reformation, but would seem to be a matter of course. Promises made to the Apostles were made to true apostles, not to those who pretended to the office, and were false apostles. So the promises made to Christians are made not to nominal, pretended, or false Christians, but to those who truly are what they profess to be. If this be clear, then it is no less clear that the power of binding and loosing, of remitting or retaining sin, was never granted by Christ to unregenerated, wicked men, no matter by what name they may be called. This is a great point gained. The children of God in this world are not under the power of the children of the devil, to be forgiven or condemned, saved or lost, at their discretion. Therefore, when Luther was anathematized by the body calling itself the Church, as Athanasins had been before him, it did not hurt a hair of his head.

Secondly, the power granted by Christ to his Church of binding and loosing, of forgiving or retaining sin, is not absolute, but conditional. The passages above quoted are analogous to many others contained in the Scriptures, and are all to be explained in the same way. For example, our Lord said to his disciples; They who hear you, hear me. That is, the people were as much bound to believe the gospel when preached by the disciples, as though they heard it from the lips of Christ Himself. Or, if these words are to be understood as addressed exclusively to the Apostles, and to include a promise of infallibility in teaching, the meaning is substantially the same. Men were as much bound to receive the doctrines of the Apostles, as the teachings of Christ, for what they taught He taught. St. John, therefore, says, "He

that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us." (1 John iv. 6.) Nevertheless, although Christ required all men to hear his Apostles as though He himself were speaking; yet no man was bound to hear them unless they preached Christ's gospel. Therefore St. Paul said, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8.) If the Apostles taught anything contrary to the authenticated revelation of God, they were to be rejected. If they undertook to bind or loose, to remit or retain sin on any other terms than those prescribed by Christ, their action amounted to nothing; it produced no effect. In teaching and in absolution their power was simply declarative. In the one case, they, as witnesses, declared what were the conditions of salvation and the rule of life prescribed in the gospel; and in the other case, they simply declared the conditions on which God will forgive sin, and announced the promise of God that on those conditions He would pardon the sins of men. A child, therefore, may remit sin just as effectually as the pope; for neither can do anything more than declare the conditions of forgiveness. It once required the heroism of Luther to announce that truth which emancipated Europe; now it is an every-day truth.

There is, of course, a great difference between the Apostles and other Christian teachers. Christ bore witness to the correctness of their testimony as to his doctrines, and sanctioned their declarations, by signs, and wonders, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, thus giving the seal of infallibility to their teachings as uttered by the lips and as we have them recorded in the Bible. And, there is also a difference between the official ministers of the gospel and other men, in so far as the former are specially called to the work of preaching the word. But in all cases, in that of the Apostles, in that of office-bearers in

the Church, and in that of laymen, the power is simply declaratory. They declare what God has revealed. What difference does it make in the authority of the message, whether the gospel be read at the bed of a dying sinner, by a child, or by an archbishop? None in the world.

There is another class of passages analogous to those under consideration. When our Lord says, Ask and ye shall receive, Whatsoever ye ask in my name I will do it, no one understands these promises as unconditional. No one believes that any prayer of the Christian is ever heard, if it be not for something agreeable to the will of God. When then it is said, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted," why should it be inferred that no condition is implied? The language is not more explicit in the one case than in the other. As no man's prayers are heard unless he asks for things agreeable to the will of God; so no man's sins are remitted unless he truly repents and truly believes in the Lord Jesus Christ. One man has no more power to forgive sins, than another. The forgiveness of sin is the exclusive prerogative of God.

Thirdly, there is another remark to be made about this power of binding and loosing. Christ has ordained that the terms of admission to the Church, should be the same as those of admission into heaven; and that the grounds of exclusion from the Church, should be the same as those of exclusion from heaven. He, therefore, virtually said to his disciples, Whom ye receive into the Church, I will receive into heaven; and whom ye exclude from the Church, I will exclude from heaven. But this, of course, implies that they should act according to his directions. He did not bind Himself to sanction all their errors in binding and loosing; any more than He was bound by his promise to hear their prayers, to grant all the foolish or wicked petitions his people might offer; or by his promise in reference to their teaching, to sanction all the false doctrines into which they might be seduced. If

we interpret Scripture by Scripture, we escape a multitude of errors.

Fourthly, Romanists rest their doctrine of absolution and of the power of the keys over souls in purgatory, very much upon the special gifts granted to the Apostles and to their successors. In reference to this agreement it may be remarked, --

1. That the Apostles never claimed, never possessed, and never pretended to exercise, the power assumed by Romanists, in the remission of sins. They never presumed to pronounce the absolution of a sinner in the sight of God. Christ could say "Thy sins be forgiven thee;" but we never hear such language from the lips of an Apostle. They never directed those burdened with a sense of sin to go to the priest to make confession and receive absolution. They had no authority in this respect above that which belongs to the ordinary officers of the Church. They could declare the terms on which God had promised to forgive sins; and they could suspend or excommunicate members, for cause, from the communion of the visible Church. In the case of the incestuous man whom the Church in Corinth allowed to remain in its fellowship, Paul determined to do what he censured the Church for not doing; that is, in virtue of his apostolic jurisdiction extending over all the churches, he excommunicated the offender, or, delivered him to Satan, that he might repent. (1 Cor. v.) When the man did repent, the Apostle exhorted the Corinthians to restore him to their fellowship, saying, "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also." (2 Cor. ii. 10.) He claimed for himself no power which he did not recognize as belonging to them. It was a mere matter of Church discipline from beginning to end. This power of discipline, which all Churches recognize and exercise, the Romanists have perverted into the priestly power of absolution.

2. Admitting, what, however, is not conceded, that the Apostles had

special power to forgive sin, that power must have rested on their peculiar gifts and qualifications. They were infallible men; not infallible indeed in reading men's hearts, or in judging of their character, but simply infallible as teachers; and they had authority to organize the Church, and to lay down laws for its future government and discipline. These gifts and prerogatives, indeed, in no way qualified them to sit in judgment on the souls of men, to pardon or condemn them at discretion; but, such as they were, they were personal. Those who claim to be their official successors, and arrogate their peculiar prerogatives, do not pretend to possess their gifts; they do not pretend to personal infallibility in teaching, nor do they claim jurisdiction beyond their own dioceses. As no man can be a prophet without the gifts of a prophet, so no man can be an Apostle without the gifts of an Apostle. The office is simply authority to exercise the gifts; but if the gifts are not possessed what can the office amount to?

But even if the impossible be admitted; let it be conceded that the prelates have the power of remitting and retaining sin, as claimed by Romanists, in virtue of their apostleship, how is this power granted to priests who are not Apostles? It will not do to say that they are the representatives and delegates of the bishop. The bishop is said to have this power because he has received the Holy Ghost. If this means anything, it means that the Holy Spirit dwells in him, and so enlightens his mind and guides his judgment, as to render his decisions in retaining or remitting sin, virtually the decisions of God; but this divine illumination and guidance can no more be delegated than the knowledge of the lawyer or the skill of the surgeon. How can a prophet delegate his power to foresee the future to another man? It is impossible to believe that God has given men the power of forgiving or

retaining sin, unless He has given them the power of infallible judgment; and that such infallibility of judgment belongs to the Romish priesthood, no man can believe.

It has already been urged as valid arguments against the Romish doctrine of purgatory, (1.) That it is destitute of all Scriptural support. (2.) That it is opposed to many of the most clearly revealed and most important doctrines of the Bible. (3.) That the abuses to which it always has led and which are its inevitable consequences, prove that the doctrine cannot be of God. (4.) That the power to forgive sin, in the sense claimed by Romanists, and which is taken for granted in their doctrine of purgatory, finds no support in the words of Christ, as recorded in John xx. 23, and Matt. xvi. 19, which are relied on for that purpose. (5.) The fifth argument against the doctrine is derived from its history, which proves it to have had a pagan origins and to have been developed by slow degrees into the form in which it is now held by the Church of Rome.

History of the Doctrine.

The details on this subject must be sought in the common books on the history of doctrine. Here only the most meagre outline can be expected. A full exposition on this subject would require first an account of the prevalence of the idea of a purification by fire among the ancients before the coming of Christ, especially among the people of central Asia; secondly, an account of the early appearance of this idea in the first three centuries in the Christian Church, until it reached a definite form in the writings of Augustine; and thirdly, the establishment of the doctrine as an article of faith in the Latin Church, principally through the influence of Gregory the Great.

Fire is the most effectual means of purification. It is almost the only means by which the dross can be separated from the gold. In the

Scriptures it is frequently referred to, in illustration of the painful process of the sanctification of the human soul. In Zechariah xiii. 9, it is said, "I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people; and they shall say, The Lord is my God." It is in allusion to the same familiar fact, that afflictions are so often compared to a furnace, and the trials of God's people are said to be by fire. "The fire," says the Apostle, "shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. With the ancient Persians fire was sacred. It became an object of worship, as the symbol of the divinity; and elemental fire was even for the soul the great means of purification. In the Zendavesta, Ormuz is made to say to Zoroaster, "Thine eyes shall certainly see all things live anew. -- For the renovated earth shall yield bones and water, blood and plants, hair, fire and life as at the beginning. -- The souls will know their bodies. -- Behold my father! my mother! my wife! Then will the inhabitants of the universe appear on earth with mankind. Everyone will see his good or evil. Then a great separation will occur. Everything corrupt will sink into the abyss. Then too through the fierceness of the lire all mountains shall melt; and through the flowing stream of fire, all men must pass. The good will go through as easily as through flowing milk. The wicked find it real fire; but they must pass through and be purified. Afterward the whole earth shall be renewed." [808]

With the Greek Stoics also, fire was the elementary principle and soul of the world, and they also taught a renovation of the world through fire. With the Stoics, "The universe is one whole, which comprises all things; yet contains a passive principle, matter, to paschon, and an active principle, to poiou, which is reason, or God. The soul of man is

part of this divine nature, and will be reabsorbed into it and lose its individual existence. The Deity in action, if we may so speak, is a certain active æther, or fire, possessed of intelligence. This first gave form to the original chaos, and, being an essential part of the universe, sustains it in order. The overruling power, which seems sometimes in idea to have been separated from the Absolute Being, was heimarmene, fate, or absolute necessity. To this the universe is subject, both in its material and divine nature. Men return to this life totally oblivious of the past, and by the decrees of fate are possessed of a renovated existence, but still in imperfection and subject to sorrow as before." [809] This is an inchoate form of the pantheism of the present day. The system as stated is not self-consistent; as it says that the souls of men are to be absorbed into the soul of the world, and yet that they are to return to this life, although oblivious to the past; which amounts to saying that there will be a new generation of men.

The idea of a purification by fire after death became familiar to the Greek mind, and was taken up by Plato, and wrought into his philosophy; he taught that no one could become perfectly happy after death, until he had expiated his sins; and that if they were too great for expiation, his sufferings would have no end. [810] That this doctrine passed from the Gentiles to the Jews may be inferred not only from the fact already mentioned that Judas Maccabeus sent money to Jerusalem to pay for sacrifices to be offered for the sins of the dead; but also from the doctrine of the Rabbins, that children, by means of sin offerings, could alleviate the sufferings of their deceased parents. [811] Some of them also taught that all souls, not perfectly holy, must wash themselves in the fire-river of Gehenna; that the just would therein be soon cleansed, but the wicked retained in torment

indefinitely. [812] It was in this general form of a purification by fire after death that the doctrine was adopted by some of the fathers. Nothing more than this can be proved from the writings of the first three centuries. Origen taught first that this purification was to take place after the resurrection. "Ego puto," he says, "quod et post resurrectionem ex mortuis indigeamus sacramento eluente nos atque purgante: nemo enim absque sordibus resurgere poterit: nec ullam posse animam reperiri quæ universis statim vitiis careat." [813] And secondly, that in the purifying fire at the end of the world, all souls, and all fallen angels, and Satan himself, will ultimately be purged from sin, and restored to the favour of God. In his comment on Romans viii. 12, he says: "Qui vero verbi Dei et doctrinæ Evangelicæ purificationem spreverit, tristibus et poenalibus purificationibus semetipsum reservat, ut iguis gehennæ in cruciatibus purget, quem nec apostolica doctrina nec evangelicus sermo purgavit." [814] This doctrine was condemned in the Church; but, as Flügge [815] says: "This anathema was the less effective because the eastern views on this subject differed so much from the western or Church doctrine. The former, or Origen's doctrine, contemplated the purification of the greatest sinners and of the devil himself; the Latin Church thought only of believers justified by the blood of Christ. The one supposed the sinner to purify himself from his desire of evil; the other, asserted expiation by suffering. According to the former, the sinner was healed and strengthened; according to the latter, divine justice must be satisfied." It is not to be inferred from this, that the Greek Church adopted Origen's views as to "the restoration of all things;" but it nevertheless maintained until a much later period the views by which it was distinguished from the Latins on the doctrine of the future state.

It was, therefore, in the western Church that the development of the doctrine of purgatory took place. Augustine first gave it a definite form, although his views are not always consistently or confidently expressed. Thus he says: It is doubtful whether a certain class of men are to be purified by fire after death, so as to be prepared to enter heaven; "utrum ita sit," he says, "quæri potest: et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium; quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusque salvari." [816] In other places, however, he teaches the two essential points in the doctrine of purgatory, first, that the souls of a certain class of men who are ultimately saved, suffer after death; and secondly, that they are aided through the eucharist, and the alms and prayers of the faithful. [817]

It was, however, Gregory the Great who consolidated the vague and conflicting views circulating through the Church, and brought the doctrine into such a shape and into such connection with the discipline of the Church, as to render it the effective engine for government and income, which it has ever since remained. From this time onward through all the Middle Ages, purgatory became one of the prominent and constantly reiterated topics of public instruction. It took firm hold of the popular mind. The clergy from the highest to the lowest, and the different orders of monks vied with each other in their zeal in its inculcation; and in the marvels which they related of spiritual apparitions, in support of the doctrine. They contended fiercely for the honour of superior power of redeeming souls from purgatorial pains. The Franciscans claimed that the head of their order descended annually into purgatory, and delivered all the brotherhood who were there detained. The Carmelites asserted that the Virgin Mary had promised that no one who died with the Carmelite scapulary upon their shoulders,

should ever be lost. [818] The chisel and pencil of the artist were employed in depicting the horrors of purgatory, as a means of impressing the public mind. No class escaped the contagion of belief; the learned as well as the ignorant; the high and the low; the soldier and the recluse; the skeptic and the believer were alike enslaved. [819] From this slavery the Bible, not the progress of science, has delivered all Protestants.

---

[775] Théologie Dogmatique, par S. E. le Cardinal Gousset, Archeveque de Reims, 10th edit Paris, 1866, vol. ii. pp. 95, 96.

[776] Prælectiones Theologicæ, edit. Paris, 1861, vol. i. p. 494.

[777] Sess. v., canon 4; Streitwolf, vol. i. pp. 18, 19.

[778] Quoted by Perrone, Prælectiones Theologicæ, III. vi. 599; edit. Paris, 1861, vol. i. pp. 496, 497.

[779] Gousset, ut supra, p. 96.

[780] Innocent III. Caput "Majores" de Baptismo.

[781] Gousset, ut supra, p. 160.

[782] Consolatio Philosophiæ, Lib. iii, prosa 2; Lyons, 1671, p. 107.

[783] Enarratio in Psalmum, ii. 11; Works, Paris, 1835, vol. iv. p. 8, c.

[784] Perrone, ut supra, vol. i. p. 467.

[785] Gousset, p. 132.

[786] Ut supra, p. 473.

[787] Gousset, ut supra, vol. ii. 143.

[788] See Aquinas, Summa, III. xlvi. 6, 3.

[789] Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. By Cardinal Wiseman. Two volumes in one. Sixth American from the last London edition. Revised and Corrected. Baltimore, 1870. Lecture XI. On Satisfaction and Purgatory.

[790] Cardinal Wiseman says: "I have more than once commented on the incorrectness of that method of arguing which demands that we prove every one of our doctrines individually from the Scriptures. I occupied myself, during my first course of lectures, in demonstrating the Catholic principle of faith that the Church of Christ was constituted by Him the depositary of his truths, and that, although many were recorded in his holy word, still many were committed to traditional keeping, and that Christ Himself has faithfully promised to teach in his Church, and has thus secured her from error." Lectures, ut supra, xi. vol. ii. p. 45. This resolves all controversies with Romanists into two questions. First, what is the prerogative of the Church as a teacher; and secondly, is the Church of Rome, or any other external organized body, the body of Christ to which the prerogatives and promises of the Church belong?

[791] Lectures, ut supra, vol. ii. p. 49.

[792] An earnest Remonstrance to the author of the "Pope's Pastoral Letter to Certain Members of the University of Oxford," London, 1836, p. 25. The Hon. Archibald Campbell, whose work is quoted above, says that all the authorities to which he refers from among the English Bishops and theologians, side with him in defending prayers for the dead and in denouncing purgatory.

[793] Wiseman, ut supra, vol. ii. p. 40. It will be observed that the Cardinal, in detailing the kind of satisfaction to be made, mentions fasting, alms-giving, and prayer, but says nothing of scourgings, hair shirts, spiked girdles, and all other means of self-torture so common and so applauded in the Romish Church. In this way he softens down and understates all "Catholic Doctrines and Practices," to render them less revolting to the reason and conscience of his readers. Purgatory with him is a bed of roses with here and there a thorn, instead of the lake

of real fire and brimstone which glares through all Church history.

[794] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 70.

[795] De Monogamia, 10; Works, edit. Basle, 1562, p. 578.

[796] Ep. xlvi. p. 114. (?)

[797] In Esaiæ, ix. 19; Works, edit. Paris, 1618, vol. i. p. 1039, d.

[798] Catechesis Mystagogica, v. 9; Opera, Venice, 1763, p. 328, a, b.

[799] Oratio de Mortuis; Works, Paris, 1615, vol. ii. pp. 1066-1068.

[800] "Dixit: Sic tamen quasi per ignem,' ut salus hæc non sine poena sit: . . . . estendit salvum illum quidem futurum; sed poenas ignis passurum, ut per ignem purgatus fiat salvus, et non sicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueatur." Works, edit. Paris, 1661, vol. iii. p. 351, a.

[801] Comment in c. lxv. Isai. Opera, Paris, 1579, tome iv., p. 502, d, e.

[802] "Nam pro defunctis quibusdam, vel ipsius Ecclesiæ, vel quorumdam piorum exauditur oratio: sed pro his quorum in Christo regeneratorum nec usque adeo vita in corpore male gesta est ut tali misericordia judicentur digni non esse, nec usque adeo bene, ut talem misercordiam reperiantur necessariam non habere. Sicut etiam facta resurrectione mortuorum non deerunt quibus post poenas, quas patiuntur spiritas mortuorum, impertiatur misericordia, ut in ignem non mittantur æternum. Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur, quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc sæculo, neque, in futuro, nisi essent quibus, etsi non in isto, tamen remittetur in futuro." De Civitate Dei, XXI. xxiv. 2; Works, 2d. Benedictine edition, Paris, 1838, vol. vii. p. 1028, c. d. "Ædificarent autem aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, et de utroque igne securi essent; non solum de illo æterno qui in æternum cruciaturus est impios, sed etiam de illo qui emendabit eos qui per ignem salvi erunt . . . . Et quia dicitur, 'salvus erit,' contemnitur ille

guis. . . . . Gravior tamen erit ille ignis quam quidquid potest homo pati in hac vita." Enarratio in Psalmum, xxxvii. 2, 3; Works, vol. iv. pp. 418, d. 419, a.

[803] In the passage quoted in part on a preceding page, Cardinal Wiseman says: "No fasting, no prayers, no alms-deeds, no works that we can conceive to be by man, however protracted, however expensive or rigorous they may be, can, according to the Catholic doctrine, have the most infinitesimal weight for obtaining the remission of sin, or of the eternal punishment allotted to it. This constitutes the essence of forgiveness, of justification, and in it we hold that man has no power. Now, let us come to the remaining part of the sacrament [of penance]. We believe that upon this forgiveness of sins, that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God in his justice awards to transgressions against his law, He has been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or temporary punishment appropriate to the guilt which had been incurred; and it is on this part of the punishment alone, that, according to the Catholic doctrine, satisfaction can be made to God." Lectures, ut supra, vol. ii. p. 35.

[804] Wiseman, Lectures vol. ii. p. 15.

[805] Ibid. pp. 19, 20.

[806] Ibid. p. 39.

[807] Lectures, ut supra, xii.; vol. ii. p. 75.

[808] Kleuker's Zendavesta im Kleinem, 2 Thl. s. 128.

[809] The Mutual Influence of Christianity and the Stoic School. By James Henry Bryant, B. D., St. John's College, Cambridge, Incumbent of Astley, Warwickshire. The Halsean Dissertation for the year 1865. London and Cambridge, 1866, p. 22. Sir Alexander Grant, in his Ethics of Aristotle, Essay vi., The Ancient Stoics (first and Oxford Essay, 1858), London, 1866, vol. i. p. 246, remarks: "If we cast our eyes on a

list of the early Stoics and their native places, we cannot avoid noticing how many of this school appear to have come of an Eastern and often of a Semitic stock. This circumstance in connection with affinity in doctrine, goes to show the eastern origin of the Stoic system. It includes the pantheism of the Orientals with some of the elements peculiar to the religion of the Semitic race as we find them in the Bible.

[810] Hoepfner, De Origine Dogmatis de Purgatorio, Halle, 1792-98; quoted by Flügge, ut supra, p. 323.

[811] Eisenmenger, Endecktes Judenthum, II. vi.; Königsberg, 1711, pp. 357, 358.

[812] Kabbala Denudata, edit. Frankfort, 1684, vol. ii. part 1, pp. 108, 109, 113.

[813] Homil. xv. in Luc. Works, edit. Delarue, Paris, 1740, vol. iii. p. 948, B, a.

[814] Ibid. Paris, 1759, vol. iv. p. 640, B, b, c.

[815] Ut supra, p. 327.

[816] Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Charitate, 69; Works, Paris, 1837, vol. vi. p. 382, b.

[817] De Civitate Dei, XXI. xiii.; Ibid. vol. vii., p. 1015, d. Enchiridion de Fide, Spe et Charitate, 110; Ibid. vol. vi. p. 403, b, c.

[818] Mosheim, Historia Ecclesiæ, Sæculum XIII. pars ii. 2, 29; edit. Helmstadt, 1764, p. 454.

[819] All experience proves that infidelity is no protection against superstition. If men will not believe the rational and true, they will believe the absurd and the false. When the writer was returning from Europe, he had as a fellow passenger a distinguished French diplomatist. One evening when admiring the moon shining in its

brightness, that gentleman adverted to the idea of creation, and pronounced it absurd, avowing himself an atheist. But he added immediately, "Don't misunderstand me. I am a good Catholic, and mean to die in the faith of the Catholic Church. You Protestants are all wrong. You tell every man to think for himself. Ho! then I'll think what I please. I want a religion which tells me I shan't think; only submit. Well! I mean to submit, and be buried in consecrated ground."

CHAPTER II: THE RESURRECTION.

THE RESURRECTION.

---

§ 1. The Scriptural Doctrine.

By the resurrection is not meant the continued existence of the soul after death. The fact that the Sadducees in the time of Christ, against whom most of the arguments found in the New Testament in favour of the doctrine of the resurrection were directed, denied not only that doctrine, but also that of the continued existence of the soul after death, sufficiently accounts for the sacred writings combining the two subjects. Thus our Lord, in reasoning with the Sadducees, said: "As touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living." (Mark xii. 26.) All that this passage directly proves is that the dead continue alive after the dissolution of the body. But as this is Christ's answer to a question concerning the resurrection, it has been inferred that the resurrection means nothing more than that the soul does not die with the body, but rises to a new and higher life. Thus also the Apostle in the elaborate argument contained in 1 Corinthians xv. evidently regards the denial of the resurrection as tantamount with the denial of the future life of the soul. Hence many maintain that the only resurrection of which the Bible speaks is the resurrection of the soul when the body dies. The first position, therefore, to be defended, in stating the Scriptural doctrine on this subject is, that our bodies are the subjects of the resurrection spoken of in the Scriptures.

The Bodies of Men are to rise again.

This is denied, first, by those who take the word resurrection in a figurative sense, expressing the rising of the soul from spiritual death to spiritual life. At the grave of Lazarus Martha said to our Lord, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." To which our Lord, according to Mr. Alger, replies substantially, "You suppose that in the last day the Messiah will restore the dead to live again upon the earth. I am the Messiah, and the last days have therefore arrived. I am commissioned by the Father to bestow eternal life upon all who believe on me; but not in the manner you have anticipated. The true resurrection is not calling the body from the tomb, but opening the fountains of eternal life in the soul. I am come to open the spiritual world to your faith. He that believeth in me and keepeth my commandments, has passed from death unto life become conscious that though seemingly he passes into the grave, yet really he shall live with God forever. The true resurrection is, to come into the experience of the truth that, God is not the God of the dead but of the living; for all live unto Him.' Over the soul that is filled with such an experience, death has no power. Verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead, the ignorant and guilty, buried in trespasses and sins, shall lay hold of the life thus offered, and be blessed." [820]

Secondly, the resurrection of the body is denied by those who, with the Swedenborgians, hold that man, in this life, has two bodies, an external and internal, a material and psychical. [821] The former dies and is deposited in the grave, and there remains never to rise again. The other does not die, but in union with the soul passes into another state of existence. The only resurrection, therefore, which is ever to occur, takes place at the moment of death.

Thirdly, it is denied by those who assume that the soul as pure spirit, cannot be individualized or localized; that it cannot have any relation to space, or act or be acted upon, without a corporeity of some kind; and who, therefore, assume that it must be furnished with a new, more refined, ethereal body, as soon as its earthly tabernacle is laid aside. The resurrection body is according to this view also furnished at the moment of death.

That the Scriptures, however, teach a literal resurrection of the body is proved, (1.) From the meaning of the word. Resurrection signifies a rising again; a rising of that which was buried; or a restoration of life to that which was dead. But the soul, according to the Scriptures, does not die when the body is dissolved. It, therefore, cannot be the subject of a resurrection except in the sense antithetical to spiritual death, which is not now in question. The same is true of the psychical body, if there be such a thing. It does not die, and, therefore, cannot rise again. The same may also be said of a new body furnished the soul when its earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved.

(2.) Those who are in the dust of the earth; those "that are in the graves" are said to rise. But it is only of the body that it can be said, it is in the grave; and, therefore, it is of the body the resurrection spoken of, must be understood.

(3.) It is "our mortal bodies" which are to rise again. This form of expression is decisive of the Apostle's meaning. "He that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. viii. 11.) It is "our vile body" which is to be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body. (Phil. iii. 21.)

(4.) This also is clearly the doctrine taught in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. There were certain errorists in Corinth who denied the fact and the desirableness of the resurrection of believers.

Paul's argument is directed to both those points. As to the fact that the dead can rise, he refers to what no Christian could deny, the rising of Christ from the dead. This, as a historical fact, he supports by historical evidence. He then shows that the denial of the resurrection of Christ, is the denial of the whole Gospel, which rests on that fact. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." But if Christ rose from the dead, all his people must. Christ rose as the first fruits of them that sleep. There is in Paul's view, the same divinely appointed, and therefore necessary connection between the resurrection of Christ and that of his people, as between the death of Adam and that of his descendants. As surely as all in Adam die, so surely shall all in Christ be made alive. And finally, on this point, the Apostle condescends to argue from the faith and practice of the Church. What is the use, he asks, of being baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not? The whole daily life of the Christian is founded, he says, on the hope of the resurrection; not of the continued existence of the soul merely, but of the glorious existence of the whole man, soul and body, with Christ in heaven. As to the second point, the desirableness of the resurrection of the body, he shows that all objections on this score are founded on the assumption that the future is to be like the present body. He says that the man who makes that objection is a fool. The two are no more alike than a seed and a flower, a clod of earth and a stare the earthly and the heavenly. "It [the body of course] is sown in corruption. it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." This whole discourse, therefore, is about the body. To the objection that our present bodies are not adapted to our future state of existence, he answers, Granted; it is true that

flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. It would seem that the Apostle in this chapter must have had in his eye a host of writers in our day who make themselves merry with the doctrine of the resurrection, on much the same grounds as those relied upon by the errorists of Corinth, whose fragments he scattered to the winds eighteen centuries ago.

(5.) Another argument on this subject is drawn from the analogy constantly presented, between the resurrection of Christ and that of his people. The sacred writers, as we have seen, argue the possibility and the certainty of the resurrection of our bodies, from the fact of Christ's resurrection; and the nature of our future bodies from the nature of his body in heaven. There would be no force in this argument if the body were not the thing which is to rise again.

(6.) Finally, as Paul argued from the faith of the Church, we cannot err in following his example. The Bible is a plain book, and the whole Christian world, in all ages, has understood it to teach, not this or that, but the literal rising from the dead of the body deposited in the grave. All Christians of every denomination are taught to say, I believe in "The forgiveness of sins; The resurrection of the body; And the life everlasting."

The Identity of the Future with our Present Body.

There are two distinct questions to be here considered. First, Do the Scriptures teach that the resurrection body is to be the same as that deposited in the grave? Second, Wherein does that sameness or identity consist? The first of these questions we may be able to answer with confidence; the second we may not be able to answer at all.

The arguments to prove that we are hereafter to have the same bodies that we have in the present life, are substantially the same as those

already adduced. Indeed, identity is involved in the very idea of a resurrection; for resurrection is a living again of that which was dead; not of something of the same nature, but of the very thing itself. And all the passages already quoted as proving the resurrection of the body, assume or declare that it is the same body that rises. It is our present "mortal bodies;" "our vile body;" it is "this corruptible," "this mortal;" it is that which is sown, of which the resurrection and transformation is predicted and promised. Our resurrection is to be analogous to that of Christ; but in his case there can be no doubt that the very body which hung upon the cross, and which laid in the tomb, rose again from the dead. Otherwise it would have been no resurrection. This identity was the very thing Christ was anxious to prove to his doubting disciples. He showed them his pierced hands and feet, and his perforated side. On this subject, however, there is little difference of opinion. Wherever the resurrection of the body is an article of faith the identity of the present and future body has been admitted. The usual form of Christian burial, in the case of the faithful, has ever been, "We commit this body to the grave in the sure hope of a blessed resurrection."

Wherein does this Identity consist?

It is obvious that identity in different cases depends on very different conditions. First, in the case of unorganized matter, as a clod of earth or a stone, the identity depends on the continuity of substance and of form. If the stone be reduced to powder and scattered abroad, the same substance continues, but not in the same combination; and therefore the identity is gone. In what sense is water in a goblet the same from hour to hour, or from day to day? It is the same substance resulting from the combination of oxygen and hydrogen, and it is the same portion of that substance. If that goblet be emptied into

the ocean, what becomes of the identity of the water which it contained? If you separate the water into its constituent gases, the elementary substances continue, but they are no longer water. You may change its state without destroying its identity. If frozen into ice and again thawed, it is the same water. If evaporated into steam, and then condensed, it is the same water still. This sameness, of which continuance of the same substance is the essential element, is the lowest form of identity. In the Church it has often been assumed that sameness of substance is essential to the identity between our present and future bodies. This idea has been pressed sometimes to the utmost extreme. Augustine seems to have thought that all the matter which at any period entered into the organism of our present bodies, would in some way be restored in the resurrection body. Every man's body, however dispersed here, shall be restored perfect in the resurrection. Every body shall be complete in quantity and quality. As many hairs as have been shaved off, or nails cut, shall not return in such vast quantities as to deform their original places; but neither shall they perish; they shall return into the body into that substance from which they grew. [822] Thomas Aquinas was more moderate. He taught that only those particles which entered into the composition of the body at death, would enter into the composition of the resurrection body. This idea seems to have entered into the theology of Romanists, as some at least of the theologians of the Church of Rome labour to remove the objection to this view of the subject derived from the fact that the particles of the human body after death are not only dispersed far and wide and mingled with the dust of the earth, but also enter into the composition of the bodies of plants, of animals, and of men. To this Perrone answers, "Difficile Deo non est moleculas omnes ad corpus aliquod spectantes, etiam post innumeros transitus ex uno in aliud

colligere. Hæc mutatio seu transitus accidentalis est, minime vere essentialis, ut ex physiologia ac zoobiologia constat universa." [823]

It is true, as our Lord teaches us: "With God all things are possible;" and if sameness of substance be essential to that identity between our present and future bodies, which the Bible asserts, then we should have to submit to these difficulties, satisfied that it is within the power of omniscient omnipotence to do whatever God has promised to effect. Others assume that it is not necessary to the identity contended for that all the particles of the body at death should be included in the resurrection body. It is enough that the new body should be formed exclusively out of particles belonging to the present body. But as the body after the resurrection is to be refined and ethereal, a tenth, a hundredth, or a ten thousandth portion of those particles would suffice. It would take very little of gross matter to make a body of light. Tertullian thought that God had rendered the teeth indestructible in order to furnish material for the future body. Many others also suppose that there is somewhere an indestructible germ in our present body, which is to be developed into the body of the future. [824]

Secondly, in works of art sameness of substance holds a very subordinate part. The Apollo Belvidere once lay dormant in a block of marble. The central portion of that block containing every particle of matter in the statue was not the Apollo of the artist. Could every particle clipped off, be restored, the substance would remain, but the statue would be gone. Here form, expression, the informing idea are the main constituents of identity. If a penitentiary should be taken down, and the materials be employed in the construction of a cathedral, the substance would be the same, but not the building. When you look into a mirror the image reflected remains the same, but not the substance; for

that is changed with every new reflection. And if it were possible, or proved, that in like manner the Madonna del Sixti of Raphael had a thousand times changed its substance, it would remain the same picture still. The soul here informs the body. The character is more or less visibly impressed upon the face. We know the former by looking at the latter. If this be so, if the soul have power thus to illuminate and render intelligent the gross material of our present frames, why may it not hereafter render its ethereal vestment so expressive of itself as to be at once recognized by all to whom it was ever known. Thus we may at once recognize Isaiah, Paul, and John. It is not said that this will be so; that herein lies the identity of their heavenly and earthly bodies; but should it prove to be true, we should not stop to inquire or to care how many particles of the one enter into the composition of the other.

Thirdly, identity in living organisms is something still higher, and more inscrutable than in works of art. The acorn and the oak are the same; but in what sense? Not in substance, not in form. The infant and the man are the same, through all the stages of life; boyhood, manhood, and old age; the substance of the body, however, is in a state of perpetual change. It is said this change is complete once every seven years. Hence if a man live to be seventy years old, the substance of his body has, during that period, been entirely changed ten times. Here, then, is an identity independent of sameness of substance. Our future bodies, therefore, may be the same as those we now have, although not a particle that was in the one should be in the other.

The object of these remarks on the different kinds of identity, is not to explain anything. It is not intended to teach wherein the identity of the earthly and heavenly consists; whether it be an identity of substance; or of expression and idea, as in works of art; or of the

uninterrupted continuity of the same vital force as in the plant and animal through their whole progress of growth and decay; or whether it is a sameness which includes all these; or something different from them all. Nothing is affirmed. The subject is left where the Bible leaves it. The object aimed at is twofold; first, to show that it is perfectly rational for a man to assert the identity between our present and our future bodies, although he is forced to admit that he does not know wherein that identity is to consist. This is no more than what all men have to admit concerning the continued sameness of our present bodies. And, secondly, to stop the mouths of gainsayers. They ridicule the idea of a resurrection of the body; asking if the infant is to rise as an infant; the old man, wrinkled and decrepid; the maimed as maimed; the obese with their cumbrous load; and by such questions think they have refuted a Scripture doctrine. The Bible teaches no such absurdities; and no Church goes beyond the Scriptures in asserting two things, namely: that the body is to rise, and that it is to be the same after the resurrection that it was before; but neither the Bible nor the Church determines wherein that sameness is to consist.

With regard to our present bodies, the fact of their continued identity is not denied. According to one view the principle of this identity is in the body and perishes, or ceases, with it. According to another, although in the body, it does not perish with it, but remains united to the soul, and under appropriate circumstances fashions for itself a new body. According to others, this vital principle is in the soul itself. Agassiz, as a zoologist, teaches that with every living germ there is an immaterial principle by which one species is distinguished from another, and which determines that the germ of a fish develops into a fish; and that of a bird, into a bird, although the two germs are exactly the same (i.e., alike) in substance and structure. When the

individual dies, this immaterial principle ceases to exist. This is Agassiz's doctrine. Dr. Julius Müller [825] thinks that this vital organizing force continues in union with the soul, but is not operative between death and the resurrection. He says, "it is not the sarx, the mass of earthly material, ... but the soma, the organic whole, to which the Scriptures promise a resurrection. . . . . The organism, as the living form which appropriates matter to itself, is the true body, which in its glorification becomes the soma pneumatikon. But he understands the Apostle in 2 Corinthians v. 4, as clearly teaching that the soul during the interval between death and the resurrection remains unclothed. Dr. Lange, whose imagination often dominates him, teaches that the soul was created to be incarnate; and therefore was endowed with forces and talents to that end. In virtue of its nature, it as certainly gathers from surrounding matter the materials for a body, as a seed gathers from the earth and air the matter suited to its necessities. He assumes, therefore, that there is in the soul "a law or force, which secures its forming for itself a body suited to its necessities and sphere or more properly," he adds, "the organic identity" may be characterized as the "Schema des Leibes," which is included in the soul, or, as the "Incarnationstrieb des Geistes;" a "nisus formativus" which belongs to the human soul. [826] The soul while on earth forms for itself a body out of earthly materials; when it leaves the earth it fashions a habitation for itself out of the materials to be found in the higher sphere to which it is translated; and at the end of the world, when the grand palingenesia is to occur, the souls of men, according to their nature, will fashion bodies for themselves out of the elements of the dissolving universe. "The righteous will clothe themselves with the refined elements of the renovated earth; they shall shine as the sun. The wicked shall be

clothed with the refuse of the earth; they shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt." [827]

Leaving out of view what is fanciful in this representation, it may be readily admitted by those who adhere to the generally received doctrine that man consists of soul and body (and not of spirit, soul, and body), that the soul, besides its rational, voluntary, and moral faculties, has in it what may be called a principle of animal life. That is, that it has not only faculties which fit it for the higher exercises of a rational creature capable of fellowship with God, but also faculties which fit it for living in organic union with a material body. It may also be admitted that the soul, in this aspect, is the animating principle of the body, that by which all its functions are carried on. And it may further be admitted that the soul, in this aspect, is that which gives identity to the human body through all the changes of substance to which it is here subjected. And finally it may be admitted, such being the case, that the body which the soul is to have at the resurrection, is as really and truly identical with that which it had on earth, as the body of the man of mature life is the same which he had when he was an infant. All this may pass for what it is worth. What stands sure is what the Bible teaches, that our heavenly bodies are in some high, true, and real sense, to be the same as those which we now have.

Nature of the Resurrection Body.

It is obvious that this is a subject of which we can know nothing, except from divine revelation. We are of necessity as profoundly ignorant of this matter, as of the nature of the inhabitants of the planets or of the sun. The speculations of men concerning the nature of the future body have been numerous; some merely fanciful, others, revolting.

There are two negative statements in the Bible on this subject, which imply a great deal. One is the declaration of Christ, That in the resurrection men neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God. The other is the words of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." There seem to be plainly three things implied or asserted in these passages. (1.) That the bodies of men must be specially suited to the state of existence in which they are to live and act. (2.) That our present bodies, that is, our bodies as now organized, consisting as they do of flesh and blood, are not adapted to our future state of being. And (3.) That everything in the organization or constitution of our bodies designed to meet our present necessities, will cease with the life that now is. Nothing of that kind will belong to the resurrection body. If blood be no longer our life, we shall have no need of organs of respiration and nutrition. So long as we are ignorant of the conditions of existence which await us after the resurrection, it is vain to speculate on the constitution of our future bodies. It is enough to know that the glorified people of God will not be cumbered with useless organs, or trammeled by the limitations which are imposed by our present state of existence.

The following particulars, however, may be inferred with more or less confidence from what the Bible has revealed on this subject, --

1. That our bodies after the resurrection will retain the human form. God, we are told, gave to all his creatures on earth each its own body adapted to its nature, and necessary to attain the end of its creation. Any essential change in the nature of the body would involve a corresponding change in its internal constitution. A bee in the form of a horse would cease to be a bee and a man in any other than a human form, would cease to be a man. His body is an essential element in his

constitution. Every intimation given in Scripture on this subject, tends to sustain this conclusion. Every time Christ appeared to his disciples not only before, but also after his ascension, as to Stephen, Paul, and John, it was in human form. Origen conceited that, because the circle is the most perfect figure, the future body will be globular. But a creature in that form would not be recognized either in earth or heaven as a man.

2. It is probable that the future body will not only retain the human form, but that it will also be a glorified likeness of what it was on earth. We know that every man has here his individual character, -- peculiarities mental and emotional which distinguish him from every other man. We know that his body by its expression, air, and carriage more or less clearly reveals his character. This revelation of the inward by the outward will probably be far more exact and informing in heaven than it can be here on earth. How should we know Peter or John in heaven, if there were not something in their appearance and bearing corresponding to the image of themselves impressed by their writings on the minds of all their readers?

3. This leads to the further remark that we shall not only recognize our friends in heaven, but also know, without introduction, prophets, apostles, confessors, and martyrs, of whom we have read or heard while here on earth. (a.) This is altogether probable from the nature of the case. If the future body is to be the same with the present, why should not that sameness, whatever else it may include, include a certain sameness of appearance. (b.) When Moses and Elias appeared on the mount with Christ, they were at once known by the disciples. Their appearance corresponded so exactly with the conceptions formed from the Old Testament account of their character and conduct, that no doubt was entertained on the subject. (c.) It is said that we are to sit down

with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. This implies that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be known; and if they are known surely others will be known also. (d.) It is promised that our cup of happiness will then be full; but it could not be full, unless we met in heaven those whom we loved on earth. Man is a social being with a soul full of social affections, and as he is to be a man in heaven, is it not likely that he will retain all his social affections there? God would hardly have put this pure yearning in the hearts of his people if it were never to be gratified. David weeping over his dead son, said, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." And this has been the language of every bereaved heart from that day to this. (e.) The Bible clearly teaches that man is to retain all his faculties in the future life. One of the most important of those faculties is memory. If this were not retained there would be a chasm in our existence. The past for us would cease to exist. We could hardly, if at all, be conscious of our identity. We should enter heaven, as creatures newly created, who had no history. Then all the songs of heaven would cease. There could be no thanksgiving for redemption; no recognition of all God's dealings with us in this world. Memory, however, is not only to continue, but will doubtless with all our faculties be greatly exalted, so that the records of the past may be as legible to us as the events of the present. If this be so, if men are to retain in heaven the knowledge of their earthly life; this of course involves the recollection of all social relations, of all the ties of respect, love, and gratitude which bind men in the family and in society. (f.) The doctrine that in a future life we shall recognize those whom we knew and loved on earth, has entered into the faith of all mankind. It is taken for granted in the Bible, both in the Old Testament and in the New. The patriarchs always spoke of going to their fathers when they

died. The Apostle exhorts believers not to mourn for the departed as those who have no hope; giving them the assurance that they shall be reunited with all those who die in the Lord.

4. We know certainly that the future bodies of believers are to be, --

(a.) Incorruptible; not merely destined never to decay, but not susceptible of corruption. By the certain action of physical laws, our present body, as soon as deserted by the soul, is reduced to a mass of corruption, so revolting that we hasten to bury our dead out of our sight. The future body will be liable to no such change; neither, as we learn from Scripture, will it be subject to those diseases and accidents which so often mar the beauty or destroy the energy of the bodies in which we now dwell. Being unsusceptible of decay, they will be incapable of, or at least, carefully preserved from, suffering, by Him who has promised to wash all tears from our eyes.

(b.) The future body is to be immortal. This is something different from, something higher than incorruptible; the latter is negative, the other positive; the one implies immunity from decay; the other not merely immunity from death, but perpetuity of life. There is to be no decrepitude of age no decay of the faculties; no loss of vigour; but immortal youth.

(c.) The present body is sown in weakness, it will be raised in power. We know very well how weak we now are, how little we can effect; how few are our senses; how limited their range; but we do not yet know in what ways, or in what measure our power is to be increased. It is probable that however high may be our expectations on this subject, they will fall short of the reality; for it doth not yet appear, it is not revealed in experience or in hope, what we shall be. We may have new senses, new and greatly exalted capabilities of taking cognizance of external things, of apprehending their nature and of deriving

knowledge and enjoyment from their wonders and their beauties. Instead of the slow and wearisome means of locomotion to which we are now confined, we may be able hereafter to pass with the velocity of light or of thought itself from one part of the universe to another. Our power of vision, instead of being confined to the range of a few hundred yards, may far exceed that of the most powerful telescope. These expectations cannot be extravagant, for we are assured that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.

(d.) The body is sown in dishonour, it shall be raised in glory. Glory is that which excites wonder, admiration, and delight. The bodies of the saints are to be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body. We shall be like Him when we see Him as He is. More than this cannot be said; what it means we know not now, but we shall know hereafter. We already know that when the body of Christ was transfigured upon the mount, the Apostles fainted and became as dead men in its presence; and we know that when He shall come again the second time unto salvation the heavens and the earth shall flee away at the sight of his glory. Let it suffice us to know that as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Well might the Apostle exhort believers not to mourn for the pious dead, whom they are to see again, arrayed in a beauty and glory of which we can now have no conception.

(e.) It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. When words are used thus antithetically, the meaning of the one enables us to determine the meaning of the other. We can, therefore, in this case learn what the word "spiritual" means, from what we know ot the meaning of the word "natural." The psuchikon, translated "natural," as every

one knows, is derived from psuche, which means sometimes the life; sometimes the principle of animal life which men have in common with the brutes; and sometimes the soul in the ordinary and comprehensive sense of the term; the rational and immortal principle of our nature; that in which our personality resides; so that to say "My soul rejoices," or, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful," is equivalent to saying, "I rejoice," or, "I am sorrowful." Such being the signification of the psuche, it is plain that soma psuchikon, the psychical, or natural, body, cannot by possibility mean a body made out of the psuche. In like manner it is no less plain that soma pneumatikon cannot by possibility mean a body made of spirit. That indeed would be as much a contradiction in terms, as to speak of a spirit made out of matter. Again, we know that man has an animal as well as a rational nature; that is, his soul is endowed not only with reason and conscience, but also with sensibilities, or faculties which enable it to take cognizance of the appetites of the body, as hunger and thirst, and of its sensations of pleasure and pain. These appetites and sensations are states of consciousness of the soul. The soma psuchikon, or natural body, therefore, is a body adapted to the soul in this aspect of its nature; and the soma pneumatikon, or spiritual body, is a body adapted to the higher attributes of the soul. We know from experience what the former is; it is an earthly body, made of the dust of the earth. The chemist can analyze it, and reduce it to its constituents of ammonia, hydrogen, carbon, etc.; and in the grave it soon becomes undistinguishable from other portions of the earth's surface. It is a body which, while living, has constant need of being repaired; it must be sustained by the oxygen of the air, and by the chemical elements of its food. It soon grows weary, and must be refreshed by rest and sleep. In a little more than seventy years, it is worn out, and drops into the

grave. The reverse of this is true of the spiritual body; it has no such necessities, and is not subject to such weariness and decay. It is no doubt involved in the fact, that while our present bodies are adapted to the lower faculties of our nature, and the spiritual body to our higher faculties, that the latter must be more refined, ætherial, and, as Paul says, heavenly, than the other. Even now the soul, in one sense, pervades the body. It is in every part of it; it is sensible of all its changes of state; it gives to it a look and carriage which reveal man as the lord of this world. To a far greater degree may the soul permeate the refined and glorified body which it is to receive at the resurrection of the just; and thus render it to a degree now incomprehensible, in its very nature spiritual. If the face of man formed out of the dust of the earth often beams with intelligence and glows with elevated emotions, what may be expected of a countenance made like unto that of the Son of God.

If then our future bodies are to retain the human form; to be easily distinguished by those who knew and loved us on earth; if they are to be endued with an unknown power; if they are to be incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual; if we are to bear the image of the heavenly, we may well bow down with humble and joyful hearts and receive the exhortation of the Apostle: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

---

[820] Alger, ut supra, p. 324.

[821] Bonnet, Palingénésie Philosophique. Essai Analytique sur l'Ame, chap. xxiv., par. xxii., Neufchatel, 1783, vol. xiv. p. 205 ff., especially p. 230 ff., and vol. xvi. p. 481 ff. Lange, Beiträge zu der Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Meurs, 1841. Lange's doctrine, however,

as will appear in thie sequel, is not that of Swedenborg.

[822] De Civitate Dei, XXII., xx.; Works, Paris, 1838, vol. vii. pp. 1085-1089.

[823] Prælectiones, edit. Paris., 1861, vol. i. p. 503.

[824] See Essay on the Identity and General Resurrection of the Human Body, by Samuel Drew, chapter vi. section 7, Brooklyn, 1811, p. 315 ff.

[825] Studien und Kritiken, 1835, pp. 777, 785.

[826] Beiträge zu der Lehre von den Letzten Dingen. Meurs, 1841, p. 235.

[827] Ibid. p. 251.

---

§ 2. History of the Doctrine.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is not exclusively a doctrine of the Bible. It is found, in different forms, in many of the ancient religions of the world. This is the more remarkable as it is in itself so improbable, and so much out of the analogy of nature. One generation of plants and animals succeeds another in uninterrupted succession; but the same individuals never reappear. The case is the more remarkable when we consider the difficulties with which the doctrine is beset; difficulties so great that it is rejected and even ridiculed by all in this generation who do not recognize the sacred Scriptures as an authority from which they dare not dissent. When such doctrines are found not only in the Bible but also in the religions of heathen nations it may be assumed that the Hebrews borrowed then, from their heathen neighbours. This is the hypothesis adopted generally by rationalists. They urge in its support that the doctrine of Satan, of the resurrection of the body, and of the destruction and renovation of the earth, do not appear in those portions of the Scriptures which were written before the Babylonish captivity. To carry out this argument

they refer Job, Daniel, and a large portion of Isaiah to a period subsequent to the exile, contrary to evidence both external and internal in favour of the greater antiquity of those books. Even if it be conceded that the doctrines do not appear distinctly in any but the later writings of the Old Testament, that would not justify the assumption of their heathen origin, provided that their genesis can be traced in the earlier books of Scripture. Nothing is more obvious, or more generally admitted than the progressive character of the divine revelations. Doctrines at first obscurely intimated are gradually developed. This is the case with the doctrines of the Trinity, of the personality of the Holy Spirit, of the divinity of Christ, of the nature of his redemption, of the future state; and, as might be expected, of the resurrection of the dead. It is just as unreasonable and as unhistorical to say that the Church received the doctrine of the resurrection of the body from the heathen, as that it received from Plato the doctrine of the Trinity. There is another consideration on this subject, which for the Christian is decisive. The doctrines which in the New Testament are declared to be part of the revelation of God, are thereby declared not to be of heathen origin. The heathen may have held them, as they hold the doctrine of the existence of God and of the immortality of man; that does not prove that such doctrines have only a human origin and human authority.

These things being premised, it is admitted as a remarkable fact that belief in the resurrection of the body did prevail among the ancients prior to the advent of Christ. Reference is sometimes made to the Brahminic doctrine of the constant succession of cycles of countless ages in the history of the universe, one cycle being a reproduction or renewal of another, as having an analogy to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. "The first appearance of this notion of a bodily

restoration," says Mr. Alger, [828] "which occurs in the history of opinions, is among the ancient Hindus. With them it appears as a part of a vast conception, embracing the whole universe in an endless series of total growths, decays, and exact restorations. In the beginning the Supreme Being is one and alone. He thinks to himself I wills become many' [This is a figure of speech; for according to the Hindu system the Supreme Being, the Absolute, cannot think]. Straight way the multiform creation germinates forth, and all beings live. Then for an inconceivable period -- a length of time commensurate with the existence of Brahma, the Demiurgus [This again is a mixture of ideas, for Brahma of the Hindus does not correspond with the Demiurgus of the Greeks] -- the successive generations flourish and sink. At the end of this period all forms of matter, all creatures, sages, and gods, fall back into the Universal Source whence they arose. Again the Supreme Being is one and alone. After an interval the same causes produce the same effects, and all things recur exactly as they were before." [829] According to the Hindu system men have not to wait for the conclusion of one of these great cycles to be absorbed in the Supreme Being. By a life strictly conformed to prescribed rules, and by a process of complete self-abnegation, they attain a state in which they are lost in the Infinite as drops of rain in the ocean. As individuals they can never be reproduced, any more than the drops of rain can be recovered from the ocean. The ocean, by evaporation may produce other clouds which shall fall in other drops of rain; but this is not a reproduction of those which fell a thousand years ago. There is therefore no analogy between this theory and the Christian doctrine of the resurrection.

"The same general conception," continues Mr. Alger, [830] "in a modified form was held by the Stoics of later Greece, who doubtless borrowed it from the East, and who carried it out in greater detail.

God is an artistic fire, out of which the cosmopoeia issues.' This fire proceeds in a certain fixed course, in obedience to a fixed law, passing through certain intermediate gradations, and established periods, until it returns into itself and closes with a universal conflagation. . . . . The Stoics supposed each succeeding formation to be perfectly like the preceding. Every particular that happens now, has happened exactly so a thousand times before, and will happen a thousand times again. This view they connected with astronomical calculations making the burning and recreating of the world coincide with the same position of the stars as that at which it previously occurred. This they called the restoration of all things. The idea of these enormous revolving identical periods -- Day of Brahm, Cycle of the Stoics, or Great Year of Plato -- is a physical fatalism, effecting a universal resurrection of the past, by reproducing it over and over forever."

[831]

In the first volume of this work the attempt was made to show that the Brahminical and several Grecian systems of philosophy, were only different modifications of the pantheistic theory of the Infinite by fixed and necessary laws manifesting itself in the finite in all its endless diversities of forms. This endless succession of individuals, however, has no affinity with the Bible doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The flora and fauna of this are not a resurrection of the plants and animals of the geologic periods.

In the religion of Zoroaster there is a far nearer approach to the doctrines of the Bible. [832] As the Scriptures teach that God at first created all things good, and made man after his own image, and placed him upon probation in Eden; so Zoroaster taught that Ormuzd created all things good, and that all were sinless and happy, and fitted for immortality. And as the Bible teaches that through the seduction of

Satan man fell from his original state, and became the subject of sin, misery, and death; so in the religion of the ancient Persians it is taught, that Ahriman, the personal principle of evil, co-eternal with Ormuzd the principle of good, effected the ruin of man for this world and the next. Such was the origin of evil; such was the beginning of the conflict between good and evil, of which our earth has been the theatre. Both systems teach the ultimate triumph of the good, and the redemption of man; both teach a future state, the resurrection of the body, and the renewal of the earth, or, that there are to be a new heaven and a new earth. It is certain from the teachings of the New Testament that the Hebrews did not derive these doctrines from the Persians; it is, therefore, in the highest degree probable that the Persians derived them from their neighbours of the family of Shem, who were the depositaries of the revelations of God.

It has already been seen that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was clearly taught in the Old Testament, and in the apocryphal books of the Jews; that it was a cardinal article of faith among the Jews when Christ came into the world; and that it was emphatically asserted by Christ and his Apostles. We have also seen that the Bible teaches nothing on this subject beyond (1.) That the body is to rise again. (2.) That its identity will be preserved. And (3.) That it is to be so changed and refined as to adapt it to the high state of existence to which it is destined. In this simple form the doctrine has ever been held by the Church, which is not responsible for the fanciful theories adopted by many of its members.

The philosophical theologians of the Alexandrian school, in the early Church, were disposed to spiritualize all the Bible says of the resurrection of the body, and of its future state. The Latins, on the other hand, adhered to a literal interpretation of Scriptural language,

often to the grossest extremes. Augustine, as we have seen, thought the resurrection body was to be composed of all the matter that ever belonged to it in this world, and Jerome asks: "If men are not raised with flesh and bones, how can the damned gnash their teeth in hell?" [833]

During the Middle Ages, the faith of the Church, on this subject, remained unchanged. The speculations of individual writers were diverse, inconsistent, and of little interest, because of no authority.

At the time of the Reformation the simple doctrine of the Bible was reaffirmed; and theologians beyond those limits were left to their own guidance. The form in which the doctrine was usually presented by the theologians of the seventeenth century, was: (1.) That the resurrection body is to be numerically and in substance, one with the present body. (2.) That it is to have the same organs of sight, hearing, etc., as in this life. (3.) Many held that all the peculiarities of the present body as to size or stature, appearance, etc., are to be restored. (4.) As the bodies of the righteous are to be refined and glorified, those of the wicked, it was assumed, would be proportionately repulsive. The later Protestant theologians, as well Lutheran as Reformed, confine themselves more strictly within the limits of Scripture.

Rationalism, as far as it prevailed, swept the whole doctrine away. Reason does not teach the doctrine, and cannot explain it; therefore, it has no title to recognition. Deistical rationalists admitted that the doctrine was taught in the Scriptures, but this was to them only an additional reason for denying their divine origin. The more moderate rationalists, who admitted the Bible to be a revelation of the truths of reason, or of natural religion, explained away all that it teaches concerning the resurrection, making it refer to the rising of the soul from a state of sin to a state of holiness; or, as relating not to the

resurrection of the body, but to the continued life of the soul in a future state.

Of course the modern speculative, or pantheistic theology, ignores the doctrine of a resurrection. It does not even admit of the existence of the soul after the dissolution of the body. The race is immortal, but the individuals of which it is composed are not. Scientific materialism admits of no other resurrection than the reappearance of the same chemical elements which now form our bodies, in the bodies of future plants, animals, or men. The lime in our bones may help to form the bones of those who come after us. Thus philosophy and science, when divorced from the Bible, lead us only to negations, darkness, and despair.

---

[828] Alger, ut supra, p. 488.

[829] Wilson, Lectures on the Religion of the Hindus, London, 1862, vol. ii. pp. 91, 95, 100, 108.

[830] Alger, ut supra, p. 489.

[831] Ritter's Geschichte d. Philosophie d. Alt. Zeit, 3ter Th. xi. 4; Hamburg, 1831, p. 582.

[832] See Ten Great Religions; an Essay on Comparative Theology. By James Freeman Clarke. Boston, 1872, ch. v., specially p. 200.

[833] See Jerome. Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum, 33, Works, edit. Migne, vol. ii. pp. 384, 385 [441].

CHAPTER III: SECOND ADVENT.

SECOND ADVENT.

---

§ 1. Preliminary Remarks.

This is a very comprehensive and very difficult subject. It is intimately allied with all the other great doctrines which fall under the head of eschatology. It has excited so much interest in all ages of the Church, that the books written upon it would of themselves make a library. The subject cannot be adequately discussed without taking a survey of all the prophetic teachings of the Scriptures both of the Old Testament and of the New. This task cannot be satisfactorily accomplished by any one who has not made the study of the prophecies a specialty. The author, knowing that he has no such qualifications for the work, purposes to confine himself in a great measure to a historical survey of the different schemes of interpreting the Scriptural prophecies relating to this subject.

The first point to be considered is the true design of prophecy, and how that design is to be ascertained. Prophecy is very different from history. It is not intended to give us a knowledge of the future, analogous to that which history gives us of the past. This truth is often overlooked. We see interpreters undertaking to give detailed expositions of the prophecies of Isaiah, of Ezekiel, of Daniel, and of the Apocalypse, relating to the future, with the same confidence with which they would record the history of the recent past. Such interpretations have always been falsified by the event. But this does not discourage a certain class of minds, for whom the future has a fascination and who delight in the solution of enigmas, from renewing

the attempt. In prophecy, instruction is subordinate to moral impression. The occurrence of important events is so predicted as to produce in the minds of the people of God faith that they will certainly come to pass. Enough is made known of their nature, and of the time and mode of their occurrence, to awaken attention, desire, or apprehension, as the case may be; and to secure proper effort on the part of those concerned to be prepared for what is to come to pass. Although such predictions may be variously misinterpreted before their fulfilment; yet when fulfilled, the agreement between the prophecy and the event is seen to be such as to render the divine origin of the prophecy a matter of certainty. Thus with regard to the first advent of Christ, the Old Testament prophecies rendered it certain that a great Redeemer was to appear; that He was to be a Prophet, Priest, and King; that He would deliver his people from their sins, and from the evils under which they groaned; that He was to establish a kingdom which should ultimately absorb all the kingdoms on earth; and that He would render all his people supremely happy and blessed. These predictions had the effect of turning the minds of the whole Jewish nation to the future, in confident expectation that the Deliverer would come; of exciting earnest desire for his advent; and of leading the pious portion of the people to prayerful preparation for that event. Nevertheless, of all the hundreds of thousands to whom these predictions of the Hebrew Scriptures were made known, not a single person, so far as appears, interpreted them aright; yet, when fulfilled, we can almost construct a history of the events from these misunderstood predictions concerning them. Christ was indeed a king, but no such king as the world had ever seen, and such as no man expected; He was a priest, but the only priest that ever lived of whose priesthood he was Himself the victim; He did establish a kingdom, but

it was not of this world. It was foretold that Elias should first come and prepare the way of the Lord. He did come; but in a way in which no man did or could have anticipated.

It follows, from what has been said, that prophecy makes a general impression with regard to future events, which is reliable and salutary, while the details remain in obscurity. The Jews were not disappointed in the general impression made on their minds by the predictions relating to the Messiah. It was only iu the explanation of details that they failed. The Messiah was a king; He did sit upon the throne of David, but not in the way in which they expected; He is to subdue all nations, not by the sword, as they supposed, but by truth and love; He was to make his people priests and kings, but not worldly princes and satraps. The utter failure of the Old Testament Church in interpreting the prophecies relating to the first advent of Christ, should teach us to be modest and diffident in explaining those which relate to his second coming. We should be satisfied with the great truths which those prophecies unfold, and leave the details to be explained by the event. This the Church, as a Church, has generally done.

---

§ 2. The Common Church Doctrine.

The common Church doctrine is, first, that there is to be a second personal, visible, and glorious advent of the Son of God. Secondly, that the events which are to precede that advent, are

1. The universal diffusion of the Gospel; or, as our Lord expresses it, the ingathering of the elect; this is the vocation of the Christian Church.

2. The conversion of the Jews, which is to be national. As their casting away was national, although a remnant was saved; so their

conversion may be national, although some may remain obdurate.

3. The coming of Antichrist.

Thirdly, that the events which are to attend the second advent are: --

1. The resurrection of the dead, of the just and of the unjust.

2. The general judgment.

3. The end of the world. And,

4. The consummation of Christ's kingdom.

---

§ 3. The Personal Advent of Christ.

It is admitted that the words "coming of the Lord" are often used in Scripture for any signal manifestation of his presence either for judgment or for mercy. When Jesus promised to manifest Himself to his disciples, "Judas saith unto Him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John xiv. 22, 23.) There is a coming of Christ, true and real, which is not outward and visible. Thus also in the epistle to the Church in Pergamos it is said: "Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly." (Rev. ii. 16.) This form of expression is used frequently in the Bible. There are, therefore, many commentators who explain everything said in the New Testament of the second coming of Christ, of the spiritual manifestation of his power. Thus Mr. Alger, to cite a single example of this school, says: "The Hebrews called any signal manifestation of power -- especially any dreadful calamity -- a coming of the Lord. It was a coming of Jehovah when his vengeance strewed the ground with the corpses of Sennacherib's host; when its storm swept Jerusalem as with fire, and bore Israel into bondage; when its sword came down upon Idumea and was bathed in blood upon Edom. The day of the

Lord' is another term of precisely similar import. It occurs in the Old Testament about fifteen times. In every instance it means some mighty manifestation of God's power in calamity. These occasions are pictured forth with the most astounding figures of speech." [834] On the following page he says he fully believes that the evangelists and early Christians understood the language of Christ in reference to his second coming, as predictions of a personal and visible advent, connected with a resurrection and a general judgment, but he more than doubts whether such was the meaning of Christ Himself. (1.) Because he says nothing of a resurrection of the dead. (2.) The figures which He uses are precisely those which the Jewish prophets employed in predicting "great and signal events on the earth." (3.) Because He "fixed the date of the events He referred to within that generation." Christ he thinks, meant to teach that his "truths shall prevail and shall be owned as the criteria of Divine judgment. According to them," he understands Christ to say, "all the righteous shall be distinguished as my subjects, and all the iniquitous shall be separated from my kingdom. Some of those standing here shall not taste death till all these things be fulfilled. Then it will be seen that I am the Messiah, and that through the eternal principles of truth which I have proclaimed I shall sit upon a throne of glory, -- not literally, in person, as you thought, blessing the Jews and cursing the Gentiles, but spiritually, in the truth, dispensing joy to good men and woe to bad men, according to their deserts." It is something to have it admitted that the Apostles and early Christians believed in the personal advent of Christ. What the Apostles believed we are bound to believe; for St. John said "He that knoweth God, heareth us." That the New Testament does teach a second, visible, and glorious appearing of the Son of God, is plain: --

1. From the analogy between the first and second advents. The

rationalistic Jews would have had precisely the same reasons for believing in a more spiritual coming of the Messiah as modern rationalists have for saying that his second coming is to be spiritual. The advent in both cases is predicted in very nearly the same terms. If, therefore, his first coming was in person and visible, so his second coming must be. The two advents are often spoken of in connection, the one illustrating the other. He came the first time as the Lamb of God bearing the sins of the world; He is to come "the second time, without sin, unto salvation." (Heb. ix. 28.) God, said the apostle Peter, "shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii. 20, 21.) Christ is now invisible to us, having been received up into heaven. He is to remain thus invisible, until God shall send him at the restitution of all things.

2. In many places it is directly asserted that his appearing is to be personal and visible. At the time of his ascension, the angels said to his disciples: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? 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." (Acts i. 11.) His second coming is to be as visible as his ascension. They saw Him go; and they shall see him come. In Matt. xxvi. 64, it is said, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;" Matt. xxiv. 30, "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Luke xxi. 27, "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud."

3. The circumstances attending the second advent prove that it is to be personal and visible. It is to be in the clouds; with power and great

glory; with the holy angels and all the saints; and it is to be with a shout and the voice of the archangel.

4. The effects ascribed to his advent prove the same thing. All the tribes of the earth shall mourn; the dead, both small and great are to arise; the wicked shall call on the rocks and hills to cover them; the saints are to be caught up to meet the Lord in the air; and the earth and the heavens are to flee away at his presence.

5. That the Apostles understood Christ to predict his second coming in person does not admit of doubt. Indeed almost all the rationalistic commentators teach that the Apostles fully believed and even taught that the second advent with all its glorious consequences would occur in their day. Certain it is that they believed that He would come visibly and with great glory, and that they held his coming as the great object of expectation and desire. Indeed Christians are described as those who "are waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. i. 7); as those who are "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Tit. ii. 13) (it is to them who look for Him, He is to "appear the second time, without sin unto salvation," Heb. ix. 28); as those who are expecting and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God. (2 Pet. iii. 12.) It is a marked characteristic of the apostolic writings that they give such prominence to the doctrine of the second advent. "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come. (1 Cor. iv. 5.) "Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." (1 Cor. xv. 23.) Ye are our rejoicing "in the day of the Lord Jesus." (2 Cor. i. 14.) "He . . . . will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." (Phil. i. 6.) "That I may rejoice in the day of Christ." (ii. 16.) "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." (iii. 20.) "When Christ, who is our

life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." (Col. iii. 4.) "To wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." (1 Thess. i. 10.) "What is our hope, ... are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" (ii. 19.) "Unblamable in holiness . . . . at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." (iii. 13.) "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord . . . . shall be caught up . . . . in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (iv. 15-17.) In his second epistle he assures the Thessalonians that they shall have rest, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." (2 Thess. i. 7.) The coming of Christ, however, he tells them was not at hand; there must come a great falling away first. Paul said to Timothy, "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Tim. vi. 14.) "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim. iv. 8.) The epistles of Peter afford the same evidence of the deep hold which the promise of Christ's second coming had taken on the minds of the Apostles and of all the early Christians. He tells his readers that they "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time . . . . that the trial of your faith. . . . might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. i. 5-7.) Men are to "give account to Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." (iv. 5.) "Rejoice that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." (verse 13.) "When the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory." (v. 4.) " We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you

the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty." (2 Pet. i. 16). The transfiguration on the mount was a type and pledge of the glory of the second advent. The Apostle warns the disciples that scoffers would come "saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." In answer to this objection, he reminds them that the threatened deluge was long delayed, but came at last; that time is not with God as it is with us; that with Him a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. He repeats the assurance that "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." (2 Peter iii. 3-10.)

From all these passages, and from the whole drift of the New Testament, it is plain, (1.) That the Apostles fully believed that there is to be a second coming of Christ. (2.) That his coming is to be in person, visible and glorious. (3.) That they kept this great event constantly before their own minds, and urged it on the attention of the people, as a motive to patience, constancy, joy, and holy living. (4.) That the Apostles believed that the second advent of Christ would be attended by the general resurrection, the final judgment, and the end of the world.

As already intimated, it is objected to this view of the prophe cies of the New Testament referring to the Second Advent, --

1. That the first advent of Christ is predicted in the Old Testament in nearly as glowing terms as his second coming is set forth in the New Testament. He was to come in the clouds of heaven; with great pomp and power; all nations were to be subject to Him; all people were to be gathered before Him; the stars were to fall from heaven; the sun was to

be darkened, and the moon to be turned into blood. These descriptions were not realized by the event; and are understood to refer to the great changes in the state of the world to be effected by his coming. It is unreasonable, therefore, as it is agreed, to expect anything like a literal fulfilment of these New Testament prophecies. To this it may be answered, (1.) That in the Old Testament the Messianic period is described as a whole. The fact that the Messiah was to come and establish an everlasting kingdom which was to triumph over all opposition, and experience a glorious consummation, is clearly foretold. All these events were, so to speak, included in the same picture; but the perspective was not preserved. The prophecies were not intended to give the chronological order of the events foretold. Hence the consummation of the Messiah's kingdom is depicted as in immediate proximity with his appearance in the flesh. This led almost all the Jews, and even the disciples of Christ themselves, before the day of Pentecost, to look for the immediate establishment of the Messiah's kingdom in its glory. Such being the character of the Old Testament prophecies, it cannot be fairly inferred that they have as yet received their full accomplishment; or that they are now being fulfilled in the silent progress of the Gospel. They include the past and the present, but much remains to be accomplished in the future more in accordance with their literal meaning. (2.) The character of the predictions in the New Testament does not admit of their being made to refer to any spiritual coming of Christ or to the constant progress of his Church. They evidently refer to a single event; to an event in the future, not now in progress; an event which shall attract the attention of all nations, and be attended by the resurrection of the dead, the complete salvation of the righteous, and the condemnation of the wicked. (3.) A third answer to the objection under consideration is, that the

Apostles, as is conceded, understood the predictions of Christ concerning his second coming, in the way in which they have been understood by the Church, as a whole, from that day to this.

2. A second objection to the common Church view of the eschatology of the New Testament is, that our Lord expressly says that the events which He foretold were to come to pass during that generation. His words are, "Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." This objection is founded upon the pregnant discourse of Christ recorded in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew. It is to be remarked that those chapters contain the answer which Christ gave to three questions addressed to Him by his disciples; first, when the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem was to occur second, what was to be the sign of his coming; and third, when the end of the world was to take place. The difficulty in interpreting this discourse is, to determine its relation to these several questions. There are three methods of interpretation which have been applied to this passage. The first assumes that the whole of our Lord's discourse refers but to one question, namely, When was Jerusalem to be destroyed and Christ's kingdom to be inaugurated; the second adopts the theory of what used to be called the double sense of prophecy; that is, that the same words or prediction refer to one event in one sense, and to a different event in a higher sense; the third assumes that one part of our Lord's predictions refers exclusively to one of the questions asked, and that other portions refer exclusively to the other questions.

The rationalistic interpreters adopt the first method and refer everything to the overthrow of the Jewish polity, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the inauguration of the Church which is to do its work of judgment in the earth. Some evangelical interpreters also assume

that our Lord answers the three questions put to Him as one, as they constituted in fact but one in the minds of his disciples, since they believed that the three events, the destruction of Jerusalem, the second coming of Christ, and the end of the world, were all to occur together. Thus Luthardt says: "There are three questions according to the words; but only one in the minds of the disciples, as they did not consider the three events, the destruction of Jerusalem, the second coming of Christ, and the end of the world, as separated chronologically; but as three great acts in the final drama of the world's history." [835] In this sense our Lord, he adds, answered their inquiries. He does not separate the different subjects, so as to speak first of one and then of another; but he keeps all ever in view. "It is the method," he says, "of Biblical prophecy, which our Lord observes, always to predict the one great end and all else and what is preparatory, only so far as it stands in connection with that end and appears as one of its elements." [836] Although, therefore, the prophecy of Christ extends to events in the distant future, He could say that that generation should not pass away until all was fulfilled; for the destruction of Jerusalem was the commencement of that work of judgment which Christ foretold.

According to this view, the first method of interpretation differs very little from the second of those above mentioned. Both suppose that the same words or descriptions are intended to refer to two or more events very different in their nature and in the time of their occurrence. Isaiah's prediction of the great deliverance which God was to effect for his people, was so framed as to answer both to the redemption of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, and to the greater redemption by the Messiah. It was in fact and equally a prediction of both events. The former was the type, and the first step toward the accomplishment

of the other. So also in the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah, the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, the spiritual redemption, and the final judgment, are blended together. As, therefore, in the Old Testament the Messianic prophecies took in the whole scope of God's dealings with his people, including their deliverance from Babylon and their redemption by Christ, so as to make it doubtful what refers to the former and what to the latter event; so this discourse of Christ may be considered as taking in the whole history of his kingdom, including his great work of judgment in casting out the Jews and calling the Gentiles, as well as the final consummation of his work. Thus everything predicted of the final judgment had its counterpart in what was fulfilled in that generation.

The third method of interpretation is greatly to be preferred, if it can be successfully carried out. Christ does in fact answer the three questions presented by his disciples. He told when the temple and the city were to be destroyed; it was when they should see Jerusalem compassed about with armies. He told them that the sign of the coming of the Son of Man was to be great defection in the Church, dreadful persecutions, and all but irresistible temptations, and that with his coming were to be connected the final judgment and the end of the world; but that the time when those events were to occur, was not given unto them to know, nor even to the angels of heaven. (Matt. xxiv. 36.) If this be the method of interpreting these important predictions, then the declaration contained in Matt. xxiv. 34, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled," must be restricted to the "all things spoken of, referring to the destruction of Jerusalem and the inauguration of the Church as Christ's kingdom on earth. There is, however, high authority for making he genea haute, here and in the parallel passages, Mark xiii. 30 and Luke xxi. 32, refer to Israel as a

people or race; in this case the meaning would be that the Jews would not cease to be a distinct people until his predictions were fulfilled.

[837] There is nothing, therefore, in this discourse of Christ's inconsistent with the common Church doctrine as to the nature and concomitants of his Second Advent.

---

[834] Alger's Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. Philadelphia, 1864, p. 319.

[835] Die Lehre von den letzen Dingen in Abhandlungen und Schriftauslegungen dargestellt, von Chr. Ernst Luthardt, der Theologie Doktor und Professor zu Leipzig. Leipzig, 1861, p. 87.

[836] Ibid. pp. 87, 88.

[837] Dorner. De Oratione Christi Eschatologica, Tractatus Theologicus. Stuttgart, 1844, pp. 76-86. C. A. Auberlen, The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John. Translated by Rev. Adolph Saphir, Edinburgh, 1856, p. 354. "The Lord Jesus himself," says Auberlen, "prophesied (Matthew xxiv. 34), that Israel was to be preserved during the entire Church-historical period."

---

§ 4. The Calling of the Gentiles.

The first great event which is to precede the second coming of Christ, is the universal proclamation of the Gospel.

1. The first argument in proof of the position that the Gospel must be preached to all nations before the second advent, is founded on the predictions of the Old Testament. It is there distinctly foretold that when the Messiah appeared the Spirit should be poured out on all flesh, and that all men should see the salvation of God. The Messiah was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel. The feet of those who brought the glad tidings and published

peace, were to be beautiful upon the mountains. God said in Hosea ii. 23, "I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God." And in Isaiah xlv. 22, 23, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself . . . . that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." That is, the true religion shall prevail oyer the whole earth. Jehovah shall everywhere be recognized and worshipped as the only true God. It is to be remembered that these and many other passages of like import are quoted and applied by the Apostle to the Gospel dispensation. They are enforced on the attention of those to whom they wrote as showing the Gentiles that the Gospel was designed for them as well as for the Jews; and to impress upon the Church its obligation to preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven.

2. Christ repeatediy taught that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations before his second coming. Thus in Matt. xxiv. 14, it is said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Mark xiii. 10) "The gospel must first be published among all nations."

3. Accordingly our Lord after his resurrection, in giving his commission to the Church, said: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in 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 always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) In Mark xvi. 15, the commission reads thus: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." This commission prescribes the present duty of the Church; one that is not to be deferred or languidly performed until a new and more effective dispensation be inaugurated. The promise of Christ to be

with his Church, as then commissioned, to the end of the world, implies that its obligation to teach the nations is to continue until the final consummation.

4. Having imposed upon his Church the duty to preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven, He endowed it with all the gifts necessary for the proper discharge of this duty, and promised to send his Spirit to render their preaching effectual. "He gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." Of these officers some were temporary, their peculiar function being the founding and organizing the Church; some were permanent. Their common object was the perfecting of the saints. Their mission and duties were and are to continue until "all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Eph. iv. 11-13.) The duties of the ministry, therefore, are to continue until all, that is, all believers, the whole Church, or, as our Lord says, all the elect, are gathered in and brought to the stature of perfection in Christ.

5. The Apostles understood their commission in this sense and entered on their duties with a clear view of the task set before them. Our Lord, in his high-priestly prayer said concerning them, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." He would not leave them alone; He promised to send the Paraclete, the Helper, who should bring all things to their remembrance; He would give them a mouth and a wisdom which all their adversaries should be unable to gainsay or resist. The Spirit was to abide with them and dwell in them, so that it would not be they who spoke, but the Spirit of the Father who spoke in them; that Spirit was to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment; He was to render their preaching the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. Their simple duty was to teach;

their commission was, "Go teach all nations." One of the great elements of the Papal apostasy was the idea derived from paganism, that the main design of the Church is "cultus," worship, and not instruction. The Apostles, as Peter teaches (Acts i. 22), and as is everywhere else taught in Scripture, were to be witnesses of Christ; to bear testimony to his doctrines, to the facts of his life, to his death, and especially to his resurrection, on which everything else depended. As, however, of themselves they could do nothing, they were required to attempt nothing, but to abide in Jerusalem, until they were imbued with power from on high. When thus imbued they began at once to declare the wonderful works of God to "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians;" thus making the first proclamation of the Gospel after the resurrection of Christ typical of its design and destiny as the religion of the whole world.

The Apostles accordingly "went everywhere;" and everywhere taught (1.) That God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles; that He is rich in mercy towards all who call upon him, justifying the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith. (2.) That the Gospel, therefore, was designed and adapted for the whole world; for all classes of men; not only for Jews and Gentiles, but also for the learned and unlearned, the young and the old, for the wicked and the righteous. It is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth. (3.) Being thus suited to all men, it should be preached to all men. "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except

they be sent?" (Rom. x. 14, 15.) Paul magnified his office: he thanked God for giving him the grace to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. He said that he was under obligation to preach the Gospel both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise. He devotes no small portion of his Epistle to the Romans and the greater portion of the doctrinal part of that to the Ephesians, to setting forth the purpose of God to bring the Gentiles into his Church, and to make them equally with the Jews partakers of the redemption of Christ. He teaches that the middle wall of partition between the two had been broken down, and that the Gentiles were no more "strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (Eph. ii. 19.) The great object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to show that the Gospel is the substance of which the old dispensation was the shadow; that nothing more glorious, real, and effectual was to be, or could be, so far as the salvation of sinners is concerned. The eternal Son of God, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, had assumed our nature to become the Apostle and High Priest of our profession. There was no hope for those who neglected the great salvation which he announced, and no more sacrifice for sin remained for those who refused to be cleansed by his most precious blood. The final revelation of God's truth, the offering of the infinitely meritorious sacrifice for sin, and the cooperation of the everywhere present and almighty Spirit of God are all made known in the Gospel; and the Bible knows nothing of any other arrangements for the salvation of men. It is evident that the Apostles considered the dispensation of the Spirit under which we are now living, as the only one which was to intervene between the first advent of Christ and the end of the world.

6. In 2 Corinthians iii. the Apostle contrasts the new and old

dispensations, showing that the former excels the latter, (1.) Because the one used the ministration of the latter, the other uses that of the spirit. (2.) Because the one was the ministration of death and of condemnation, the other is the ministration of the Spirit and of righteousness; and (3.) Because the one was transient and the other is permanent. "If that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." (verse 11.)

7. In Romans xi. 25, Paul teaches that the national conversion of the Jews is not to take place "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." The pleroma ton ethnon, is that which makes the number of the Gentiles full; the full complement which the Gentiles are to render to make the number of the elect complete.

This ingathering of the heathen is the special work of the Church. It is a missionary work. It was so understood by the Apostles. Their two great duties were the propagation and defence of the truth. To these they devoted themselves. While they laboured night and day, and travelled hither and thither through all parts of the Roman world, preaching the Gospel, they laboured no less assiduously in its defence. All the epistles of the New Testament, those of Paul, Peter, John, and James, are directed towards the correction of false doctrine. These two duties of propagating and of defending the truth, the Apostles devolved on their successors. During the apostolic age and for some time after it, the former had the ascendancy; to preach the Gospel to all nations, to bring all men to the knowledge of the truth, was felt to be the special vocation of the Church. Gradually, and especially after the conversion of Constantine and the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire, the mind of the Church was directed principally to securing what had been attained; in perfecting its organization and in stating its creed and defending it against the

numerous forms of error by which it was assailed.

From this time for long centuries the Church found its hands filled with its internal affairs. Its energies were expended mainly in three directions, in building up a hierarchy with a supreme pontiff, surrounded by ecclesiastical princes, which sought to concentrate in itself all power over the bodies and souls of men; in founding numerous orders of monks; and in the subtleties of metaphysical discussions. The work of missions during this period was almost entirely neglected.

When the Reformation came, the Protestants had as much as they could do to live. They had arrayed against them everywhere the tremendous power of the Romish Church, and in most cases all the power of the State. They had to defend their doctrines against the prejudices and learning of the age; to organize their Churches, and alas! they were distracted among themselves. Under these circumstances it is not to be wondered at that the command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," was almost forgotten. It is only within the last fifty years that the Church has been brought to feel that its great duty is the conversion of the nations. More, probably, has been done in this direction during the last half century than during the preceding five hundred years. It is to be hoped that a new effusion of the Spirit like that of the day of Pentecost may be granted to the Church whose fruits shall as far exceed those of the first effusion as the millions of Christians now alive exceed in number the one hundred and twenty souls then gathered in Jerusalem.

That the conversion of the Gentile world is the work assigned the Church under the present dispensation, and that it is not to fold its hands and await the second coming of Christ to accomplish that work for it, seems evident from what has already been said, (1.) This is the work which Christ commanded his Church to undertake. (2.) He furnished

it with all the means necessary for its accomplishment; He revealed the truth which is the power of God unto salvation; He instituted the ministry to be perpetuated to the end of the world, and promised to endow men from age to age with the gifts and graces necessary for the discharge of its duties, and to grant them his constant presence and assistance. (3.) The Apostles and the Church of that age so understood the work assigned and addressed themselves to it with a devotion and a success, which, had they been continued, the work, humanly speaking, had long since been accomplished. (4.) There is no intimation in the New Testament that the work of converting the world is to be effected by any other means than those now in use. (5.) It is to dishonour the Gospel, and the power of the Holy Spirit, to suppose that they are inadequate to the accomplishment of this work. (6.) The wonderful success of the work of missions in our day goes to prove the fact contended for. Barriers deemed insurmountable have been removed; facilities of access and intercourse have been increased a hundred fold; hundreds of missionary stations have been established in every part of the world; many thousands of converts have been gathered into churches and hundreds of thousands of children are under Christian instruction; the foundations of ancient systems of idolatry have been undermined; nations lately heathen have become Christian, and are taking part in sending the Gospel to those still sitting in darkness; and nothing seems wanting to secure the gathering in of the Gentiles, but a revival of the missionary spirit of the apostolic age in the churches of the nineteenth century.

---

§ 5. Conversion of the Jews.

The second great event, which, according to the common faith of the Church, is to precede the second advent of Christ, is the national

conversion of the Jews.

First, that there is to be such a national conversion may be argued, --

1. From the original call and destination of that people. God called Abraham and promised that through him, and in his seed, all the nations of the earth should be blessed. He entered into a solemn covenant with him engaging to be his God and the God of his posterity to the latest generations; and that they should be his people. These promises have been hitherto fulfilled; God preserved the Hebrews, although comparatively few in numbers amid hostile nations, from destruction or dispersion until the promised seed of Abraham appeared and accomplished his redeeming work. This is an assurance that the other promises relating to this people shall be fully accomplished.

2. The second argument is from the general drift of the Old Testament concerning the chosen people. Those prophecies run through a regular cycle often repeated in different forms. The people are rebuked for their sins and threatened with severe punishment; when that punishment has been inflicted, and the nation brought to repentance, there uniformly follow promises of restoration and favour. Isaiah predicted that for their idolatry the people should be carried into captivity, but that a remnant should be restored to their own land, and their privileges secured to them again. Joel and Zechariah predicted that for their rejection of the Messiah, they should be scattered to the ends of the earth, but that God would bring them back, and that his favour should not be finally withdrawn from them. Thus it is with all the prophets. As these general predictions are familiar to all the readers of the Bible, they need not be specified.

3. There are in the Old Testament express predictions of their national conversion to faith in Him whom they had rejected and crucified. Thus in Zechariah xii. it is said; "I will pour upon the house of David and

upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications; and they shall look on me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." This is to be a national conversion, for it is said "the land shall mourn" every family apart.

4. The most decisive passage, however, bearing on this subject, one which may be taken "instar omnium," is the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Paul had taught, (1.) That God had cast off the Jews as a nation because they as a nation, represented by the Sanhedrim, the High Priest, the scribes and the Pharisees, by their rulers of every class, and by the popular voice, had rejected Christ. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Therefore, as a nation, God rejected them. (2.) This rejection, however, he here teaches, was not entire. There was "a remnant according to the election of grace" who believed in Christ and were received into his kingdom. (3.) This national rejection of Israel, as it was not entire, so neither was it to be final. It was to continue until the bringing in of the Gentiles. God had made a covenant with Abraham that his posterity should be his people; and "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." Therefore, although broken oft from the olive-tree for the present, they were to be grafted in again. (4.) Thus "all Israel shall be saved." Whether this means the Jews as a nation, or the whole elect people of God including both Jews and Gentiles, may be doubtful. But in either case it is, in view of the context, a promise of the restoration of the Jews as a nation. There is, therefore, to be a national conversion of the Jews.

Second, this conversion is to take place before the second advent of Christ. This the Apostle teaches when he says, that the salvation of

the Gentiles was designed to provoke the Jews to jealousy, verse 11; and that the mercy shown to the Gentiles was to be the means of the Jews obtaining mercy, verse 31. The rejection of the Jews was the occasion of the conversion of the Gentiles; and the conversion of the Gentiles is to be the occasion of the restoration of the Jews. On this point Luthardt says: "As our Lord (Matt. xxiii. 39) said: Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord' -- so it is certain that, when Jesus comes, who will be visible to all the world, as the lightning which cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, whom all eyes, even of those who pierced Him and all kindreds of the earth shall see (Rev. i. 7; Zech. xii. 10), -- the Jews must have been converted and have become a Christian nation. . . . . And further when Peter (Acts iii. 19-21) exhorts to repentance and conversion until the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord shall come; so it appears to be to me beyond all doubt that the conversion of Israel is to precede the Second Advent of Christ." [838]

Are the Jews to be restored to their own Land?

According to one view, the Jews after their conversion are to be restored to the land of their fathers and there constituted a distinct nation. According to another, their restoration to their own land is to precede their conversion. And according to a third view there is to be no such restoration, but they are to be amalgamated with the great body of Christians as they were in the times of the Apostles.

In favour of a literal restoration it is urged, --

1. That it is predicted in the Old Testament in the most express terms. Luthardt says a man must "break" the Scriptures who denies such restoration. To him it is certain and undeniable that the Jews are to be brought back to their own land and reestablished as a nation. [839]

2. It is argued that the promise of God to Abraham has never yet been fully accomplished. God promised to give to him and to his seed after him all the land from the river of Egypt (understood to be the Nile) to the river Euphrates. They were, however, during all their national history pent up m the narrow strip between the Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea, except for a while when the two and a half tribes dwelt on the eastern side of Jordan. As the promise cannot fail, the time must yet come when the whole region granted to Abraham shall be occupied by his descendants.

3. A presumptive argument is drawn from the strange preservation of the Jews through so many centuries as a distinct people. They have often been compared to a river flowing through the ocean without mingling with its waters. There must be some purpose in this wonderful preservation. That people must have a future corresponding to its marvellous past.

4. Reference is also made to the fact that the land promised to the Jews is now empty, as though waiting for their return. It once teemed with a population counted by millions; and there is no reason why it may not in the future be as densely inhabited.

The arguments against the assumed restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land are, --

1. The argument from the ancient prophecies is proved to be invalid, because it would prove too much. If those prophecies foretell a literal restoration, they foretell that the temple is to be rebuilt, the priesthood restored, sacrifices again offered, and that the whole Mosaic ritual is to be observed in all its details. (See the prophecies of Ezekiel from the thirty-seventh chapter onward.) We know, however, from the New Testament that the Old Testament service has been finally abolished; there is to be no new temple made with hands; no other

priest but the high-priest of our profession; and no other sacrifice but that already offered upon the cross. It is utterly inconsistent with the character of the Gospel that there should be a renewed inauguration of Judaism within the pale of the Christian Church. If it be said that the Jews are to return to their own land as Jews, and there restore their temple and its service, and then be converted; it may be answered that this is inconsistent with the prophetic representations. They are to be brought to repentance and faith, and to be restored to their land, or, to use the figure employed by the Apostle, grafted again into their own olive-tree, because of their repentance. When Christ comes, "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. xxiv. 31.) But further than this, in Zechariah xiv., it ia predicted that after the restoration, all the nations of the earth "shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles." In Isaiah lxvi. 22, 23, it is said, "As the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." The literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies relating to the restoration of Israel and the future kingdom of Christ, cannot by possibility be carried out, and if abandoned in one point, it cannot be pressed in regard to others.

2. It is undeniable that the ancient prophets in predicting the events of the Messianic period and the future of Christ's kingdom, borrowed their language and imagery from the Old Testament institutions and usages. The Messiah is often called David; his church is called

Jerusalem, and Zion, his people are called Israel; Canaan was the land of their inheritance; the loss of God's favour was expressed by saying that they forfeited that inheritance, and restoration to his favour was denoted by a return to the promised land. This usage is so pervading that the conviction produced by it on the minds of Christians is indelible. To them, Zion and Jerusalem are the Church and not the city made with hands. To interpret all that the ancient prophets say of Jerusalem of an earthly city, and all that is said of Israel of the Jewish nation, would be to bring down heaven to earth, and to transmute Christianity into the corrupt Judaism of the apostolic age.

3. Accordingly in the New Testament it is taught, not in poetic imagery, but didactically, in simple, unmistakable prose, that believers are the seed of Abraham; they are his sons; his heirs; they are the true Israel. (See especially Romans iv. and ix. and Galatians iii.) It is not natural descent, that makes a man a child of Abraham. "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." (Rom. ix. 8.) The Apostle asserts that the promises are made not to the Israel kata sarka, but to the Israel kata pneuma. He says in the name of believers, "We are the circumcision." (Phil. iii. 3.) "We are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii. 29.) The promise to Abraham that he should be the father of many nations, did not mean merely that his natural descendants should be very numerous; but that all the nations of the earth should have the right to call him father (Rom. iv. 17); for he is "the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised." (Rom. iv. 11.) It would turn the Gospel upside down; not only the Apostle's argument but his whole system would collapse, if what the Bible says of Israel should be understood of the natural descendants of Abraham to the exclusion of

his spiritual children.

4. The idea that the Jews are to be restored to their own land and there constituted a distinct nation in the Christian Church, is inconsistent not only with the distinct assertions of the Scriptures, but also with its plainest and most important doctrines. It is asserted over and over again that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile has been broken down; that God has made of the two one; that Gentile believers are fellow-citizens of the saints and members of the household of God; that they are built up together with the Jews into one temple. (Eph. ii. 11-22.) "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 all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ s, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii. 27-29.) There could not be a more distinct assertion that all difference between the Jew and Gentile has been done away within the pale of the Christian Church. This, however, is not a mere matter of assertion, it is involved in the very nature of the Gospel. Nothing is plainer from the teachings of Scripture than that all believers are one body in Christ, that all are the partaker. of the Holy Spirit, and by virtue of their union with Him are joint and equal partakers of the benefits of his redemption; that if there be any difference between them, it is not in virtue of national or social distinctions, but solely of individual character and devotion. That we are all one in Christ Jesus, is a doctrine which precludes the possibility of the preeminence assigned to the Jews in the theory of which their restoration to their own land, and their national individuality are constituent elements.

5. The Apostles uniformly acted on this principle. They recognize no future for the Jews in which the Gentile Christians are not to

participate. As under the old dispensation proselytes from the heathen were incorporated with the Jewish people and all distinction between them and those who were Jews by birth, was lost, so it was under the Gospel. Gentiles and Jews were united in undistinguished and undistinguishable membership in the same Church. And so it has continued to the present day; the two streams, Jewish and Gentile, united in the Apostolic Church, have flowed on as one great river through all ages. As this was by divine ordinance, it is not to be believed that they are to be separated in the future.

6. The restoration of the Jews to their own land and their continued national individuality, is generally associated with the idea that they are to constitute a sort of peerage in the Church of the future, exalted in prerogative and dignity above their fellow believers; and this again is more or less intimately connected with the doctrine that what the Church of the present is to look forward to is the establishment of a kingdom on earth of great worldly splendour and prosperity. For neither of these is there any authority in the didactic portions of the New Testament. There is no intimation that any one class of Christians, or Christians of any one nation or race, are to be exalted over their brethren; neither is there the slightest suggestion that the future kingdom of Christ is to be of earthly splendour. Not only are these expectations without any foundation in the teachings of the Apostles, but they are also inconsistent with the whole spirit of their instructions. They did not exhort believers to look forward to a reign of wealth and power, but to long after complete conformity to the image of Christ, and to pray for the coming of that kingdom which is righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost. Any Christian would rejoice to be a servant of Paul, or of John, of a martyr, or of a poor worn-out missionary; but to be servant to a Jew, merely because he is a

Jew, is a different affair; unless indeed such should prove to be the will of Christ; then such service would be an honour. It is as much opposed to the spirit of the Gospel that preeminence in Christ's kingdom should be adjudged to any man or set of men on the ground of natural descent, as on the ground of superior stature, physical strength, or wealth.

The Scriptures, then, as they have been generally understood in the Church, teach that before the Second Advent, there is to be the ingathering of the heathen; that the Gospel must be preached to all nations; and also that there is to be a national conversion of the Jews; but it is not to be inferred from this that either all the heathen or all the Jews are to become true Christians. In many cases the conversion may be merely nominal. There will probably enough remain unchanged in heart to be the germ of that persecuting power which shall bring about those days of tribulation which the Bible seems to teach are to immediately precede the coming of the Lord.

---

[838] Lehre von den letzten Dingen, pp. 71, 72.

[839] Lehre von den letzten Dingen, p. 71.

---

§ 6. Antichrist.

That Antichrist is to appear before the second coming of Christ, is expressedly asserted by the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians ii. 1-3, "We beseech you . . . . that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled . . . . as that the day of Christ is at hand. . . . . For that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." This is clear; but as to who or what Antichrist is, there is no little diversity of opinion.

1. Some understand by that term any antichristian spirit, or power, or

person. The Apostle John says, "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time . . . . Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." (1 John ii. 18 and 22.) And again, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." (iv. 3.) And in 2 John 7, it is said, "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist (ho planos kai ho antichristos, the deceiver and the antichrist)." Thus our Lord had predicted, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." (Matt. xxiv. 24.) And the Apostle Paul in 1 Timothy iv. 1, says. "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils." These passages refer to a marked characteristic of the period between the apostolic age and the second coming of Christ. There were to be many antichrists; many manifestations of malignant opposition to the person and to the work of Christ; many attempts to cast off his authority and to overthrow his kingdom.

2. Besides this general reference to the antichristian spirit which was to manifest itself in different forms and with different degrees of intensity, many believe that there is yet to be a person, in whom the power of the world shall be concentrated, and which will exert all his energies to overthrow Christianity, and to usurp the place of Christ on earth. This is the Antichrist of prophecy; of whom it is assumed that

Daniel, Paul, and St. John in the Apocalypse speak. This is the view generally adopted by Romanists and by many eminent evangelical Protestant theologians.

3. The common opinion, however, among Protestants is, that the prophecies concerning Antichrist have special reference to the papacy. This conviction is founded principally on the remarkable prediction contained in Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians. The Apostle knew that the Thessalonians, in common with other Christians of the early Church, would be exposed to grievous persecutions; to comfort them under their sufferings, to give them patience and to, sustain their faith, he referred to the promised second coming of Christ. When the Lord should come all their sorrows would be ended; those who in the meantime had fallen asleep, would not lose their part in the blessing of his second advent. For "we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." (1 Thess. iv. 15-17.) These words it seems had been perverted and misinterpreted, by some who were "disorderly, working not at all, but" were "busybodies;" unsettling the minds of the people, turning them off from present duties, as though the day of the Lord were at hand. To correct this abuse, the Apostle writes his second epistle. He does not set the doctrine of the second advent in the background, or say anything to weaken its power as a source of consolation to the suffering believers. On the contrary, he sets forth the glory of that advent and the richness of the blessings by which it

should be attended, in more glowing terms than ever before. "We ourselves," he says, "glory in you in the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God. for which ye also suffer; seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when 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: . . . . when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. i. 4-10.) All this stands true. Nevertheless the Thessalonians were not to be deceived. The great day of deliverance was not at hand. They had much to do, and much to suffer before that day should come. The time of the second advent was not revealed. In his first epistle he had said, "Of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." (1 Thess. v. 1, 2.) That being conceded, they should know that great things must occur before that day could come. First, there was to be a great apostasy. As the Church was then in its infancy, and had just begun to make progress among the nations, such language naturally presupposes a much more extended propagation of the Gospel, than had as yet taken place. The second event that was to precede the second advent was the coming of Antichrist, or, in other words, the man of sin was to be revealed.

The first question, to be determined in the interpretation of this prophecy, is, Whether Antichrist is a particular individual, or an institution, a power, or a corporation. Protestants generally adopt the

latter view; because they do not regard any one pope, but the papacy, as the Antichrist of Scripture. In favour of this view it may be urged, (1.) That it is according to the analogy of prophecy to speak of nations, institutions, or kingdoms, as individuals. In Daniel, the ten kings are ten kingdoms or dynasties; the several beasts which he saw in vision, were not the symbols of particular men, but of nations. When therefore the Apostle speaks of Antichrist as "the man of sin," and "the son of perdition," it is perfectly consistent with Scriptural usage to understand him to refer to an order of men, or to an institution. (2.) The work assigned to Antichrist in prophecy, extends over far too long a period to be accomplished by one man. (3.) Those who insist that the antichrist here predicted, is an individual man, are forced to admit that what is said in 2 Thessalonians ii. 7 ("He who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way") is to be understood of a power. It is generally understood of the Roman power. Luthardt understands it of the moral power which sustains the right, and therefore is opposed to the reckless disregard of all law, which is one of the characteristics of Antichrist. It is true that he supposes that reference is also made to one of the guardian or protecting angels spoken of by the prophet Daniel. But such an angel is not to be "taken out of the way." And there is nothing in the context or in Paul's writings anywhere to justify the assumption that reference is here had to any angelic personage.

The second question is, Whether the antichrist here described is an ecclesiastical or civil power; whether it is to arise in the Church or in the world. The considerations which are in favour of the former of these assumptions are, --

1. That the designations "man of sin" and "son of perdition" have a religious import, and are more appropriate to an ecclesiastical than to

a worldly power or potentate.

2. Antichrist was to have the seat of his power in the "temple of God." It is there he sits. This seems clearly to indicate that it is an ecclesiastical usurping, tyrannical, and persecuting power, that is here depicted. By the temple of God in this passage is generally understood the Church which is so often elsewhere called, and especially by Paul, God's temple. Some, however, suppose that the reference is to the literal temple in Jerusalem; but this supposes, (a.) That the Jews are to be restored to their own land. (b.) That they are to be restored as Jews, or unconverted, and that the temple is to be there rebuilt. (c.) That the Thessalonians knew all this and would understand the Apostle as referring to the temple made with hands; which is to the last degree improbable.

3. His coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders. This is not the way in which worldly potentates gain their power; they rely on force. But this is the way, as though traced by the pen of history rather than by the pencil of prophecy, in which the papacy has attained and maintained its fearful ascendancy in the world. Its power has been achieved mainly by fraud, "by the deceivableness of unrighteousness;" by forged documents and false pretences, by claiming that Peter was made primate over the whole Church and the vicar or plenipotentiary of Christ on earth; that he was the bishop of Rome; that his successors in that office were his successors in that primacy; and that as the vicar of Christ he was superior to all earthly potentates, not merely as the spiritual is above the temporal, but as lord of the conscience, authorized to decide what was right and what was wrong for them to do in all their relations as men and as rulers; which is a claim of absolute dominion. This, however, is a small matter so far as it concerns the things of this

world. It was to the mass of the people of little moment whether their absolute sovereign was a bishop or a prince; whether he resided at Rome or in Paris, whether his authority extended over one nation or over all nations. It is the false claim of the papacy to have supreme authority over the faith of men, to decide for them what they must believe on the pain of eternal perdition, that is the most fearful power ever assumed by sinful men. To this is to be added the false claim to the power to forgive sin. This is, as we have seen, a twofold power, answering to the twofold penalty attached to sin, namely, the eternal penalty as a violation of the divine law, and the penances still due after the remission of the eternal penalty, as satisfactions to divine justice. The former can be obtained only through the intervention or absolution of the priest; and the latter can be imposed or remitted at the discretion of the Church. This includes power over purgatory, the pains of which are represented as frightful and of indefinite duration. These pains the pope and his subordinates falsely claim the power to alleviate or remit. These claims have no parallel in the history of the world. If such pretensions as these do not constitute the power which makes them Antichrist, then nothing more remains. Any future antichrist that may arise must be a small affair compared to the papacy.

Then again, the Apostle tells us, these portentous claims, these unrighteous deceits, were to be supported by "signs and lying wonders." These have seldom, if ever, been appealed to by worldly powers to support their pretensions. They ever have been and still are among the chief supports of the papacy. There is not a false doctrine which it teaches, or a false assumption which it makes, which is not sustained by "lying wonders." Its whole history is a history of apparitions of the Virgin Mary or of saints and angels; and of miracles of every possible description from the most stupendous to the most absurd. It

has ever acted on the principle "populus vult decipi," and that it in right to deceive them for their own good, or, the good of the Church. The whole system, so far as it is distinctive, [840] is a system of falsehood, or false pretensions, supported by deceit.

4. Antichrist is to be a persecuting power. Is not this true of the papacy? It has been drunk with the blood of the saints. It not only persecutes, but it justifies persecution, and avows to this day its purpose to enforce its dominion by the rack and the stake wherever it has the power. This is involved in its justification of the past, and in its making it a duty to suppress every form of religion but that of Rome. The thirty years' war in Germany; the persistent attempts to exterminate the Piedmontese; the massacres by the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands; the horrors of the inquisition in Spain; the dragonnades and the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France, over which Te Deums were sung in Rome, show that the people of God can hardly have more to suffer under any future antichrist than they have already suffered, and perhaps have yet to suffer, under the papacy.

5. Antichrist, according to the Apostle, was to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or is worshipped; "so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." This is true of no worldly power. It was not true of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is regarded as the type whence the prophetic portrait of Antichrist was drawn. It was not true of any of the Roman emperors. Some of them allowed themselves to be enrolled among the thousand gods of the Pantheon; but this falls very far short of the description here given. It is, however, all true of the papacy, and it is true of no other power which has yet appeared upon earth. Paul does not concern himself with theories, but with facts. It is not that the popes openly profess to be superior to God; or, that in theory they claim to be more

than men. It is the practical operation of the system which he describes. The actual facts are first, that the popes claim the honour that is due to God alone; secondly, that they assume the powers which are his exclusive prerogatives; and thirdly, that they supersede the authority of God, putting their own in its place. It is thus they exalt themselves above God.

They assume the honour which belongs to God not merely by claiming to be the vicars of Christ on earth, and by allowing themselves to be addressed as Lord and God, but by exacting the submission of the reason, the conscience, and the life, to their authority. This is the highest tribute which a creature can render the Creator; and this the popes claim to be their due from all mankind. They claim divine prerogatives as infallible teachers on all questions of faith and practice, and as having the power to forgive sin. And they exalt their authority above that of God by practically setting aside his word, and substituting their decrees and what they put forth as the teachings of the Church. It is a simple and undeniable fact that in all countries under the effective dominion of the pope, the Scriptures are inaccessible to the people, and the faith of the masses reposes not on what the Bible teaches, but on what the Church declares to be true.

Even such a writer as John Henry Newman, in an essay written before his formal adhesion to the Church of Rome, uses such language as the following: The question is, "Has Christ, or has He not, appointed a body representative of Him in earth during his absence?" This question he answers in the affirmative, and says, "Not even the proof of our Lord's divinity is plainer than that of the Church's commission. Not even the promises to David or to Solomon more evidently belong to Christ, than those to Israel, or Jerusalem, or Sion, belong to the Church. Not even Daniel's prophecies are more exact to the letter, than

those which invest the Church with powers which Protestants consider Babylonish. Nay, holy Daniel himself is in no small measure employed on this very subject. He it is who announces a fifth kingdom, like a stone cut out without hands,' which broke in pieces and consumed' all former kingdoms, but was itself to stand forever' and to become a great mountain,' and to fill the whole earth.' He it is also who prophesies that the Saints of the most High shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever.' He saw in the night visions and behold one like to the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and there was given Him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him.' Such too is Isaiah's prophecy, Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and He shall judge among the nations and rebuke many people.' Now Christ Himself was to depart from the earth. He could not then in his own person be intended in these great prophecies; if He acted it must be by delegacy." [841] According to the Romanists, therefore, these prophecies, relating to Christ and his kingdom, refer to the papacy. It is the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which is to break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms; which is to stand forever; which is to fill the whole earth, to which is given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve. If this be not to put itself in the place of God, it is hard to see how the prophecies concerning Antichrist can ever be fulfilled.

No more conclusive argument to prove that the papacy is Antichrist, could be constructed, than that furnished by Dr. Newman, himself a Romanist. According to him the prophecies respecting the glory, the exaltation, the power, and the universal dominion of Christ, have their fulfilment in the popes. But who is Antichrist, but the man that puts

himself in the place of Christ; claiming the honour and the power which belong to God manifest in the flesh, for himself? Whoever does this is Antichrist, in the highest form in which he can appear.

6. Another argument to prove that the Antichrist described by the Apostle is an ecclesiastical power is that his appearance is the consequence of a great apostasy. That the apostasy spoken of is a defection from the truth is plain from the Scriptural usage of the term (Acts xxi. 21), and from the connection in which it here occurs. When God brought the heathen upon the people as conquerors, in punishment of their idolatry, their sufferings were a judicial consequence of their apostasy, but it cannot be said that the power of Chaldean or Egyptian oppressors was the fruit of their defection from the truth. In this case, however, Antichrist is represented as the ultimate development of the predicted apostasy. If a simple minister should claim to be a priest, and then one priest assume dominion over many priests, and then one prelate over other prelates, and then one over all, and then that one claim to be the ruler of the whole world as vicar of Christ, clothed with his authority, so that the prophecy that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve the Son of Man, is fulfilled in him, then indeed we should have a regular development, from the first step to the. last. Bishop Ellicott, though believing Antichrist to be "one single personal being, as truly man as He whom he impiously opposes," and that he is to be hereafter revealed, still admits that Antichrist is to be "the concluding and most appalling phenomenon" of the great apostasy. But if so, he must be an ecclesiastical, and not a worldly power.

7. Again the Apostle says that "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." That is, the principles and spirit had already begun to manifest themselves in the Church, which were to culminate in the revelation of

the Man of Sin. How could this be said of a person who was to be a worldly prince, appearing outside of the Church, separated, not only chronologically by ages from the apostolic age, but also logically, from all the causes then in operation. If Antichrist is to be a single person, concentrating in himself all worldly power as a universal monarch, to appear shortly before the end of the world, as is assumed by so many expounders of prophecy, it is hard to see how he was to be the product of the leaven already working in the times of the Apostles. If however, as Protestants have so generally believed, the papacy is the Antichrist which the Apostle had in his prophetic eye, then this passage is perfectly intelligible. The two elements of which the papacy is the development are the desire of preeminence or lust of power, and the idea of a priesthood, that is, that Christian ministers are mediators whose intervention is necessary to secure access to God, and that they are authorized to make atonement for sin; to which was added the claim to grant absolution. Both these elements were at work in the apostolic age. The papacy is the product of the transfer of Jewish and Pagan ideas to the Christian system. The Jews had a high priest, and all the ministers of the sanctuary were sacrificing priests. The Romans had a "Pontifex Maximus" and the ministers of religion among them were priests. Nothing was more natural and nothing is plainer as a historical fact than that the assumption of a priestly character and functions by the Christian ministry, was one of the earliest corruptions of the Church. And nothing is plainer than that to this assumption the power of the papacy is in a large measure to be attributed. And as to the desire of preeminence, we know that there was, even among the twelve, a contention who should be the greatest. The Apostle John (3 Epistle 9) speaks of Diotrephes, "who loveth to have the preeminence;" and in all the Epistles there is evidence of the

struggle for ascendancy on the part of unworthy ministers and teachers. The leaven of iniquity, therefore, was at work in the apostolic age, which concentrated by degrees into the portentous system of the papacy.

8. According to this view, the difficult passage in verses 6 and 7 admits of an easy interpretation. The Apostle there says: "Now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." There was, therefore, at that time an obstacle which prevented the development of the Man of Sin, and would continue to present it, as long as it remained as it then was. It is to be noticed that Paul says, "Now ye know what withholdeth." How could the Thessalonians know to what he referred? only from the Apostle's instructions, or from the nature of the case. The fact however is that they did know, and, therefore, it is probable that knowledge was communicated to others, and was not likely to be soon forgotten. This consideration gives the more weight to the almost unanimous judgment of the early fathers that the obstacle to the development of Antichrist was the Roman empire. While that continued in its vigour it was impossible that an ecclesiastic should become the virtual sovereign of the world. It is a historical fact that the conflict between the Emperors and the Popes for the ascendancy, was continued for ages, and that as the power of the former decreased that of the latter increased.

On the assumption that the Antichrist of which Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, is a powerful worldly monarch hereafter to appear, these verses, the 6th and 7th, present the greatest difficulty. The causes which are to bring such a monarch into the possession of his power were not then in operation; there was then no obstacle to his manifestation so obvious as to be generally known to

Christians, and the removal of which was to be followed at once by his revelation. Even on the assumption that the obstacle of which the Apostle speaks, was not the Roman empire, but rather the regard to law and order deeply fixed in the public mind, which stood in the way of the revelation of the Man of Sin, this difficulty is scarcely lessened. How could the Thessalonians have known that? How foreign to their minds must have been the thought that a regard for law must be taken out of the way before the lawless one could appear. It seems plain that the early fathers were right in their interpretation of the Apostle's language; and that he meant to say that the appearance of ecclesiastical claimants to universal dominion, was not possible until the Roman empire was effectually broken.

According to Paul's account, Antichrist was to arise in the Church. He was to put forth the most exorbitant claims; exalt himself above all human authority; assume to himself the prerogatives of God, demanding a submission due only to God, and virtually setting aside the authority of God, and substituting his own in its place. These assumptions were to be sustained by all manner of unrighteous deceits, by signs, and by lying wonders. This portrait suits the papacy so exactly, that Protestants at least have rarely doubted that it is the Antichrist which the Apostle intended to describe.

Dr. John Henry Newman says, that if Protestants insist on making the Church of Rome Antichrist, they thereby make over all Roman Catholics, past and present, "to utter and hopeless perdition." [842] This does not follow. The Church of Rome is to be viewed under different aspects; as the papacy, an external organized hierarchy, with the pope, with all his arrogant claims, at its head; and also as a body of men professing certain religious doctrines. Much may be said of it in the one aspect, which is not true of it in the other. Much may be said of Russia as an

empire that cannot be said of all Russians. At one time the first Napoleon was regarded by many as Antichrist; that did not involve the belief that all Frenchmen who acknowledged him as emperor, or all soldiers who followed him as their leader, were the sons of perdition. That many Roman Catholics, past and present, are true Christians, is a palpable fact. It is a fact which no man can deny without committing a great sin. It is a sin against Christ not to acknowledge as true Christians those who bear his image, and whom He recognizes as his brethren. It is a sin also against ourselves. We are not born of God unless we love the children of God. If we hate and denounce those whom Christ loves as members of his own body, what are we? It is best to be found on the side of Christ, let what will happen. It is perfectly consistent, then, for a man to denounce the papacy as the man of sin, and yet rejoice in believing, and in openly acknowledging, that there are, and ever have been, many Romanists who are the true children of God.

Admitting that the Apostle's predictions refer to the Roman pontiffs, it does not follow that the papacy is the only antichrist. St. John says there are many antichrists. Our Lord says many shall come in his name, claiming in one form or another his authority, and endeavouring to take his place by dethroning him. The Apostle John tells us this "is the last time" (1 John ii. 18) in which many antichrists are to appear. This "last time" extends from the first to the second advent of Christ. This long period lay as one scene before the minds of the prophets. And they tell what was given them to see, not as though they were writing a history, and unfolding events in their historical order, but as describing the figures which they saw, as it were, represented on the same canvass. As Isaiah describes the redemption from Babylon and the redemption by the Messiah as though they were contemporary events, so

Joel, in almost the same sentence, connects the effusion of the spirit which attended the first advent of Christ with the great elemental changes which are to attend his second coming. How long the period between the first and second advents of the Son of God is to be protracted is unrevealed. It has already lasted nearly two thousand years, and, for what we know, may last two thousand more. As this long period, crowded with great events, was presented as a whole to the minds of the prophets, it is not surprising that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, one should fix on one prominent feature in the scene, and others upon another. Under the divine guidance granted to these holy seers, there could be no error and no contradiction, but there could hardly fail to be great variety. It would not, therefore, invalidate the account given of Paul's description of Antichrist, if it should be found to differ in some respects from the antichrists of Daniel and of the Apocalypse.

The Antichrist of Daniel.

The reader of the prophecies of Daniel has, at least in many cases, the advantage of a divine interpretation of his predictions. The prophet himself did not understand the import of his visions, and begged to have them explained to him; and his request was, in a measure, granted. Thus in the seventh chapter we read: "I saw in my vision by night, and behold, ... four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. The first was like a lion; . . . . a second like to a bear; another like a leopard; (and) a fourth beast dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, ... and it had ten horns . . . . And behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things."

These beasts were, as the explanation states, the symbols of four kingdoms, the Babylonish, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. This last was to be divided into ten kingdoms. That kings in this prophecy mean kingdoms, not individuals, but an organized community under a king, is plain from the nature of the predictions and from the express declaration of the prophet; for he says, in verse 17, that the four beasts are four kings; and in verse 23, that the fourth beast is the fourth kingdom. King and kingdom, therefore, are interchanged as of the same iport, After, or in the midst of these ten kingdoms signified by the ten horns, there was to arise another kingdom or power symbolized by the little horn. Of this power it is said: (1.) That it was to be of a different kind from the others. Perhaps, as they were civil or worldly kingdoms, this was to be ecclesiastical. (2.) He was to gain the ascendancy over the other powers; at least three of them were to be plucked up by the roots. (3.) He was to speak great things, or be arrogant in his assumptions. (4.) He was to set himself against God; speaking "great words against the Most High." (5.) He was to persecute the saints; prevail against them and wear them out; and they shall be given into his hands. (6.) This antichristian power was to continue until the judgment, i.e., "until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High." (Dan. vii. 22.) In all these particulars the Antichrist of Daniel answers to the description given by St. Paul in 2 Thessalonians. In one point, however, they appear to differ. According to Daniel, the power of Antichrist was to last, or at least his persecution of the saints, only "a time and times and the dividing of a time;" that is, three years and a half. (Compare Rev. xiii. 5, and xi. 2, 3.) This is the interpretation generally adopted. Calvin adopts the principle that in the prophecies definite periods of time are used for periods of

indefinite duration. In his Commentary on Daniel he makes the little horn spoken of in the seventh chapter to be Julius Cæsar, and says: "Qui annum putant hic notari per tempus, falluntur meo judicio . . . . Annus sumetur figurate pro tempore aliquo indeterminato." [843] He significantly says: "In numeris non sum Pythagoricus." [844]

There are two answers to this difficulty. The word antichrist may be a generic term, as it seems to have been used by St. John, not referring exclusively to any one individual person, or to any one organization, but to any and every antichristian power, having certain characteristics. So that there may be, as the Apostle says, many Antichrists. Hence Daniel may describe one, and Paul another. Secondly, the same power, retaining all its essential characteristics, may change its form. If republican France, during the first revolution, was an antichristian nation, it did not necessarily change its character when it became an empire; and what was, or might have been, said of it in prophecy under the one form, might not have answered to what it was under the other form. During the Middle Ages, bishops were sometimes princes and warriors. A prophetic description of them, while giving their general characteristics suited to both their ecclesiastical and worldly functions, might say some things of them as warlike princes which did not belong to them as bishops. However, we do not pretend to be experts in matters of prophecy; our object is simply to state what Paul said of the Antichrist which he had in view, and what Daniel said of the Antichrist which he was inspired to describe.

In the eleventh chapter of Daniel, from the 36th verse to the end, there is a passage which is commonly understood of Antichrist, because what is there said is not true of Antiochus Epiphanes, to whom the former part of the chapter is referred, and is true of Antichrist as described in other places in the Scriptures. It is not true of

Antiochus Epiphanes that he abandoned the gods of his fathers. On the contrary, his purpose was to force all under his control, the Jews included, to worship those gods. What is said in verse 36 is in substance what Paul says, in 2 Thessalonians ii. 4, of the Man of Sin. Daniel says that "the king," whom he describes, "shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done." This exalting himself "above all that is called god" is the prominent characteristic of Antichrist as he is elsewhere presented in Scripture.

The Antichrist of the Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse seems to be a summing up and expansion of all the eschatological prophecies of the Old Testament, especially of those of Ezekiel, Zechariah and Daniel. The same symbols, the same forms of expression, the same numbers, the same cycle of events, occur in the New Testament predictions, that are found in those of the Old. Everyone knows that commentators differ not only in their interpretation of the details, but even as to the whole structure and design of the book of Revelation. Some regard it as a description in oriental imagery of contemporaneous events; others as intended to set forth the different phases of the spiritual life of the Church; others as designed to unfold the leading events in the history of the Church and of the world in their chronological order; others again assume that it is a series, figuratively speaking, of circles; each vision or series of visions relating to the same events under different aspects; the end, and the preparation for the end, being presented over and over again; the great theme being the coming of the Lord, and the triumph of his Church.

[845]

The most commonly accepted view of the general contents of the book by those who adopt the chronological method is that so clearly presented in the admirable little work of Dr. James M. Macdonald (now of Princeton, New Jersey). [846] According to this view, the introduction is contained in chapters i.-iii.; part second relates the Jewish persecutions, and the destruction of that power, in chapters iv.-xi. 14, part third relates the Pagan persecutions, and the end of the Pagan persecuting power, in chapters xi. 15-xiii. 10; part fourth relates the Papal persecutions and errors, and their end, in chapters xiii. 11-xix.; and part fifth relates the latter day of glory, the battle of Gog and Magog, the final judgment, and the heavenly state, in chapters xx.-xxii.

Luthardt may be taken as a representative of the advocates of the theory that the historical sequence of events is not designed to be set forth in the Apocalypse. The three works of the Apostle John contained in the New Testament, the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, according to Luthardt, form a beautiful, harmonious whole; as faith, love, and hope mingle into one, so do these writings of St. John, though each has its characteristic; faith is prominent in the Gospel, love in the Epistles, and hope in the Apocalypse. The theme of the Book of Revelation is, "Behold, He comes." Luthardt admits that commentators differ greatly as to their views of its meaning, and that, at first, it appears very full of enigmas; but he adds, [847] "Whoever is familiar with the ancient prophecies, and gives himself with loving confidence to this book, will soon find the right way, which will lead him safely through all its labyrinths." This is the experience of every commentator so far as he himself is concerned, however he may fail to satisfy his readers that his way is the right one. The main principle of Luthardt's exposition is, "That the Revelation of John does not

contemplate the events of history, whether of the Church or of the world. It contemplates the end. We find that the antagonism of the Church and the world, and the issue of the conflict are its contents; the coming of Christ is its theme. The events of history preceding the consummation are taken up only so far as they are connected with the final issue. This consummation is not chronologically unfolded, but is ever taken up anew, in order to lead us by a new way to the end." [848]

One thing is certain, namely, that the Apocalypse contains the series of predictions common to all the prophets; the defections of the people of God; persecutions of their enemies; direful judgments on the persecutors; and the final triumph and blessedness of the elect. Under different forms, this is the burden of all the disclosures God has seen fit to make of the fate of his Church here on earth and this is the burden of the Apocalypse. According to Luthardt, the first vision i. 9-iii. 22, concerns the present state of the Church; the second vision, iv. 1-viii. 1, concerns God and the world; the third vision, viii. 2-xi. 19, concerns the judgment of the world and the consummation of covenant fellowship with God; the fourth vision, xii.-xiv. concerns the Church and the antichristian world power; this contains the vision of the woman, which brought forth the man child; and in xii. 18-xiii. 18, Antichrist and the false prophet; and in xiv. the Church of the end, and the judgment of the antichristian world; and the fifth vision, xv.-xxii. concerns the outpouring of wrath upon the world and the redemption of the Church.

It is characteristic of the Apocalypse that it takes up and expands the eschatological predictions of the earlier portions of Scripture. What in the Old Testament or in the Epistles of the New Testament, is set forth under one symbol and in the concrete, is in the Apocalypse presented under two or more symbols representing the constituent

elements of the whole. Thus the Antichrist is predicted in Daniel under the symbol of "the little horn," and in Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians under the title of the Man of Sin. Antichrist, as thus portrayed, includes an ecclesiastical and a worldly element; an apostate Church invested with imperial, worldly power. In the Apocalypse these two elements are represented as separate and united; a woman sitting on a beast with ten horns. The woman is the apostate Church; the beast is the symbol of the world-power by which it is supported. The destruction of the one, therefore, does not involve the destruction of the other. According to the prediction in the eighteenth chapter, the kings of the earth, wearied with the arrogance and assumption of the apostate Church, shall turn against it, waste, and consume it; that is, despoil it of its external power and glory. The destruction of Babylon, therefore, here predicted, is understood by that diligent student of prophecy, Mr. D. N. Lord, not as implying the overthrow of the Papacy, but its "denationalization" and spoliation.
[849]
Throughout the Scriptures the relation between God and his people is illustrated by that of a husband to his wife; apostasy from God, therefore, is in the ancient prophets called adultery. In the Revelation, the Church, considered as faithful, is called the woman; as apostate, the adulteress or harlot; and as glorified, the bride, the Lamb's wife. It is in accordance with the analogy of Scripture that the harlot spoken of in chapters xvii. and xviii. is understood to be the apostate Church. Of this woman it is said: (1.) That she sits on many waters. This is explained in xvii. 15, of her wide spread dominion: "The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." (2.) That she seduced the nations into idolatry; making the inhabitants of the earth drunk with

the wine of her fornication. (3.) That she is sustained in her blasphemous assumption of divine prerogatives and powers by the kings and princes of the earth. She is seen sitting on a scarlet-coloured beast, full of the names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. In verse 12, these ten horns are said to be ten kings, i.e., in the language of prophecy, ten kingdoms. (4.) That she takes rank among and above the kings and princes of the earth. She is "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls." (5.) That her riches are above estimate. This is dwelt upon at length in the eighteenth chapter. (6.) That she is a persecuting power, "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." (7.) That the claims of this persecuting power, as appears from Revelation xiii. 3, 14, are to be sustained by lying wonders. "He doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by those miracles which he hath power to do in the sight of the beast." We find, therefore, in this description all the traits which in Daniel and the Epistle to the Thessalonians are ascribed to the Man of Sin, or, ho antikeimenos, the Antichrist. It matters not what this power may be called. "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." Any man; any institution; any organized power which answers to this prophetic description, comes within the prophetic denunciations here recorded. [850] Neither does it matter what is to happen after this judgment on the mystical Babylon. Should another Antichrist arise, essentially worldly in his character, as so many anticipate, who shall attain universal dominion, and set himself against God and his Christ with more blasphemous assumptions, with a more malignant hatred of the Church, and a more demoniacal spirit than any of his predecessors, this would not at all disprove the

correctness of the interpretation given above of St. John's predictions concerning Babylon. On this point, Maitland says: "The two great powers whose names stand foremost in prophecy come into historical contact at a single point. Where Babylon ends, Antichrist begins: the same ten kings that destroy the first, give their power to the second. When the ten kings shall have burnt Rome, so complete will be the ruin, that no sign of life or habitation will again be found in her. Here, then, is a decisive landmark; Rome is still standing, therefore, Antichrist has not yet come: we are still in the times of Babylon, whether tasting or refusing her golden cap." In this view, that is, in assuming that the Scriptural prophecies respecting Antichrist, have not their full accomplishment in any one anti-christian power or personage exclusively, many of the most distinguished eschatologists, as Auberlen and Luthardt, substantially agree. The ancient prediction that Japhet should dwell in the tents of Shem, had its fulfilment every time the descendants of the latter participated in the temporal or spiritual heritage of the children of the former; and had its final and great accomplishment in the sons of Japhet sharing the blessings of redemption, which were to be realized in the line of Shem. In like manner the predictions concerning Antichrist may have had a partial fulfilment in Antiochus Epiphanes, in Nero and Pagan Rome, and in the papacy, and, it may still have a fulfilment in some great anti-christian power which is yet to appear. So much, at least, is clear, in the time of Paul there was in the future a great apostasy and an antichristian, arrogant persecuting power, which has been realized, in all its essential characteristics, in the papacy, whatever may happen after Antichrist, in that form, is utterly despoiled and trodden under foot. [851]

Roman Catholic Doctrine of Antichrist.

The general opinion in the early Church was that Antichrist was a man of Satanic spirit endowed with Satanic power who should appear before the second coming of Christ. Jerome says, in his Commentary on Daniel: "Let us say what all ecclesiastical writers have handed down, namely, that at the end of the world, when the Roman empire is destroyed, there will be ten kings who will divide the Roman world amongst them; and there will arise an eleventh little king, who will subdue three of the ten kings, that is, the king of Egypt, of Africa, and of Ethiopia, as we shall hereafter show. And on these being slain the seven others will also submit. And behold,' he says, in the ram were the eyes of a man.' This is said that we may not suppose him to be a devil or demon, as some have thought, but a man in whom Satan will dwell utterly and bodily. And a mouth speaking great things,' for he is the man of sin, the son of perdition, who sitteth in the temple of God, making himself as God.'" [852]

Substantially the same view prevailed during the Middle Ages. Some however of the theologians of the Latin Church saw that the development of the Man of Sin was to take place in the Church itself and be connected with a general apostasy from the faith. They were therefore sufficiently bold to teach that the Church of Rome was to fall away, and that the Papacy or some individual pontiff was to become the Antichrist spoken of in Scripture. The abbot Joachim of Floris (died 1202), a Franciscan, put himself in opposition to the worldly spirit of the Church of his time, and his followers, called "Spirituales," came to denounce the Church of Rome as the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. This was done with great boldness by John Peter of Oliva (died 1297), whose works were formally condemned as "blasphemous and heretical." Among the passages thus condemned are the following: "The woman here stands for the people and empire of Rome, both as she

existed formerly in a state of Paganism, and as she has since existed, holding the faith of Christ, though by many crimes committing harlotry with this world. And, therefore, she is called a great harlot; for, departing from the faithful worship, the true love and delights of her Bridegroom, even Christ her God, she cleaves to this world, its riches and delights; yea, for their sake she cleaves to the devil, also to kings, nobles, and prelates, and to all other lovers of this world."

"She saith in her heart, that is, in her pride, I sit a queen: -- I am at rest; I rule over my kingdom with great dominion and glory. And I am no widow: -- I am not destitute of glorious bishops and kings." [853]

Not only the poets Dante and Petrarch denounced the corruptions of the Church of Rome, but down to the time of the Reformation that Church was held up by a succession of theologians or ecclesiastics, as the Babylon of the Apocalypse which was to be overthrown and rendered desolate. When the Reformers with one voice pronounced the same judgment, and, making little distinction between Babylon and Antichrist, held up the Papacy as the antichristian power predicted by Daniel, by St. Paul, and by St. John, the Romanists laid out their strength in defending their Church from this denunciation. Bellarmin, the great advocate of the cause of Romanism, devotes an extended dissertation to the discussion of this subject, which constitutes the third book of his work, "De Romano Pontifice." The points that he assumes are: First, that the word "Antichrist" cannot mean, as some Protestants thought, "substitute or vicar" of Christ, but an opponent of Christ. In this all parties are now agreed. Second, that Antichrist is "unus homo," and not "genus hominum." The Magdeburg Centuriators [854] said: "Docent [Apostoli] Antichristum non fore unam aliquam tantum personam, sed integrum regnum, per falsos doctores in templo Dei, hoc est in Ecclesia Dei præsidentes, in urba magna, quæ habet regnum super reges terræ id est,

in Romana civitate, et imperio Romano, opera diaboli, et fraude, et deceptione comparatum." This view Bellarmin undertakes to refute, controverting the arguments of Calvin and Beza in its support. In this opinion also the leading Protestant interpreters of the present day, as above stated, agree. According to the views already advanced, there may be hereafter a great antichristian power, concentrated in an individual ruler, who will be utterly destroyed at the coming of the Lord, and at the same time the belief may be maintained that the Antichrist described by Daniel and St. Paul is not a man, but an institution or organized power such as a kingdom or the papacy.

The third position assumed by Bellarmin is that the Antichrist is still future. In this way he endeavours to make it plain that the papacy is not Antichrist. But, as just said, even if an Antichrist, and even the Antichrist kat' exochen, is yet to come, that would not prove that the papacy is not the power predicted by the Apostle as the Man of Sin, and the mystical Babylon as predicted in the Apocalypse.

Bellarmin says that the Holy Spirit gives us six signs of Antichrist, from which it is plain that he has not yet appeared. Two of these signs precede his coming, the universal proclamation of the Gospel, and the utter destruction of the Roman Empire, two are to attend it, namely, the preaching of Enoch and Elias, and persecutions so severe as to cause the cessation of all public worship of God; and two are to follow his appearance; his utter destruction after three years and a half; and the end of the world. The passages on which he relies to prove that Enoch and Elias are to come and oppose themselves to Antichrist, and to preserve the elect, are Malachi iv., Ecclesiasticus xliv. and xlviii., Matthew xvii. 11 (Jesus said, "Elias truly shall first come and restore all things"), and Revelation xi. 3, where the appearance of the two witnesses, who were to prophesy two thousand two hundred and sixty

days, is foretold. As modern evangelical interpreters agree with Bellarmin in so many other points, so they agree with him in teaching that there is to be a second appearance of Elias, before the second advent of Christ. Luthardt understands Matthew xvi. 11 as predicting such reappearance of the Old Testament prophet. He was to be one, and Moses the other of the two witnesses spoken of in Revelation xi. 3. Of course, says Luthardt, Elias and Moses are to reappear in the sense in which Elias appeared in the person of John the Baptist. [855]

Fourthly, according to Bellarmin, Antichrist is to be a Jew, and probably of the tribe of Dan. He is to claim to be the Messiah, and this claim is to be recognized by the Jews. In virtue of his Messiahship he sets himself against Christ, and puts himself in his place, and arrogates the reverence, the obedience, the universal dominion and the absolute authority, which rightfully belong to the Lord Jesus Christ. The seat of his dominion is to be Jerusalem. In the Temple restored in that city, he is to take his seat as God, and exalt himself above all that is called God. He is called "the little horn," because the Jews are comparatively a small nation. But he is to subdue one kingdom after another until his dominion as a worldly sovereign becomes absolutely universal. The authority urged for this view is principally that of the fathers, many of whom taught that Antichrist was to be a Jew of the tribe of Dan. Appeal was made by those fathers as by their followers to Genesis xlix. 17, where it is said, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse-heels, so that his rider shall fall backward." And also to Revelation vii., because in the enumeration of the tribes from which the hundred and forty and four thousand were sealed, the name of Dan is omitted. Bellarmin argues that Antichrist is to be a Jew from John v. 43: "I am come in my Father's name and ye (Jews) receive me not: if

another shall come in his own name, him ye (Jews) will receive." That is, will receive as the Messiah; but the Jews, as Bellarmin argues, would never receive as the Messiah any one who was not himself a Jew. The principal Scriptural ground of the opinion that Antichrist is to be a Jew is founded on Revelation xi. 8, where the seat of his dominion is said to be the great city "where also our Lord was crucified." In answer to this argument it may be said, first, that admitting that the literal Jerusalem is to be the seat of the kingdom of Antichrist, it does not follow that either he or his kingdom is to be Jewish. Many interpreters hold that the Jews, instead of being the supporters of Antichrist, are to be the principal objects of his malice, and that it is by persecuting and oppressing them that he is to get possession of their holy city and profane their temple far more atrociously than it was profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes. And secondly, interpreters so different as Hengstenberg and Mr. David N. Lord, agree in understanding the predictions in Revelation xi. to refer not to the literal Jerusalem and its Temple, but to that of which they were the symbols. The New Jerusalem is the symbol of the purified and glorified Church; the city where our Lord was crucified, the symbol of the worldly and nationalized Church. [856]

Fifthly, as to the doctrine of Antichrist, everything follows, from the assumption that he claims to be Christ. In claiming to be the Messiah predicted by the prophets, he is to claim to be the only object of worship. That he is to admit of no other God, whether true or false, nor of any idols, Bellarmin infers from 2 Thessa1onians ii. 2, "He opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is worshipped." "Certum est," says Bellarmin, "Antichristi persecutionem fore gravissimam et notissimam; ita ut cessent omnes publicæ religionis ceremoniæ et sacrificia . . . . [Daniel xii. docet] Antichristum

interdictdurum omnem divinum cultum, qui in ecclesiis Christianorum exercetur." [857] Thus also Stapleton says: "Pelli sane potent in desertam ecclesia, regnante Antichristi, et illo momento temporis in deserta, id est, in locis abitis, in speluncis, in latibulis quo sancti se recipient, non incommode quæretur ecclesia." [858] During the reign of Antichrist, according to the notes to the Romish version of the New Testament on 2 Thessalonians ii., "The external state of the Romish Church, and the public intercourse of the faithful with it, may cease. Yet the due honour and obedience towards the Roman see, and the communion of heart with it, and the secret practice of that communion, and the open confession thereof, if the occasion require, shall not cease." Again on verse 4th it is said, "The great Antichrist who must come towards the world's end, shall abolish all other religions, true and false; and put down the blessed sacrament of the altar, wherein consisteth principally the worship of the true God, and also all idols of the Gentiles." "The oblation of Christ's blood," it is said, "is to be abolished among all the nations and churches in the world." Finally, concerning the kingdom and wars of Antichrist, the Roman cardinal teaches, (1.) That from small beginnings, he is by fraud and deceit, to attain the kingdom of the Jews. (2.) That he is to subdue and take possession of the three kingdoms of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia. (Dan. xi.) (3.) That he is then to reduce to subjection the other seven kingdoms spoken of by the prophet; and (4.) That with an innumerable army, he shall make for a time successful war against all Christians in every part of the world, and finally be overthrown and utterly destroyed, as described in the twentieth chapter of Revelation. From this review it appears that the doctrine of the Romish theologians concerning Antichrist, agrees with that of a large body of modern Protestant writers in the following points: (1.) That he is to be an

individual, and not a corporation, or "genus hominum." (2.) That he is to be a worldly potentate. (3.) That he is to attain universal dominion. (4.) That he is to be, in character, godless and reckless, full of malignity against Christ and his people. (5.) That by his seductions and persecutions he is to succeed for a time in almost banishing true religion from the world. (6.) That his reign is to be brief.

The principal difference between the early Protestants and the modern evangelical interpreters, is, that the former identify Babylon and Antichrist; that is, they refer to one and the same power the prophecies of Daniel referring to the little horn; the description given by the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians ii.; and the account of the beast in chapter xiii. of the Apocalypse and that given in chapter xvii. Whereas, the moderns for the most part distinguish between the two. The papacy they regard as set forth under the symbol of Babylon; and Antichrist, as a worldly potentate, under the beast which came up out of the abyss. [859]

The great truth set forth in these prophecies is, that there was future in the time, not only of Daniel, but also of the Apostles, a great apostasy in the Church; that this apostasy would be Antichristian (or Antichrist), ally itself with the world and become a great persecuting power; and that the two elements, the ecclesiastical and the worldly, which enter into this great Antichristian development, will, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, become the more prominent; sometimes acting in harmony, and sometimes opposed one to the other; and, therefore, sometimes spoken of as one, and sometimes as two distinct powers. Both, as united or as separate, are to be overtaken with a final destruction when the Lord comes. So much is certain, that any and every power, be it one or more, which answers to the description given

in Daniel vii. and xi. and in 2 Thessalonians ii. is Antichrist in the Scriptural sense of the term.

According, then, to the common faith of the Church, the three great events which are to precede the second advent of Christ, are the universal proclamation of the Gospel or the conversion of the Gentile world; the national conversion of the Jews; and the appearance of Antichrist.

---

[840] This qualification is necessary. Papists of course hold the truths of natural religion; and many of the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel. This is to be acknowledged. We are not to deny that truth is truth, because held by Romanists; nor are we to deny, that where truth is, there may be its fruits. While condemning Papacy, Protestants can, and do joyfully admit that there are among Romanists such godly men as St. Bernard, Fénélon, and Pascal, and doubtless thousands more known only unto God.

[841] Essays Critical and Historical. By John Henry Newman, formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London, 1871. The Protestant Idea of Antichrist. vol. ii. pp. 173-175.

[842] The Protestant Idea of Antichrist, in vol. ii. of his Essays Critical and Historical, p. 148.

[843] In Danielem vii. 20, 25; Works, Amsterdam, 1667, vol. v. pp. 109, 113.

[844] In Danielem xii. 12; Ibid., p. 205 b.

[845] The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelations of St. John, viewed in their Mutual Relation, with an Exposition of the Principal Passages. By Carl August Auberlen, Dr. Phil., Licentiate and Professor Extraordinarius of Theology in Basil. Edinburgh, 1856. Auberlen says, on page 859: "The interpretation of the Apocalypse may be reduced to

three grand groups. First, the church-historical view regards the Revelations as a prophetic compendium of Church history." This was the early Church view. Its principal representative in Germany is Bengel. It is generally adopted by the British and French interpreters. To this class belong Elliot's Horæ Apocalypticæ, or a Commentary on the Apocalypse, Critical and Historical, second edition, London; 1846; four volumes; and the work of Gaussen of Geneva, entitled Daniel le Prophéte. The second class includes the modern German interpreters, who, denying any real prediction of the future, confine the views of Daniel and John to their contemporary history. To this class belong Ewald, De Wette, Lücke, and others. The third group includes those who admit the divine inspiration of the prophecies and acknowledge the prediction of even minute events, but deny that the Apocalypse was designed to be a detailed history of the future. "Its object is to represent the great epochs and leading principal powers in the development of the kingdom of God viewed in its relation to the world-kingdoms." (p. 361.) To this class Auberlen himself belongs, and he has carried out the theory with singular clearness and ability. His work is excellently translated by the Rev. Adolph Saphir.

[846] A Key to the Book of Revelation; with an Appendix. By James M. Macdonald, Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Jamaica, L. I. Second edition. New London, 1848.

[847] Die Lehre von den letzten Dingen, pp. 165-173; see page 173.

[848] Ibid., p. 171.

[849] An Exposition of the Apocalypse. By David N. Lord. New York, 1859, p. 502.

[850] Auberlen, 293, quotes with approbation the following passage from John Michael Hahn (Briefe und Lieder über die Offenbarung. Works, vol. v. § 6, Tübingen, 1820): "The harlot is not the city of Rome alone,

neither is it only the Roman Catholic Church, to the exclusion of another, but all churches and every church, ours included, namely, all Christendom that is without the Spirit and life of our Lord Jesus, which calls itself Christian and has neither Christ's mind nor Spirit."

While giving the prophecy this wide scope, Auberlen, nevertheless, adds, "The Roman Catholic Church is not only accidentally and de facto,' but in virtue of its very principle a harlot; she has the lamentable distinction of being the harlot kat' exochen, the metropolis of whoredom, the mother of harlots (Rev. vii. 5); it is she, who, more than others, boasts of herself; I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow (xviii. 7), whereas the evangelical (Protestant) Church is, according to her principle and fundamental creed, a chaste woman; the Reformation was a protest of the woman against the harlot."

[851] The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation: with its History down to the Present Time. London, 1849, p. 41. Mr. Maitland, on p. 42, presents the differences between Babylon and Antichrist in the following manner: --

"Babylon is Described. Antichrist is Described

As a feminine power. As a masculine power.

Seductive and abandoned, prevaling through her golden cup.

Ferocious and warlike, enforcing his laims by the sword.

Is succeeded by ten antichristian kings.

A final apostasy provoking Christ's second coming in vengence.

Is burnt by the ten kings, who afterwards fight against the Lamb.

Destroyed, together with the kings, in the great battle with the Lamb.

Is bewailed by her accomplices to the crime. Leaves none to lament his fall.

Contains some of the God's people even to the end. Fatal to salvation of all his followers.

Established on the seven hills. Reigns in Jerusalem."

The undue size which this volume has already reached forbids a fuller discussion of this subject. The reader is referred to the American edition of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, under the word "Antichrist," for an elaborate exhibition of the different views which have prevailed in the Church, and for an exhaustive statement of the literature of the subject. Doctor William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D. D., with the cooperation of Ezra Abbot, LL. D., Assistant Librarian of Harvard College. New York, 1870.

[852] "Dicamus quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt: in consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros reges, qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant, et undecimum surrecturum esse regem parvulum, qui tres reges de decem regibus superaturus sit, id est, Ægyptiorum regem, et Africæ et Æthiopiæ, sicut in consequentibus manifestius dicemus. Quibus interfectus, etiam septem alii reges victori colla submittent. 'Et ecce,' ait, 'oculi quasi oculi hominis erant in cornu isto.' Ne eum putemus juxta quorumdam opinionem, vel diabolum esse, vel dæmonem: sed unum de hominibus, in quo totus satanas habitaturus sit corporaliter. 'Et os loquens ingentia (2 Thess. ii.).' Est enim homo peccati, filius perditionis, ita ut in templo Dei sedere audeat, faciens se quasi Deum." In Danielum, vii. 8; Works, edit. Migne, vol. v. p. 531, a, b [667, 668.]

[853] Maitland, The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation, p. 340; see also Guericke, Kirchengeschichte, 6th edit., Leipzig, 1846, vol. ii. pp. 223-226.

[854] De Antichristo, cent. I. lib. ii. cap. iv.; Basle, vol. i. pp. 434, 435, of second set.

[855] Luthardt, Lehre von den letzten Dingen, p. 46.

[856] Mr. Lord says: "The place where Christ was crucified, was an open elevated space without the walls of Jerusalem, and on one of the principal entrances to the city. The street where the dead body of the witnesses is to be placed, represents parts thereof of the ten kingdoms, bearing a relation to conspicuity and importance to the apostate hierarchies, like that which the great entrance to Jerusalem that passed along by the foot of Calvary bore to that city; -- parts of those kingdoms from which those hierarchies largely derived their sustenance, wealth, and worshippers." An Exposition of the Apocalypse, p. 297.

[857] Bellarmin, De Romano Pontifice, III. vii.; Disputationes, Paris, 1608, vol. i. pp. 721 a, 723 c.

[858] Princip. Doct. cap. 2.

[859] Ebrard says, "The Reformers and the early theologians, erred only in this, that they identified the beast that was to remain three and one half years mentioned in Rev. xiii. with that mentioned in chap. xvii. That is, they identified the papacy and the Antichristian kingdom." Christliche Dogmatik, Konigsberg, 1852, vol. ii. p. 736.

CHAPTER IV: THE CONCOMITANTS OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

THE CONCOMITANTS OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

THE events which according to the common doctrine of the Church are to attend the second coming of Christ, are first, the general resurrection of the dead; second, the final judgment; third, "the end of the world;" and fourth, the consummation of the kingdom of Christ.

---

§ 1. The General Resurrection.

That there is to be a general resurrection of the just and of the unjust, is not, among Christians, a matter of doubt. Already in the book of Daniel xii. 2, it is said, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as stars for ever and ever." This prediction our Lord repeats without any limitation. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are it the graves 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 damnation." (John v. 28, 29.) Again: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations." (Matt. xxv. 31, 32.) Paul, in his speech before Felix (Acts xxiv. 15), avowed it as his own faith and that of his fathers that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." John (Rev. xx. 12, 13) says: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the

dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell gave up the dead which were in them."

The Time of this General Resurrection.

The uniform representation of Scripture on this subject is that this general resurrection is to take place "at the last day," or, at the second coming of Christ. The same form of expression is used to designate the time when the people of Christ are to rise, and the time when the general resurrection is to occur. The Bible, if the doubtful passage Revelation x. 4-6 be excepted, never speaks of any other than one resurrection. The dead, according to the Scriptures, are to rise together, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. When Christ comes, all who are in their graves shall come forth, some to the resurrection of life, and others to the resurrection of damnation. When in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, it is said, "The dead in Christ shall rise first," it does not mean that there are to be two resurrections, one of those who are in Christ, and the other of those who are not in Him. The Apostle is speaking of a different subject. He comforts the Thessalonians with the assurance, that their friends who sleep in Jesus shall not miss their part in the glories of the second advent. Those then alive should not prevent, i.e., precede, those who were asleep; but, the dead in Christ should rise before those then living should be changed; and then both should be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. The parallel passage is in 1 Corinthians xv. 51, 52, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."

In 1 Corinthians xv. 23, 24, the Apostle, when speaking of the

resurrection, says: "Every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end." This passage is often understood to teach that the resurrection takes place in the following order: (1.) That of Christ. (2.) That of his people. (3.) Then that of the rest of mankind. And as the resurrection of Christ and that of his people are separated by a long interval; so the resurrection of the people of God and the general resurrection may also be separated by an interval of greater or less duration. This interpretation supposes that the word "end," as here used, means the end of the resurrection. To this, however, it maybe objected, (1.) That it is opposed to the constant "usus loquendi" of the New Testament. The "end," when thus used, always elsewhere means the end of the world. In 1 Peter iv. 7, it is said: "The end of all things is at hand." Matthew xxiv. 6, "The end is not yet;" verse 14, "Then shall the end come." So in Mark xiii. 7, Luke xxi. 9. In all these passages the "end" means the end of the world. (2.) The equivalent expressions serve to explain the meaning of the term. The disciples asked our Lord, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming and of the end of the world?" In answer to that question Christ said that certain things were to happen, but, "the end is not yet;" and afterwards, "then cometh the end." (Matt. xxiv. 3, 6, 14.) The same expression occurs in the same sense, Matthew xiii. 39, xxviii. 20, and elsewhere. (3.) What immediately follows in verse 24, seems decisive in favour of this interpretation. The end spoken of is when Christ shall have delivered up his kingdom; that is, when the whole work of redemption shall have been consummated. (4.) It is further to be remarked that in 1 Corinthians xv. Paul does not make the slightest reference to the resurrection of the wicked, from the beginning to the end of the chapter. The whole concerns the resurrection of believers.

That was what the errorists in Corinth denied; and that was what the Apostle undertook to prove to be certain and desirable. Christ certainly rose from the dead; so all his people shall rise; but each in his order; first, Christ, then they who are Christ's; then comes the end; the end of all things. To make this refer to another and general resurrection, would be to introduce a subject entirely foreign to the matter in hand.

Meyer, although he makes telos in the 24th verse refer to the resurrection, nevertheless says [860] "That it is the constant doctrine of the New Testament (leaving the Apocalypse out of view), that with the coming of Christ the finis hujus sæculi' is connected, so that the Second Advent is the termination of the ante-messianic, and the commencement of the future world-period."

Luthardt says, [861] "Then, not before the resurrection, . . . comes the end; the end, not of the resurrection, that is the resurrection of others than believers, but the absolute end; the end of history."

Whether the end of all things is to follow the resurrection of believers immediately, or long afterwards, is, in his view, a different question. He admits that the common view is that the coming of Christ, the general resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, the end of the world, and the new heavens and new earth, are to occur contemporaneously. His own view is different.

That the New Testament does teach that the general resurrection is to occur at the time of the Second Advent appears: --

1. From such passages as the following; In the passage in Daniel, quoted above, it is said, that the righteous and the wicked are to rise together; the one to life, the other to shame and everlasting contempt. This passage our Lord reiterates, saying that "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves 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 damnation." (John v. 28, 29.) In Matthew xxv. 31, 32, it is said, that when the Son of Man shall appear in his glory all nations shall stand before him. The same is said in Revelation xx. 12, 13. In 2 Thessalonians i. 7-10, it is taught that when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, it will be to take vengeance on those who obey not the Gospel, and to be glorified in all them that believe. In all these passages the resurrection of the righteous is declared to be contemporaneous with that of the wicked.

2. There is another class of passages which teach that the resurrection of the righteous is to take place at "the last day," and, therefore, not a thousand years before that event. Thus Martha, speaking of her brother Lazarus, said, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." (John xi. 24.) Our Lord, in John vi. 39, says that it is the Father's will "that of all which He hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." This declaration is repeated in verses 40, 44, 54, comp. xii. 48: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." It is true that the expressions "the last time," "the last day," "the end of days," "the end of the world," are often used very indefinitely in Scripture. They often mean nothing more than "hereafter." But this is not true with the phrase en te eschate hemera as used in these passages. "In the last day," is a known and definite period. It is to be remembered also that what is predicted to happen on "the last day," is elsewhere said to take place when Christ shall appear in his glory.

3. A third class of passages teach that the resurrection of the saints is to take place at the day of judgment and in connection with that event. According to the common representations of Scripture, when

Christ shall come the second time, the dead are to rise, all nations are to be judged, and the present order of things is to cease. The heavens are to retain Christ, "until the time of restitution of all things." (Acts iii. 21.) This apokatastasis "die Wiederherstellung aller Dinge in ihren frühern vollkommnern Zustand," [862] the restoration of all things to their original perfect condition. "This consummation may be called a restitution,' in allusion to a circle which returns into itself, or more probably because it really involves the healing of all curable disorder and the restoration to communion with the Deity of all that He has chosen to be so restored. Till this great cycle has achieved its revolution, and this great remedial process has accomplished its design, the glorified body of the risen and ascended Christ not only may, but must, as an appointed means of that accomplishment, be resident in heaven, and not on earth." [863] The general resurrection is represented as connected with the final judgment, in Matthew xxiv. 30, 31, and xxv. 31-46, 2 Thessalonians i. 7-10, and elsewhere. On this point Dr. Julius Müller says: "It is the plain doctrine of Scripture that the general resurrection of the dead contemporaneous with the transfiguration of believers then living on earth is to occur at the end of the world (or of history), at the reappearance of Christ for judgment and for the glorification of his kingdom. . . . . With this consummation of Christ's kingdom, and the therewith connected apolutrosis tou somatos hemon apo tes douleias tes phthoras, the Apostle, in the profound passage, Romans viii. 19-23, sets forth, as also connected with these events, the renovation of the nature of the earth and its exaltation to a participation in the glory of the children of God. As the body of man stands in intimate relation with nature, ... it is scarcely possible to form any idea of the resurrection of the body . . . . without assuming a corresponding

exaltation of the external world as the theatre of his new life. This renovation of nature, the new heavens and the new earth, takes for granted, according to the Apostle, the destruction of the world as it now is." [864] With these views, which accord with the common doctrine of the Church, Lange avows his entire agreement. [865]

The only passage which seems to teach that there is to be a first and second resurrection of the body, the former being confined to martyrs and more or fewer of the saints, and the latter including "the rest of the dead," is Revelation xx. 4-6. It must be admitted that that passage, taken by itself, does seem to teach the doctrine founded upon it. But --

1. it is a sound rule in the interpretation of Scripture that obscure passages should be so explained as to make them agree with those that are plain. It is unreasonable to make the symbolic and figurative language of prophecy and poetry the rule by which to explain the simple didactic prose language of the Bible. It is no less unreasonable that a multitude of passages should be taken out of their natural sense to make them accord with a single passage of doubtful import.

2. It is conceded that the Apocalypse is an obscure book. This almost every reader knows from his own experience; and it is proved to be true, the few who imagine it to be plain to the contrary notwithstanding, by the endless diversity of interpretations to which it has been subjected. This diversity exists not only between commentators of different classes, as rationalistic and orthodox, but between those of the same class, and even of the same school. This remark, which applies to the whole book, applies with special force to the passage under consideration.

3. The Bible speaks of a spiritual, or figurative, as well as of a literal resurrection. This figure is used both in reference to

individuals and in reference to communities. The sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, is said to be quickened and raised again in Christ Jesus. (Rom. vi. and Eph. ii.) Whole communities when elevated from a state of depression and misery, are in prophetic language said to be raised from the dead. (Rom. xi. 15; Is. xxvi. 19.) "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." (Ez. xxxvii. 12.) "I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." More than this, Elias is said to have lived again in John the Baptist; and, according to a common interpretation, the two witnesses spoken of in the Apocalypse are Moses and Elias, who are to rise not in person, but as represented by men filled with the same spirit, endued with similar gifts, and called to exercise the same offices. It would, therefore, not be inconsistent with the analogy of prophecy if we should understand the Apostle as here predicting that a new race of men were to arise filled with the spirit of the martyrs, and were to live and reign with Christ a thousand years. According to Hengstenberg, the Apostle saw the souls of the martyrs in heaven. There they were enthroned. This was their first resurrection. "There can be no doubt," he says, "that by the first resurrection we are here primarily to understand that first stage of blessedness." [866]

4. John does not say that the bodies of the martyrs are to be raised from the dead. He says: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus." The resurrection of the dead is never thus spoken of in Scripture. There is a sense in which the martyrs are said to live again, but nothing is said of their rising again from their graves. The first resurrection may be spiritual, and the second literal. There may be a time of great prosperity in the Church, in

which it will be a great blessing to participate. It is said that there is no force in this argument, as the Apostle does not speak of a resurrection of souls. He simply says he saw the souls of the martyrs; as in chapter vi. 9, it is said: "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God." The prophet, according to xx. 4, first saw the martyrs in the state of the dead, and then he saw them alive. The argument, however, is not founded merely on the use of the word "souls," but on the fact that the resurrection of the dead is never spoken of in the Scriptures in the way in which the living again of the martyrs is here described.

5. The common millenarian doctrine is, that there is to be a literal resurrection when Christ shall come to reign in person upon the earth, a thousand years before the end of the world, and that the risen saints are to dwell here and share with Christ in the glories of his reign. But this seems to be inconsistent with what is taught in 1 Corinthians xv. 50. Paul there says: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." It is here expressly asserted that our bodies as now constituted are not adapted to the state of things which shall exist when the kingdom of God is inaugurated. We must all be changed. From this it follows that the spiritual body is not adapted to our present mode of existence; that is, it is not suited or designed for an earthly kingdom. Luthardt admits this. He admits that the renovated, or transfigured, body of necessity supposes a renovated earth. He admits also that when the bodies of believers are thus changed they are to be caught up from the earth, and are to dwell with Christ in heaven. When Christ appears, his people are to appear with Him in glory. Bengel, and after him others, endeavour to reconcile these admissions with the theory of an earthly kingdom of glory, by assuming that risen saints

are, to rule this kingdom, not from the literal Jerusalem, but from heaven. This, however, is to introduce an extra-scriptural and conjectural idea.

6. It has already been said, when speaking of the restoration of the Jews to their own land, that this whole theory of a splendid earthly kingdom is a relic of Judaism, and out of keeping with the spirituality of the Gospel. [867]

All this is said with diffidence and submission. The interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy experience teaches is exceedingly precarious. There is every reason to believe that the predictions concerning the second advent of Christ, and the events which are to attend and follow it, will disappoint the expectations of commentators, as the expectations of the Jews were disappointed in the manner in which the prophecies concerning the first advent were accomplished.

---

[860] Commentar über das Neue Testament, 2d edit., Göttingen, 1849, vol. v. p. 323.

[861] Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Leipzig, 1861, p. 127.

[862] De Wette, Exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Leipzig, 1845, vol. i. part 4, p. 48.

[863] The Acts of the Apostles Explained. By Joseph Addison Alexander. New York. 1857, vol. i. p. 118.

[864] Studien und Kritiken, 1835, pp. 783-785.

[865] Lehre von den letzten Dingen, Meurs, 1841, pp. 246, 247.

[866] The Revelation of St. John Expounded, edit. Edinburgh, 1852, vol. ii. p. 281.

[867] The interpretation of this whole passage (Rev. xx. 1-6) is thoroughly discussed in the very able work of the Rev. David Brown, of St. James' Free Church, Glasgow, entitled Christ's Second Coming: Will

it be Pre-Millenial? chapter x. edit. New York, 1851, p. 218 ff.

---

§ 2. The Final Judgment.

The Scriptures abound in passages which set forth God as the moral ruler of men; which declare that He will judge the world in righteousness. The Bible represents Him as the judge of nations and of individuals; as the avenger of the poor and the persecuted. It abounds also in promises and in threatenings, and in illustrations of the righteous judgments of God. Nothing, therefore, is plainer than that men in this world are subject to the moral government of God. Besides this, the Bible also teaches that there is a future state of reward and punishment, in which the inequalities and anomalies here permitted shall be adjusted. According to some, this is all that the Bible teaches on the subject. What is said of the punishment of the wicked and of the reward of the righteous is to be understood in this general way. This is the doctrine of the common school of Rationalists. [868] Bretschneider [869] admits, however, that reason has nothing to object to the Church doctrine on this subject properly understood.

A second view of the last judgment assumes it to be a process now m progress. In the Old Testament the Messianic period is spoken of as the "last day," "the last time," "the end of days," "the end of the world," and is represented as a time of conflict and of judgment. The Jews expected that when the Messiah came, the severest judgments would fall upon the heathen, and that the chosen people would be greatly exalted and blessed. This was the day of judgment. Those who give substantially the same interpretation to the Old Testament prophecies, hold that the day of judgment covers the whole period between the first and second advents of Christ.

A third doctrine is that the world in its progress works out all

possible manifestations of God, so that according to the stereotyped dictum of Schelling, Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht; the history of the world is the judgment of the world. Premillenarians use precisely the same words, although not in the same philosophical sense. With them "to judge" is to reign; and when Christ comes to establish his personal reign upon earth, the last judgment will begin, and "the judgment of God is the administration of the government of God." [870]

A fourth theory may be mentioned. There are certain immutable laws, either independent, as some say, of the will of God, or dependent on his voluntary constitution, which secure that the righteous shall be happy and the wicked miserable; and this is all that either reason or Scripture, properly understood, teaches of rewards and punishment.

A fifth doctrine is that the day of judgment is a protracted future dispensation, as just mentioned, to commence with the second advent of Christ, and to continue during the thousand years of his personal reign upon the earth. This theory is connected with the doctrine of the pre-millenial advent of Christ.

The Church Doctrine.

By the Church doctrine is meant that doctrine which is held by the Church universal; by Romanists and Protestants in the West, and by the Greeks in the East. That doctrine includes the following points: --

1. The final judgment is a definite future event (not a protracted process), when the eternal destiny of men and of angels shall be finally determined and publicly manifested. That this is the doctrine of the Bible, is proved by such passages as the following: Matthew xi. 24, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee;" Matthew xiii. 30, "Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the taxes, and bind them in bundles

to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn;" verse 39, "The harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels;" verse 49, "So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just;" John xii. 48, "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day;" Acts xviii. 31, God "hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness;" Romans ii. 5, "The day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God;" and 1 Corinthians iv. 5, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come." It is true that the word "day" in Scripture is often used for an indefinite period; as "the day of the Lord," is the time of the Lord. And, therefore, it does not follow from the use of this word, that the judgment is to be commenced and ended in the apace of twenty-four hours. Nevertheless, the way in which the word is used in this connection, and the circumstances with which the judgment is connected, show that a definite and limited period, and not a protracted dispensation, is intended by the term. The appearance of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the gathering of the nations, are not events which are to be protracted through years or centuries.

2. Christ is to be the judge. John v. 22, 23, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father;" verse 27, "And hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man." Peter, in Acts x. 34-43, says that God "anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power;" had "raised" Him from the dead "and shewed him openly," and "commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." Paul, in his speech on Mars Hill, tells the Athenians that God "hath appointed a day, in the which He will

judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31.) And in 2 Corinthians v. 10, he says, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ." Our Lord says that He will say to the wicked, "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. v. 28; Luke xiii. 27.) In all the graphic descriptions gives in the New Testament of the process of the final judgment, Christ is represented as acting as the judge. On this point it is to be observed: (1.) That He is set forth as acting on his own authority; and not merely as the "Bevollmächter," or plenipotentiary of God. Everywhere in the New Testament, our responsibility is said to be to Him. We are to stand before his judgment-seat. He will say, "Depart from me, ye cursed." It is He, who is to bring every secret thing into judgment. (2.) He is qualified thus to sit in judgment on men and angels; because He is omniscient, and infinite in justice and mercy. (3.) It is especially appropriate that the man Christ Jesus, God manifest in the flesh, should be the judge of all men. He has this authority committed to Him because He is the Son of man; because, although in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, He humbled Himself to be found in fashion as a man. This is part of his exaltation, due to Him because He consented to become obedient unto death. It is meet that He who stood condemned at the bar of Pilate, should sit enthroned on the seat of universal judgment. It is a joy and ground of special confidence to all believers, that He who loved them and gave Himself for them, shall be their judge on the last day.

3. This judgment is to take place at the second coming of Christ and at the general resurrection. Therefore it is not a process now in progress; it does not take place at death; it is not a protracted

period prior to the general resurrection. A few of the passages bearing on this point are the following: In the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. xiii. 37-43), already referred to, we are taught that the final separation between the righteous and the wicked is to take place at the end of the world, when the Son of Man shall send forth his angels to gather out of his kingdom all things that offend. This implies that the general resurrection, the second advent, and the last judgment, are contemporaneous events. The Bible knows nothing of three personal advents of Christ: one at the time of the incarnation; a second before the millennium; and a third to judge the world. He who came in the flesh, is to come a second time without sin unto salvation. Matthew xvi. 27, "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works." Matthew xxiv. 29-35, teaches that when the sign of the Son of Man appears in the heavens, all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, and the elect shall be gathered in Matthew xxv. 31-46 sets forth the whole process of the judgment. When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, all nations shall be gathered before Him, and He shall separate them as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats; and then shall He say to those on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father; and to those on the left, Depart from me, ye cursed. 1 Corinthians iv. 5, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God." When Christ comes, the general judgment is to occur. In 2 Thessalonians i. 7-10, it is taught that when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven, it will be for the double purpose of taking vengeance on them that know not God, and of being glorified in all them that believe. In 2 Timothy iv. 1, it is said: The Lord Jesus

Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom." In the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, the Apostle expressly teaches that corruption cannot inherit incorruption, that our present vile bodies must be changed before they can enter the kingdom of God; and this change from the natural to the spiritual, from mortal to immortal, is to take place at the last trump; and in Philippians iii. 20, 21, he says it is to occur when Christ comes from heaven, who shall fashion our bodies like unto his own glorious body. In all these different ways it is taught that the general judgment is to take place at the second coming of Christ.

4. The persons to be judged are men and angels. In several passages already quoted it is said that Christ is to come to judge "the quick and the dead;" in others it is said, "all nations are to stand before Him;" in others, that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ ;" in others again it is said that "He will render to every man according to his works." This judgment, therefore, is absolutely universal; it includes both small and great; and all the generations of men. With regard to the evil angels, it is said that God "delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Pet. ii. 4.) Satan is said to be the God of this world. The conflict in which believers are engaged in this life, is with principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in heaven, en tois epouraniois. This conflict is to continue until the Second Advent, when Satan and his angels are to be cast into the pit.

The older theologians speculated on the manner in which the judgment is to be arranged, so as to admit of the countless millions of human beings who shall have lived from the beginning of the world to the final consummation being so congregated as to be all gathered before the throne of the Son of Man. The common answer to that difficulty was

that the throne is to be so exalted and so glorious as to be visible, as are the sun and moons from a large part of the earth's surface at the same time. These, however, are questions about which we need give ourselves no concern; these descriptions of the judgment are designed to teach us moral truths, and not the physical phenomena by which the solemn adjudication on the destiny of men is to be attended.

5. The ground or matter of judgment is said to be the "deeds done in the body," men are to be judged "according to their works;" "the secrets of the heart" are to be brought to light. God's judgment will not be founded on the professions, or the relations of men, or on the appearance or reputation which they sustain among their fellows, but on their real character and on their acts, however secret and covered from the sight of men those acts may have been. God will not be mocked and cannot be deceived; the character of every man will be clearly revealed. (1.) In the sight of God. (2.) In the sight of the man himself. All self deception will be banished. Every man will see himself as he appears in the sight of God. His memory will probably prove an indelible register of all his sinful acts and thoughts and feelings. His conscience will be so enlightened as to recognize the justice of the sentence which the righteous judge shall pronounce upon him. All whom Christ condemns will be self-condemned. (3.) There will be such a revelation of the character of every man to all around him, or to all who know him, as shall render the justice of the sentence of condemnation or acquittal apparent. Beyond this the representations of Scripture do not require us to go.

Besides these general representations of Scripture that the character and conduct of men is the ground on which the final sentence is to be pronounced, there is clear intimation in the Word of God, that, so far as those who hear the Gospel are concerned, their future destiny

depends on the attitude which they assume to Christ. He came to his own, and his own received Him not; but to as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God. He is God manifest in the flesh; He came into the world to save sinners; all who receive Him as their God and Saviour, are saved; all who refuse to recognize and trust Him, perish. They are condemned already, because they have not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. When the Jews asked our Lord, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? his answer was, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent." In the solemn account given of the last judgment in Matthew xxv. 31-46, the inquest concerns the conduct of men towards Christ. And the Apostle says, If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ let him be Anathema Maranatha. The special ground of condemnation, therefore, under the Gospel is unbelief; the refusal to receive Christ in the character in which He is presented for our acceptance.

6. Men are to be judged according to the light which they have severally enjoyed. The servant that knew his Lord's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew it not, shall be beaten with few stripes. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Our Lord says that it shall be more tolerable, in the day of judgment, for Tyre and Sidon, than for the men of his generation. Paul says that the heathen are inexcusable, because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God; and he lays down the principle that they who sin without law, shall be judged without law;

and that they who have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law.

7. At the judgment of the last day the destiny of the righteous and of the wicked shall be unalterably determined. Each class shall be assigned to its final abode. This is taught in the solemn words: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

How far the descriptions of the process of the last judgment, given in the Bible, are to be understood literally, it is useless to inquire.

Two things are remarkable about the prophecies of Scripture, which have already been accomplished. The one is that the fulfilment has, in many cases, been very different from that which a literal interpretation led men to anticipate. The other is, that in some cases they have been fulfilled even to the most minute details. These facts should render us modest in our interpretation of those predictions which remain to be accomplished; satisfied that what we know not now we shall know hereafter.

---

[868] J. A. L. Wegscheider, Institutiones Theologicæ, IV. ii. 99; 5th edit. Halle, 1826, p. 614 ff.

[869] Dogmatik der evangelischen Kirche, § 172, 3d edit. Leipzig, 1828; vol. ii. p. 445.

[870] The Last Times, by Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Philadelphia, 1866, p. 141.

---

§ 3. The End of the World.

The principal passages of Scriptures relating to the final consummation or the end of the world, are the following: Psalm iii. 25, 26, "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all

of them shall wax old as a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed." Isaiah li. 6, "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment." Isaiah lxv. 17, "Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." Luke xxi. 33, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." Romans viii. 19-21, "The earnest expectation of the creature (ktisis, creation) waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." 2 Peter iii. 6-13, "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . . The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up. . . . . Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Revelation xx. 11, "I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them." Revelation xxi. 1, "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."

Remarks.

1. These passages are not to be understood as predicting great political and moral revolutions. It is possible that some of them might

bear that interpretation; but others are evidently intended to be understood in a more literal sense. This is especially the case with 2 Peter iii. 6-13, in which the Apostle contrasts the destruction of the world by the waters of the deluge with the destruction by fire which is still future. If the fact be established that the Scriptures anywhere clearly predict the destruction of the world at the last day, that fact becomes a rule for the interpretation of the more doubtful passages. There is nothing in this predicted destruction of our earth out of analogy with the course of nature. Stars once clearly visible in the firmament, after a brief period of unusual splendour, have disappeared; to all appearance they have been burnt up. Scientific men tell us that there is abundant evidence that the earth was once in a state of fusion; and there are causes in operation which are adequate to reduce it to that state again, whenever God sees fit to put them unto operation.

2. The destruction here foretold is not annihilation. (a.) The world is to be burnt up; but combustion is not a destruction of substance. It is merely a change of state or condition. (b.) The destruction of the world by water and its destruction by fire are analogous events; the former was not annihilation, therefore the second is not. (c.) The destruction spoken of is elsewhere called a palingenesia, regeneration (Matt. xix. 28); an apoka tastasis, a restoration (Acts iii. 21); a deliverance from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 21). The Apostle teaches that our vile bodies are to be fashioned like unto the glorious body of Christ, and that a similar change is to take place in the world we inhabit. There are to be new heavens and a new earth, just as we are to have new bodies. Our bodies are not to be annihilated, but changed. (d.) There is no evidence, either from Scripture or experience, that any substance has ever been annihilated. If force be motion, it may

cease; but cessation of motion is not annihilation, and the common idea in out day, among men of science, is that no force is ever lost; it is, as they say, only transformed. However this may be, it is a purely gratuitous assumption that any substance has ever passed out of existence. In all the endless and complicated changes which have been going on, from the beginning, in our earth and throughout the universe, nothing, so far as known, has ever ceased to be. Of course He who creates can destroy; the question, however, concerns the purpose, and not the power of God; and He has never, either in his word or in his works, revealed his purpose to destroy anything He has once created. Many of the old theologians, especially among the Lutherans, understood the Bible to teach the absolute annihilation of our world. Schmid [871] states as the Lutheran doctrine that the world is to be reduced to nothing (in Nichts sich auflösen). He quotes Baier, Hollaz, and Quenstedt in support of this view. Quenstedt [872] says: "Forma consummationis hujus non in nuda qualitatum immutatione, alteratione seu innovatione, sed in ipsius substantiæ mundi totali abolitione et in nihilum reductione consistit." Gerhard [873] takes the same view: "Formam consummationis dicimus fore non nudam qualitatum alterationem, sed ipsius substantiæ abolitionem, adeoque totalem annihilationem, ut sic terminus a quo consummationis sive destructionis sit esse,' terminus vero ad quem non esse' sive nihil." He admits, however, that many of the fathers and Luther himself were on the other side. He quotes Irenæus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom, as in favour of mutation and against annihilation. Luther was wont to say: "The heavens have their work-day clothes on; hereafter they will have on their Sunday garments." Most of the Reformed theologians generally oppose the idea of annihilation. Turrettin certainly does. [874] One of his questions is: "Qualis futuris sit mundi interitus? An

per ultimam conflagrationem sit annihilandus, an instaurandus et renovandus?" He argues throughout in favour of the latter.

3. The subject of the change which is to take place at the last day is not the whole material universe, but our earth and what pertains to it. (a.) It is true the Bible says: "Heaven and earth are to pass away," and by heaven and earth the Scriptures often mean the universe; and it would therefore be consistent with the language of Scripture to hold that the whole universe is to be changed at the last day. It was natural that this interpretation should be put upon the language of the Bible so long as our earth was regarded as the central body of the universe and sun, moon, and stars as subordinate luminaries, intended simply for the benefit of the inhabitants of our world. "Wenn der Tanz," says Strauss, [875] "zu Ende ist, bläst der Wirth die Lichter aus." The case however assumes a different aspect when we know that our earth and even our solar system is a mere speck in the immensity of God's works. It is one of the unmistakable evidences of the divine origin of the Scriptures, that they are written on such a high level that all the mutations of human science take place beneath them without ever coming into collision with their teachings. They could be read by those who believed that the sun moves round the earth, without their convictions being shocked by their statements; and they can be read by us who know that the earth moves round the sun, with the same satisfaction and confidence. Whether the heaven and earth which are to pass away are the whole material universe, or only our earth and its atmospheric heavens, the language of the Scripture leaves undecided. Either view is perfectly consistent with the meaning of the words employed. The choice between the two views is to be determined by other considerations. (b.) The à priori probability is overwhelming in favour of the more limited interpretation. Anything so stupendous as the

passing away of the whole universe as the last act of the drama of human history would be altogether out of keeping. (c.) The Bible concerns man. The earth was cursed for his transgression. That curse is to be removed when man s redemption is completed. The ktisis that was made subject to vanity for man's sin, is our earth; and our earth is the ktisis which is to be delivered from the bondage of corruption. The change to be effected is in the dwelling-place of man. (d.) According to the Apostle Peter, it is the world which once was destroyed by water, that is to be consumed by fire. But although the predictions of Scripture concern only our earth, it does not follow that the material universe is to last forever. As it is not from eternity, it probably will not last forever. It may be only one of the grand exhibitions of the wonderful working of God in the field of infinite space, and in the course of unending ages.

4. The result of this change is said to be the introduction of a new heavens and a new earth. This is set forth not only in the use of these terms, but in calling the predicted change "a regeneration," "a restoration," a deliverance from the bondage of corruption and an introduction into the glorious liberty of the Son of God. This earth, according to the common opinion, that is, this renovated earth, is to be the final seat of Christ's kingdom. This is the new heavens; this is the New Jerusalem, the Mount Zion in which are to be gathered the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven; the spirits of just men made perfect; this is the heavenly Jerusalem; the city of the living God; the kingdom prepared for his people before the foundation of the world.

5. It is of course, in itself, no matter of interest what portion of space these new heavens and new earth are to occupy, or of what materials they are to be formed. As the resurrection bodies of

believers are to be human bodies they must have a local habitation, although it be one not made with hands eternal in the heavens. All we know about it is that it will be glorious, and adapted to the spiritual bodies which those in Christ are to receive when He comes the second time unto salvation.

---

[871] Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, von Heinrich Schmid, Professor de Theologie in Erlangen; Frankfort and Erlangen, 1853; p. 506.

[872] Theologia Didactico-Polemica, edit. Leipzig, 1715.

[873] Loci Theologici, XXX. v. 37; Tübingen, 1779, vol. xx. pp. 51, 52.

[874] Institutio, XX. v.; edit. Edinburgh, 1847, vol. iii. p. 506.

[875] Dogmatik, 104; Tübingen, vol. ii. p. 665.

---

§ 4. The Kingdom of Heaven.

In the account given of the final judgment in Matthew xxv. 31-46, we are told that the King shall "say to those on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom we prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

1. In the Old Testament it was predicted that God would set up a kingdom, which was to be universal and everlasting.

2. Of this kingdom the Messiah was to be the head. He is everywhere in the Old Testament set forth as a king. (See Gen. xlix. 10; Num. xxiv. 17; 2 Sam. vii. 16; Is. ix. 6, 7; xi.; lii.; liii.; Mich. iv.; and Psalms ii.; xlv.; lxxii.; and cx.)

3. It is called, for obvious reasons, in the Scriptures, indifferently, the kingdom of God, the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of the Son of Man (Matt. xiii. 41) and the kingdom of heaven.

4. It is described in the prophets in the most glowing terms, in

figures borrowed partly from the paradisiacal state of men, and partly from the state of the theocracy during the reign of Solomon.

5. This kingdom belongs to Christ, not as the Logos, but as the Son of Man, the Theanthropos; God manifest in the flesh.

6. Its twofold foundation, as presented in the Bible, is the possession on the part of Christ of all divine attributes, and his work of redemption. (Heb. i. 3; Phil. ii. 6-11.) It is because He being equal with God, "humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," that "God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." All power in heaven and earth has been given into his hands; and all things, ta panta, the universe, put under his feet. Even the angels are his ministering spirits, sent by Him to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation.

7. This messianic or mediatorial kingdom of Christ, being thus comprehensive, is presented in different aspects in the Word of God. Viewed as extending over all creatures, it is a kingdom of power, which, according to 1 Corinthians xv. 24, He shall deliver up to God even the Father, when his mediatorial work is accomplished. Viewed in relation to his own people on earth it is the kingdom of grace. They all recognize Him as their absolute proprietor and sovereign. They all confide in his protection, and devote themselves to his service. He rules in them and reigns over them, and subdues all their and his enemies. Viewed in relation to the whole body of the redeemed, when the work of redemption is consummated, it is the kingdom of glory, the kingdom of heaven, in the highest sense of the words. In this view his kingdom is everlasting. His headship over his people is to continue

forever, and his dominion over those whom He has purchased with his blood shall never end.

8. As this kingdom is thus manifold, so also it is, in some of its aspects, progressive. It is represented in Scripture as passing through different stages. In prophecy it is spoken of as a stone cut out without hands, which became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. In Daniel vii. 14, it is said of the Messiah that to Him "there was given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him." So, too, in Psalm ii. 8, it is written of Him, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for the inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession; in Psalm lxxii. 11, "All nations shall serve Him;" verse 17, "All nations shall call Him blessed;" in Psalm lxxxvi. 9, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name;" in Isaiah xlix. 6, "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth;" in Habakkuk ii. 14, "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea;" and in Malachi i. 11, "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles." The Scriptures abound with passages of similar import. It is not only asserted that the kingdom of Christ is to attain this universal extension by slow degrees, but its gradual progress is illustrated in various ways. Our Lord compares his kingdom to a grain of mustard-seed, which is indeed the least of all seeds, but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs; and to heaven which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

9. Although God has always had a kingdom upon earth, yet the kingdom of which the prophets speak began in its messianic form when the Son of

God came in the flesh. John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, came preaching that the kingdom of God was at hand. Our Lord Himself, it is said, went from village to village, preaching the kingdom of God. (Luke iv. 43; viii. 1.) When asked by Pilate whether He was a king, he "answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world." (John xviii. 37). The Apostles wherever they went "testified the kingdom of God." (Acts xxviii. 23.) Their business was to call upon men to receive the Lord Jesus as the Christ, the anointed and predicted Messiah or king of his people, and to worship, love, trust and obey Him as such. They were, therefore, accused of acting contrary to "the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus." (Acts xvii. 7.) Men are exhorted to seek first the kingdom of God, as a present good. It is compared to a pearl or treasure, for which it were wise for a man to sacrifice everything. Every believer receives Christ as his king. Those who receive Him in sincerity constitute his kingdom, in the sense in which the loyal subjects of an earthly sovereign constitute his kingdom. Those who profess allegiance to Christ as king constitute his visible kingdom upon earth. Nothing, therefore, can be more opposed to the plain teaching of the New Testament, than that the kingdom of Christ is yet future and is not to be inaugurated until his second coming. This is to confound its consummation with its commencement.

10. As to the nature of this kingdom, our Lord Himself teaches us that it is not of this world. It is not analogous to the kingdoms which exist among men. It is not a kingdom of earthly splendour, wealth, or power. It does not concern the civil or political affairs of men, except in their moral relations. Its rewards and enjoyments are not the good things of this world. It is said to consist in "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. xiv. 17.) Christ told his

hearers, "The kingdom of God is within you." The condition of admission into that kingdom is regeneration (John iii. 5), conversion (Matt. xviii. 3), holiness of heart and life, for the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God; nor thieves, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Eph v. 5).

11. This kingdom, in the interval between the first and second advents of Christ, is said to be like a field in which the wheat and tares are to grow together until the harvest, which is the end of the world. Then "the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall east them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. xiii. 41-43.) Experience concurs with Scripture in teaching that the kingdom of Christ passes through many vicissitudes; that it has its times of depression and its seasons of exaltation and prosperity. About this in the past, there can be no doubt. Prophecy sheds a sufficiently clear light on the future to teach us, not only that this alternation is to continue to the end, but, more definitely, that before the second coming of Christ there is to be a time of great and long continued prosperity, to be followed by a season of decay and of suffering, so that when the Son of Man comes he shall hardly find faith on the earth. It appears from passages already quoted that all nations are to be converted; that the Jews are to be brought in and reingrafted into their own olive-tree; and that their restoration is to be the occasion and the cause of a change from death unto life; that is, analogous to the change of a body mouldering in the grave to one instinct with joyous activity and power. Of this period the ancient prophets speak in terms adapted to raise the hopes of the Church to the highest pitch. It is true it is difficult to separate, in

their descriptions, what refers to "this latter day of glory" from what relates to the kingdom of Christ as consummated in heaven. So also it was difficult for the ancient people of God to separate what, in the declarations of their prophets, referred to the redemption of the people from Babylon from what referred to the greater redemption to be effected by the Messiah. In both cases enough is plain to satisfy the Church. There was a redemption from Babylon, and there was a redemption by Christ; and in like manner, it is hoped, there is to be a period of millenial glory on earth, and a still more glorious consummation of the Church in heaven. This period is called a millennium because in Revelation it is said to last a thousand years, an expression which is perhaps generally understood literally. Some however think it means a protracted season of indefinite duration, as when it is said that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years. Others, assuming that in the prophetic language a day stands for a year, assume that the so-called millennium is to last three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. During this period, be it longer or shorter, the Church is to enjoy a season of peace, purity, and blessedness such as it has never yet experienced.

The principal reason for assuming that the prophets predict a glorious state of the Church prior to the second advent, is, that they represent the Church as being thus prosperous and glorious on earth. But we know that when Christ comes again the heavens and earth are to pass away, and that no more place will be found for them. The seat of the Church, after the second coming, is not to be the earth, but a new heavens and a new earth. As therefore the Scriptures teach that the kingdom of Christ is to extend over all the earth; that all nations are to serve Him; and that all people shall call Him blessed; it is to be inferred that these predictions refer to a state of things which is to exist

before the second coming of Christ. This state is described as one of spiritual prosperity; God will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh; knowledge shall everywhere abound; wars shall cease to the ends of the earth, and there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord. This does not imply that there is to be neither sin nor sorrow in the world during this long period, or that all men are to be true Christians. The tares are to grow together with the wheat until the harvest. The means of grace will still be needed; conversion and sanctification will be then what they ever have been. It is only a higher measure of the good which the Church has experienced in the past that we are taught to anticipate in the future. This however is not the end. After this and after the great apostasy which is to follow, comes the consummation.

The Consummation.

12. When Christ comes again it will be to be admired in all them that believe. Those who are then alive will be changed, in the twinkling of an eye; their corruptible shall put on incorruption, and their mortal shall put on immortality. Those who are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man and come forth to the resurrection of life, their bodies fashioned like into the glorious body of the Son of God. Thus changed, both classes shall be ever with the Lord.

The place of the final abode of the righteous is sometimes called a house; as when the Saviour said: "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John xiv. 2); sometimes "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." (Heb. xi. 10.) Under this figure it is called the new or heavenly Jerusalem, so gorgeously described in the twenty-first chapter of the Apocalypse. Sometimes it is spoken of as "a better country, that is an heavenly" (Heb. xi. 16); a country through which flows the river of the water of life, and "on either side of the

river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve Him: and they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there: and they need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever." (Rev. xxii. 2-5.) Sometimes the final abode of the redeemed is called a "new heavens and a new earth." (2 Pet. iii. 13.)

As to the blessedness of this heavenly state we know that it is inconceivable: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." (1 Cor. ii. 9.)

"We know not, O we know not,
What joys await us there;
What radiancy of glory,
What bliss beyond compare."

We know however: (1.) That this incomprehensible blessedness of heaven shall arise from the vision of God. This vision is beatific. It beatifies. It transforms the soul into the divine image; transfusing into it the divine life, so that it is filled with the fulness of God.

This vision of God is in the face of Jesus Christ, in whom dwells the plenitude of the divine glory bodily. God is seen in fashion as a man; and it is this manifestation of God in the person of Christ that is inconceivably and intolerably ravishing. Peter, James, and John became as dead men when they saw his glory, for a moment, in the holy mount.

(2.) The blessedness of the redeemed will flow not only from the manifestation of the glory, but also of the love of God; of that love,

mysterious, unchangeable, and infinite, of which the work of redemption is the fruit. (3.) Another element of the future happiness of the saints is the indefinite enlargement of all their faculties. (4.) Another is their entire exemption from all sin and sorrow (5.) Another is their intercourse and fellowship with the high intelligences of heaven; with patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and all the redeemed. (6.) Another is constant increase in knowledge and in the useful exercise of all their powers. (7.) Another is the secure and everlasting possession of all possible good. And, (8.) Doubtless the outward circumstances of their being will be such as to minister to their increasing blessedness.

---

§ 5. The Theory of the Pre-millennial Advent.

The common doctrine of the Church stated above, is that the conversion of the world, the restoration of the Jews, and the destruction of Antichrist are to precede the second coming of Christ, which event will be attended by the general resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, the end of the world, and the consummation of the Church. In opposition to this view the doctrine of a pre-millennial advent of Christ has been extensively held from the days of the Apostles to the present time. [876] According to this view, (1.) The nations are not to be converted, nor are the Jews to be restored to their standing in the Church, until the second coming of Christ. (2.) His advent is to be personal and glorious. (3.) He will establish Himself in Jerusalem as the head of a visible, external kingdom. (4.) When He comes, the martyrs, as some say, or, as others believe, all who sleep in Jesus, shall be raised from the dead and associated with Him in this earthly kingdom. (5.) The Jews are to be converted, restored to their own land, invested with special honours and prerogatives, and made the

instruments of the conversion of the world. (6.) This kingdom is to be one of great splendour, prosperity, and blessedness, and is to continue a thousand years; which, however, as stated above, is understood in different senses. (7.) After the expiration of the millennium, the general resurrection of the dead, the end of the world, and the final consummation of the Church are to occur. Such are the general features of the scheme which., with many modifications as to details, is known as the pre-millenial advent theory.

The leading objections to this doctrine have been already presented in the discussions of the several topics included under the general head of eschatology. They may be summarily stated as follows: --

1. It is a Jewish doctrine. The principles adopted by its advocates in the interpretation of prophecy, are the same as those adopted by the Jews at the time of Christ; and they have led substantially to the same conclusions. The Jews expected that when the Messiah came He would establish a glorious earthly kingdom at Jerusalem; that those who had died in the faith should be raised from the dead to share in the blessings of the Messiah's reign; that all nations and peoples on the face of the whole earth should be subject to them; and that any nation that did not serve them should be destroyed. All the riches and honours of the world were to be at their disposal. The event disappointed these expectations; and the principles of prophetic interpretation on which those expectations were founded were proved to be incorrect.

2. This theory is inconsistent with the Scriptures, inasmuch as it teaches that believers only are to rise from the dead when Christ comes; whereas the Bible declares that when He appears all who are in the graves 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 damnation.

3. The Bible teaches that when Christ comes all nations shall appear at his bar for judgment. This theory teaches that the final judgment will not occur until after the millennium. It may be said that the judgment is to commence at the second advent and continue during the reign of a thousand years. But the general judgment cannot occur before the general resurrection, and as the general resurrection, according to this theory, is not to take place until after the millennium, so neither can the general judgment.

4. The Scriptures teach that when Christ comes the second time without sin unto salvation, then the Church shall enter on its everlasting state of exaltation and glory. Those in Christ who have departed this life shall be raised from the dead and be clothed with their spiritual bodies, and those who are alive shall be changed in a moment, and thus they shall be ever with the Lord. According to this theory, instead of heaven awaiting the risen saints, they are to be introduced into a mere worldly kingdom. [877]

5. It is inconsistent with all the representations given of the glory and blessedness of departed saints, to assume that at the resurrection they are to be brought down to a lower state of existence, degraded from heaven to earth. The millennium may be a great advance on the present state of the Church; but, exalt it as you may, it is far below heaven. This argument bears, at least, against the patristic doctrine of the millennium.

6. The view presented by pre-millennarians of the kingdom of Christ on earth is, in many respects, inconsistent with the Scriptural account of its nature. (a.) It is to be a worldly kingdom. (b.) Its blessedness is to consist largely in worldly prosperity. Although the modern advocates of the doctrine have eliminated the grosser elements included in the theory of many of the fathers on this subject, nevertheless the

essential earthly character of the kingdom remains. Men are not to be like the angels. Births and deaths are to go on, not only during the millennium, but without end. Not that the glorified believers who have been raised from the dead are to marry and be given in marriage, but the race of men is to continue indefinitely to increase in the future as it has increased in the past. [878] (c.) The Bible teaches that the distinction between the Jews and Gentiles is abolished in the kingdom of Christ. This theory teaches that after the second advent that distinction is to continue and to be made greater than ever before. The temple at Jerusalem is to be rebuilt; the sacrifices restored; and all the details of the Mosaic ritual, as described in Ezekiel, again introduced. (d.) The Bible teaches that after the end of the world, as described in 2 Peter iii. 10 and in the Apocalypse, there are to be a new heavens and a new earth. This theory teaches the "earth's eternal perpetuity." [879] "The dissolving fires of which Peter speaks," we are told, "are for the perdition of ungodly men;' and not for the utter depopulation and destruction of the whole world Men and nations will survive them and still continue to live in the flesh." [880]

7. This theory disparages the Gospel. "The more common opinion," says Dr. McNeile, "is, that this is the final dispensation, and that by a more copious outpouring of the Holy Spirit it will magnify itself, and swell into the universal blessedness predicted by the prophets, carrying with it Jews and Gentiles, even the whole world, in one glorious flock under one shepherd, Jesus Christ the Lord. This is reiterated from pulpit, press, and platform. It is the usual climax of missionary exhortation, or rather missionary prophecy." [881] "The universal prevalence of religion hereafter to be enjoyed," says Mr. Brooks, "is not to be effected by any increased impetus given by the present means of evangelizing the nations, but by a stupendous display

of Divine wrath upon all the apostate and ungodly." [882] Wrath, however, never converted a single soul, and never will. "The Scriptures," according to Mr. Tyso, "do state the design of the Gospel, and what it is to effect; but they never say it is to convert the world. Its powers have been tried for eighteen hundred years, and it has never yet truly converted one nation, one city, one town, nor even a single village." [883] In the work of Rev. David Brown on the Second Advent, [884] abundant evidence is advanced from the writings of Mr. Brooks, Dr. McNeile, and the Rev. Mr. Bickersteth, to show that those gentlemen teach that the Scriptures "are to be superseded" in the millennium. Other means, probably, as they say, other revelations are to be made for the salvation of men. Any theory which thus disparages the gospel of the grace of God must be false. Christ's commission to his Church was to preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven; Paul says, the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation; that, though a stumbling block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek, it is the wisdom of God and the power of God; that it has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe; and he plainly teaches (Rom. x. 11-15) that there is no other means of salvation. Wrath, judgments, displays of visible glory, and miracles are not designed for the conversion of souls, nor are they adapted to that end.

8. Another objection to the pre-millennial theory is the want of consistency in its advocates and the conflicting conclusions to which they come. They profess to adopt the principle of literal interpretation. They interpret literally the prophecies relating to the return of the Jews to their own land; which promise to them as a nation dominion over all the other nations of the earth, the rebuilding of the Temple and the restoration of the Temple-service, the greatest worldly prosperity, and even the everlasting perpetuity of their nation in the

highest state of blessedness here on earth and "in the flesh." Yet they are forced to abandon their literalism when they come to the interpretation of the prophecies which predict that all the nations of the earth are to go up to Jerusalem every month, and even on every Sabbath. And more than this, they go to the extreme of figurative or spiritual interpretation in explaining the prophecies which refer to the end of the world. The Apostle Peter says in express terms: "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." This they deny. They say that it is only certain nations who are to be destroyed; that the earth is not to be depopulated; that the final conflagration will produce less change or injury than the deluge did. [885]

The utmost confusion also prevails in the views of pre-millennarians as to the nature of the kingdom of Christ. According to one view Christ and his risen and glorified saints are to dwell visibly on the earth and reign for a thousand years; according to another, the risen saints are to be in heaven, and not on earth my more than the angels now are; nevertheless the subjects of the first resurrection, although dwelling in heaven, are to govern the earth; according to another it is the converted Jewish nation restored to their own land, who are to be the governors of the world; according to another, the Bible divides men into three classes: the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Church of God. The prophecies relating to the millennium are understood to refer to the relative condition of the Jews and Gentiles in this world, and not to the risen and glorified believers. Another view seems to be, that this earth, changed no more by the fires of the last day than it was by the waters of the deluge, is to be the only heaven of the redeemed. Dr. Cumming and Dr. Seiss say they wish no better heaven than this earth

free from the curse and from sin. The latter says: [886] "My faith is, that these very hills and valleys shall yet be made glad with the songs of a finished redemption, and this earth yet become the bright, blessed, and everlasting homestead of men made glorious and immortal in body and in soul." Still another view is that there are two heavens, one here and one above; two Jerusalems, both to continue forever, the one on earth and the other in heaven; the one made with hands, the other without hands; both glorious and blessed, but the earthly far inferior to the heavenly; they are like concentric circles, one within the other; both endless. Men will continue forever, on earth, living and dying; happy but not perfect, needing regeneration and sanctification; and, when they die, will be translated to the kingdom which is above.

It seems therefore that the torch of the literalist is an "ignis fatuus," leading those who follow it, they know not whither. Is it not better to abide by the plain doctrinal teaching of the Bible, rather than to trust to the uncertain expositions of unfulfilled prophecies?

What almost all Christians believe is: (1.) That all nations shall be converted unto God. Jesus shall reign from the rising to the setting of the sun. (2.) That the Jews shall be reingrafted into their own olive-tree and acknowledge our Lord to be their God and Saviour. (3.) That all Antichristian powers shall be destroyed. (4.) That Christ shall come again in person and with great glory; the dead shall be raised, those who have done good unto the resurrection of life, those who have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation; and, (5.) That the righteous clothed in their glorified bodies shall then inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and the wicked be consigned to their final doom.

Did the Apostles expect the Second Advent in their Day?

The simple facts on this subject are: (1.) That the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of his kingdom was the great object of expectation and desire for the people of God from the beginning of the world. It was the great subject of prophecy and promise under the old dispensation. The ancient saints are described (as Christians now are) as those who were constantly hoping for the coming of the Lord. (Eph. ii. 12; Acts xxvi. 6, 7.) The dying thief said: "Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom." The last question put to our Lord by his disciples was: "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel." (2.) As the Messiah came at first as a man of sorrows, to make Himself a sacrifice for sin, He promised to come a second time without sin unto salvation, to raise the dead and to gather all his people into his everlasting home. His second coming therefore was to Christians what his first coming was to the Old Testament saints; the constant object of expectation and desire. (3.) As the time of the second advent was unrevealed either to men or angels, the early Christians hoped it might occur in their day. The Apostles themselves no doubt at first cherished that expectation. (4.) To the Apostle Paul, however, it was revealed that the day of the Lord was not to come until a great apostasy had occurred. (5.) Nevertheless as the Apostolic Christians did not know how long that apostasy was to continue, their constant prayer was, O Lord come quickly. The Apostles continued to hold up the second advent as an impending event, the moral impression of which ought to be to raise the affections of the people from the world and fix them on the things unseen and eternal. Those who urge the fact that the New Testament writers speak of the day of the Lord as at hand, and exhort believers to watch and pray for his advent, as a proof that the Apostles believed that it might occur at once, that no events then future must come to pass before Christ came, forget that what

inspired men said God said. If God, who knew that Christ was not to come for at least eighteen centuries after his ascension, could say to his people: "The day of the Lord is at hand." "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh," then that language was appropriate even on the assumption that those who used it knew that the second advent was not to occur for thousands of years; for a thousand years are with God as one day, and one day as a thousand years. The Church waited four thousand years for the fist advent; we may be content to wait God's time for the second. [887]

---

[876] There recently appeared in the Presbyterian, a series of articles signed "Twisse," understood to be from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Duffield of Princeton, New Jersey, designed to sustain the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent of Christ, and especially to disprove "the doctrine of a millennial era of universal righteousness and peace on earth before" the second coming of Christ. The arguments summarily stated by the writer as the following: "(1.) Were the doctrine true, it would undoubtedly be prominent in the New Testament, and especially in the Apostolical Epistles. The fact is, it is not only just prominent, but, so far as we are informed, the advocates of the doctrine do not pretend to find in the Epistles the slightest allusion to it. (2.) The uniform and abundant teaching of the New Testament as to the condition of the Church and of the world during the present dispensation -- that is, until the advent -- forbid the expectation of such a millennium. (3.) The advent itself, not the millennium, is prominently presented in the New Testament as the blessed hope' of the Church, and is uniformly referred to as an event near at hand, ever imminent, to be looked for' with longing expectation. (4.) The Saviour's repeated command to watch' for his coming, because we know not the hour,' is inconsistent with the

idea of a millennium intervening. (5.) The New Testament teaches repeatedly and unequivocally that the advent and the manifestation of the Messianic kingdom are to be synchronous events. (6.) The Apostolic Church, under the instruction of those holy men who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, was millennarian. (7.) The Church, for two centuries immediately succeeding the Apostles was millennarian. (8.) The doctrine of a millennium before the advent is not to be found in the standards of any of the Churches of the Reformation; by several it is expressly repudiated. It is a modern novelty, suggested but one hundred and fifty years ago by Whitby, and avowedly as a new hypothesis.'"

[877] It is true that pre-millennialists differ very much on this point. The common opinion in the early Church was that the risen saints are to live and reign a thousand years with Christ on earth; but some say that the glorified believers are to be in heaven; others, that they are to appear from time to time on earth, as Christ did, during the forty days which intervened between his resurrection and ascension; and others appear to teach that glorified saints are to rule over unglorified humanity without being revealed to those over whom they reign.

[878] See passages cited from distinguished millennarians on this point in Rev. David Brown's Christ's Second Coming, pp. 167-173. Mr. David N. Lord devotes to this subject two chapters of his book on The Coming and Reign of Christ. New York, 1858. He says (p. 151), that the Scriptures teach that the earth is "to continue forever, and that mankind are forever to occupy it, and multiply in an endless succession of generations; and that it is to be the scene of Christ's everlasting kingdom and reign." He argues this from the covenant made from Noah; from the promise made to Abraham that his seed should forever possess

the land of Canaan; and from the promise made to David that his seed should sit on his throne and reign forever. This perpetuity of the human race on the earth and in the flesh, he considers one of the most clearly revealed purposes of God concerning the family of man. Instead of the number of the redeemed being nearly made up, he holds that they are to go on multiplying through all eternity.

[879] The Last Times and the Great Consummation. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia and London, 1866. p. 73. On p. 75, the author says, "The earth shall not pass away."

[880] Seiss, ut supra, p. 211.

[881] Lectures on the Prophecies Relative to the Jewish Nation, 1st ed., 1830, p. 72.

[882] Elements of Prophetic Interpretation, pp. 227, 228.

[883] Defence of the Personal Reign of Christ, 1841, p. 41, 42.

[884] pp. 311-315.

[885] The Last Times, J. A. Seiss, D. D. p. 74.

[886] The Last Times, p. 72.

[887] Millennarians are not consistent in urging the objection considered in the text, as some at least of their own number teach that important events yet future must occur before the establishment of Christ's kingdom. For example, Rev. John Cox, Minister of the Gospel, Woolwich, in his Thoughts on the Coming and Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, devotes the third chapter of that work to prove that the entire destruction of the Papacy, of Mohammedanism, and of the tyrannical kingdoms of the world, and the restoration of the Jews to their own land, must precede the kingdom of Christ. See The Literalist, vol. v. p. 26 ff. The Literalist is a collection, in five octavo volumes, of the publications of the leading English pre-millennarians. Published by Orrin Rogers, Philadelphia, 1840 and 1841.

§ 6. Future Punishment.

Our Lord in his account of the final judgment says, that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.

The sufferings of the finally impenitent, according to the Scriptures, arise: (1.) From the loss of all earthly good. (2.) From exclusion from the presence and favour of God. (3.) From utter reprobation, or the final withdrawal from them of the Holy Spirit. (4.) From the consequent unrestrained dominion of sin and sinful passions. (5.) From the operations of conscience. (6.) From despair. (7.) From their evil associates. (8.) From their external circumstances; that is, future suffering is not exclusively the natural consequences of sin, but also includes positive inflictions. (9.) From their perpetuity.

There seems to be no more reason for supposing that the fire spoken of in Scripture is to be literal fire, than that the worm that never dies is literally a worm. The devil and his angels who are to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire, and whose doom the finally impenitent are to share, have no material bodies to be acted upon by elemental fire. As there are to be degrees in the glory and blessedness of heaven, as our Lord teaches us in the parable of the ten talents, so there will be differences as to degree in the sufferings of the lost: some will be beaten with few stripes, some with many.

The Duration of Future Punishment.

On this subject the following opinions have been held: --

1. It is assumed that the design of punishment is reformation, and that it is effective to that end. The time will, therefore, come when all sinful creatures, whether men or angels, shall be purged from all corruption, and restored to the image and favour of God. This was the

doctrine of Origen in the early Church. Other restorationists rest their hope of the ultimate salvation of all men, not on the purifying effect of suffering, but on the efficacy of the death of Christ. If He died for all, they infer, all will be saved.

2. Others hold that future punishment is only hypothetically everlasting. That is, the wicked will suffer forever if they continue to sin forever. But, if the Spirit continues to strive with men m the world to come, or, as others believe, if plenary ability belongs to the very nature of a rational creature, then we may assume that some, perhaps many, perhaps all, in the course of ages, will repent and turn unto God and live.

3. Others again teach that the sufferings of the impenitent are only relatively endless; that is, it will forever be true that their condition will be inferior to what it would have been had they been better men.

4. Others hold that the life promised to the righteous is immortality, and that the death threatened against the wicked is the extinction of life, or, the cessation of conscious existence. The soul will die in the future world, just as the body dies here. It ceases to act; it ceases to feel; it ceases to be. This death of the soul is called eternal, because life is never to be restored. The punishment of the wicked is, therefore, in a sense, everlasting. It is a final and everlasting forfeiture of all good. Thus Cicero [888] calls death "sempiternum malum," and Lucretius [889] speaks of a "mors immortalis." This second death may be very painful and protracted. The finally impenitent, may, and doubtless will, suffer for a longer or shorter period, and to a less or greater degree, before the final extinction of their being. And thus there shall be a future retribution, answering all the ends of justice. [890]

5. The common doctrine is, that the conscious existence of the soul after the death of the body is unending; that there is no repentance or reformation in the future world; that those who depart this life unreconciled to God, remain forever in this state of alienation, and therefore are forever sinful and miserable. This is the doctrine of the whole Christian Church, of the Greeks, of the Latins, and of all the great historical Protestant bodies.

It is obvious that this is a question which can be decided only by divine revelation. No one can reasonably presume to decide how long the wicked are to suffer for their sins upon any general principles of right and wrong. The conditions of the problem are not within our grasp. What the infinitely wise and good God may see fit to do with his creatures; or what the exigencies of a government embracing the whole universe and continuing throughout eternal ages, may demand, it is not for such worms of the dust as we are, to determine. If we believe the Bible to be the Word of God, all we have to do is to ascertain what it teaches on this subject, and humbly submit.

1. It is an almost invincible presumption that the Bible does teach the unending punishment of the finally impenitent, that all Christian churches have so understood it. There is no other way in which this unanimity of judgment can be accounted for. To refer it to some philosophical speculation which had gained ascendancy in the Church, such as the dualism of good and evil as two coeternal and necessary principles, or the Platonic doctrine of the inherent immortality and indestructible nature of the human soul, would be to assign a cause altogether inadequate to the effect. Much less can this general consent be accounted for on the ground that the doctrine in question is congenial to the human mind, and is believed for its own sake, without any adequate support from Scripture. The reverse is the case. It is a

doctrine which the natural heart revolts from and struggles against, and to which it submits only under stress of authority. The Church believes the doctrine because it must believe it, or renounce faith in the Bible and give up all the hopes founded upon its promises. There is no doctrine in support of which this general consent can be pleaded, which can be shown not to be taught in the Bible. The doctrines of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirits the sinfulness of men, and others of a like kind, are admitted to be Scriptural even by those who do not believe them. The argument now urged, does not suppose the Church to be infallible; nor that the authority of the Church is the ground of faith; it only assumes that what the great body of the competent readers of a plain book take to be its meaning, must be its meaning.

It is unreasonable to account for the general reception of the doctrine in question on the ground of church authority. It was universally received before the external Church arrogated to itself the right to dictate to the people of God what they must believe and it continued to be received when, at the Reformation, the authority of the Church was repudiated, and the Scriptures were declared to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Any man, therefore, assumes a fearful responsibility who sets himself in opposition to the faith of the Church universal.

2. It is admitted that the doctrine of the perpetuity of the future punishment of the wicked was held by the Jews under the old dispensation, and at the time of Christ. Neither our Lord nor his Apostles ever contradicted that doctrine. They reproved the false teachers of their day for doctrinal errors on many points, but they never corrected their faith in this doctrine. They never teach anything inconsistent with it. Their recorded instructions give no ground for a

belief either of the final restoration of all rational creatures to the favour of God, or of the annihilation of the wicked. The passages which are appealed to by Universalists in support of their doctrine admit of a natural and simple interpretation in harmony with the general teaching of the Bible on this subject. For example, in Ephesians i. 10, it is said to be the purpose of God to bring into one harmonious whole (or, as it is expressed in Colossians i. 20, to reconcile unto Himself) all things, i.e., all, who are in heaven and who are on earth. The question is, who, or what are the all, who are to be reconciled unto God? This question must be answered by a reference to the nature of the thing spoken of, and to the analogy of Scripture. It cannot mean absolutely "all things," the whole universe, including sun, moon, and stars, for they are not susceptible of reconciliation to God. For the same reason it cannot mean all sensitive creatures, including irrational animals. Nor can it mean all rational creatures, including the holy angels; for they do not need reconciliation. Nor can it mean all fallen rational creatures, for it is expressly taught, Hebrews ii. 16, that Christ did not come to redeem fallen angels. Nor can it mean all men, for the Bible teaches elsewhere that all men are not reconciled to God; and Scripture cannot contradict Scripture; for that would be for God to contradict Himself. The "all" intended is the "all" spoken of in the context; the whole body of the people of God; all the objects of redemption.

Restorationists appeal also to Romans v. 18: "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." This is made to mean, that as all men are condemned for Adam's offence, so all men are justified for the righteousness of Christ. The same interpretation is put upon the parallel passage in 1

Corinthians xv. 22: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." In both these passages, however, the "all" is necessarily limited by the context. It is the all who are in Adam, that die; and the all who are in Christ, that are made alive. Restorationists limit the word to all men, or to all fallen creatures, in obedience to what they suppose to be the analogy of Scripture; and this is all that is done by the orthodox. The only question is, What do the Scriptures elsewhere teach? If they clearly teach that all men and fallen angels are to be saved, then these passages must be interpreted accordingly; but if they teach that all men are not saved, then these passages cannot be understood to assert the contrary. Of themselves they decide nothing. They may be understood in two ways; which is their real meaning depends on what is taught elsewhere.

The same remark may be made in reference to other passages which Universalists rely upon. Thus in 1 Corinthians xv. 25, it is said that Christ "must reign, until He hath put all enemies under his feet." This may mean that He must reign until all sin and misery are banished from the universe; but this is not its necessary meaning, for Satan may be subdued without being either converted or annihilated. In like manner, in 1 Timothy ii. 4, it is said God "will have all men to be saved;" if the word will, thelei, here means to purpose, then the passage teaches that all men shall ultimately be certainly saved. But if the word means here what it does in Matthew xxvii. 43, to have complacency in, (ei thelei auton,) then it teaches only what the Bible everywhere else teaches, namely, that God is love; that He delights not in the death of sinners. It is to pervert, and to misinterpret the Word of God, to make one passage contradict another simply because the language used admits of an explanation which brings them into conflict. The question is not, What certain words may mean? but, What were they intended to mean as

used in certain connections?

If Christ and his Apostles did not teach that all men are to be saved, neither did they teach that the wicked are to be annihilated Mr. Constable, in his work above referred to, lays down the principle that the language of the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, is to be interpreted according to the "usus loquendi" of the Greek writers. We are to go to our classical dictionaries to learn the meaning of the words they use. From this principle he infers that as the word zoe, life, in ordinary Greek, means continued existence, and thanatos, death, the cessation of existence, such is their meaning in the Scriptures. Therefore, when in the Bible eternal life is promised to the righteous, immortality is promised to them; and when eternal death is threatened against the wicked, annihilation is declared to be their doom. A Greek-speaking people, he says, could attach no other meaning to such language. In like manner as the words which we translate to destroy, or cause to perish, mean to blot out of existence, the inference is that when the wicked are said to be destroyed, or to perish, it can only mean that they are annihilated.

On this it may be remarked, --

1. That the rule of interpretation here laid down is obviously incorrect, and its application would reduce the doctrines of the Bible to the level of heathenism. If Greek words as used in Scripture express no higher ideas than on the lips of Pagans, then we can have only the thoughts of Pagans in the Bible. On this principle, how could the Gospel be preached to heathen? to the Hindoos, for example, if they were forbidden to attach to the words God, sin, repentance, and a holy life, no other ideas than those suggested by the corresponding terms of their own language? The Bible, so far as written in Greek, must be understood as Greek. But the "usus loquendi" of every language varies

more or less in different ages, and as spoken by different tribes and nations. Every one admits that Hellenistic Greek has a usage distinguishing it from the language of the classics. The language of the Bible must explain the language of the Bible. It has a "usus loquendi" of its own. It is, however, not true that the words life and death (zoe, and thanatos) are in any language used only in the limited sense which Mr. Constable's argument would assign to them. When the poet said, "dum vivimus vivamus," he surely did not mean to say, while we continue to exist, let us continue to exist.' The Scriptures written in the language of men use words as men are accustomed to use them, literally or figuratively, and in senses suited to the nature of the subjects to which they are applied. The word life means one thing when used of plants, another when used of animals, and another when spoken of in reference to the soul of man. The death of a plant is one thing, the death of an immortal soul is something entirely different. That the words life and death are not confined to the limited sense in which annihilationists would take them, hardly needs to be proved. The Scriptures everywhere recognize the distinction, in reference to men, between animal, intellectual, and spiritual life. A man may have the two former and be destitute of the latter. God quickens those dead in trespasses and sins; that is, he imparts spiritual life to those who are in the full vigour of their animal and intellectual being.
Therefore we are told that the favour of God is life; that to know God is eternal life; that to be spiritually minded is life and that to be carnally minded is death. The Apostle tells the Colossians: "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." He says to the Galatians: "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Those who "live in pleasure" are said to be "dead while they live." No one believes that the word life in such Scriptural phrases as "the bread of

life," "the water of life," "the tree of life," "the crown of life," means only continued existence. The word, when used of the soul of man, means not only conscious being, but a normal state of being in the likeness, fellowship, and enjoyment of God. And in like manner the word death, when spoken of the soul, means alienation or separation from God; and when that separation is final it is eternal death. This is so plain that it never has been doubted, except for the purpose of supporting the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked.

2. The same remark applies to the use of the words destroy and perish. To destroy is to ruin. The nature of that ruin depends on the nature of the subject of which it is predicated. A thing is ruined when it is rendered unfit for use; when it is in such a state that it can no longer answer the end for which it was designed. A ship at sea, dismasted, rudderless, with its sides battered in, is ruined, but not annihilated. It is a ship still. A man destroys himself when he ruins his health, squanders his property, debases his character, and renders himself unfit to act his part in life. A soul is utterly and forever destroyed when it is reprobated, alienated from God, rendered a fit companion only for the devil and his angels. This is a destruction a thousandfold more fearful than annihilation. The earnestness with which the doctrine of the unending punishment of the wicked is denounced by those who reject it, should convince them that its truth is the only rational solution of the fact that Christ and his Apostles did not condemn it.

3. But Christ and the Apostles not only failed to correct the teachings of the Jews of their day concerning the everlasting punishment of the wicked, but they themselves also taught that doctrine in the most explicit and solemn manner. It is asserted affirmatively that future punishment is everlasting; in the negative form that it can never end;

that there is in the future world an impassable gulf between the righteous and the wicked; and that there are sins which can never be forgiven either in this life or in the life to come. Thus if words can teach this doctrine it is taught in the Bible from the beginning to the end. In the Old Testament, the prophet says (Is. xxxiii. 14): "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites; who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings." In Isaiah lxvi. 24 it is said of those who should be excluded from the new heavens and the new earth which the prophet had predicted, "that their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." "Hell," however, "is of both worlds, so that in the same essential sense, although in different degrees, it may be said both of him who is still living but accursed, and of him who perished centuries ago, that his worm dieth not and his fire is not quenched." [891] The prophet Daniel (xii. 2) says of the wicked, that they "shall awake . . . . to shame and everlasting contempt." In Luke iii. 17 it is said that Christ shall "gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff He will burn with fire unquenchable." In Mark ix. 42-48 our Lord says that it is better "to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." These awful words fell three times, in one discourse, from the lips of mercy, to give them the greater effect. Christ wept over Jerusalem. Why did He not avert its doom? Simply because it would not have been right. So He may weep over the doom of the impenitent wicked; and yet leave them to their fate. It is no more possible that the cup should pass from their lips than that it should have been taken from the trembling hand of the Son of God himself. The latter spectacle was far more appalling in the eyes of angels than the

lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

The Judge on the last day, we are told, will say to those on the left hand: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." The same word is used in both clauses; the wicked are to go eis kolasin aionion; and the righteous eis zoen aionion; it must have the same sense in both. (Matt. xxv. 41, 46.) In John iii. 36 it is said: "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." Paul teaches us in 2 Thessalonians i. 9 that when Christ comes the wicked "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Jude (verse 6) says that the angels which kept not their first estate are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah . . . . are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Of apostates, he says (verses 12, 13) there is reserved for them "the blackness of darkness forever." In Revelation xiv. 9-11, those who worship the beast and his image or receive his mark, shall "be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night." Nearly the same words are repeated in chapters xix. 1-3, 20; xx. 10.

It is objected to the argument founded on these passages that the word "everlasting" is sometimes used in Scripture of periods of limited duration. In reference to this objection it may be remarked, (1.) That the Hebrew and Greek words rendered in our version eternal, or everlasting, mean duration whose termination is unknown. When used in reference to perishable things, as when the Bible speaks of "the

everlasting hills," they simply indicate indefinite existence, that is, existence to which there is no known or assignable limit. But when used in reference to that which is either in its own nature imperishable, or of which the unending existence is revealed, as the human soul or in reference to that which we have no authority from other sources to assign a limit to, as the future blessedness of the saints, then the words are to be taken in their literal sense. If. because we sometimes say we give a man a thing forever, without intending that he is to possess it to all eternity, it were argued that the word forever expresses limited duration, every one would see that the inference was unfounded. If the Bible says that the sufferings of the lost are to be everlasting, they are to endure forever, unless it can be shown either that the soul is not immortal or that the Scriptures elsewhere teach that those sufferings are to come to an end. No one argues that the blessedness of the righteous will cease after a term of years, because the word everlasting is sometimes used of things which do not continue forever. Our Lord teaches that the punishment of the wicked is everlasting, in the same sense that the blessedness of the saints is everlasting. (2.) It is to be remembered, that admitting the word "everlasting" to be ever so ambiguous, the Bible says that the worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched. We have therefore the direct assertion of the word of God that the sufferings of the lost are unending. All the modes of expression used to set forth the perpetuity of the salvation of believers and the everlasting duration of the kingdom of Christ, are employed to teach the perpetuity of the future punishment of the wicked. If that doctrine, therefore, be not taught in the Scriptures, it is difficult to see how it could be taught in human language.

4. A fourth argument on this subject is drawn from passages in which

the doctrine is implied, although not directly asserted. This includes those passages which teach that there is no repentance, no forgiveness, no change of state in the future world. This is done, for example, in our Lord's parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in which He teaches that there is no possibility of passing from hell to heaven. So, also, we are taught that those who die in sin remain sinful forever. And our Lord says, it would be better for a man had he never been born, than that he should incur the guilt of offending any of the little ones who believe on Him. This, at least, is conclusive against the doctrine of universal salvation; for if, after any period of suffering, an eternity of happiness awaits a man, his being born is an unspeakable blessing.

Rationalists say that it is very impolitic for Christians to represent the everlasting punishment of the wicked as a doctrine of the Bible. This is undoubtedly true. And so Paul felt that it was very impolitic to preach the doctrine of the Cross. He knew that doctrine to be a stumbling-block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek. He knew that had he preached the common sense doctrine of salvation by works, the offence of the cross would have ceased. Nevertheless, he knew that the doctrine of Christ crucified was the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. He knew that it was not his business to make a Gospel, but to declare that Gospel which had been taught Him, by the revelation of Jesus Christ. It would be well if all who call themselves Christians, should learn that it is not their business to believe and teach what they may think true or right, but what God in his Holy Word has seen fit to reveal.

Objections.

It is urged that it cannot be consistent with the justice of God to inflict a really infinite penalty on such a creature as man. It is very obvious to remark on this subject: --

1. That we are incompetent judges of the penalty which sin deserves. We have no adequate apprehension of its inherent guilt, of the dignity of the person against whom it is committed, or of the extent of the evil which it is suited to produce. The proper end of punishment is retribution and prevention. What is necessary for that end, God only knows; and, therefore, the penalty which He imposes on sin is the only just measure of its ill desert.

2. If it be inconsistent with the justice of God that men should perish for their sins, then redemption is not a matter of grace, or undeserved mercy. Deliverance from an unjust penalty, is a matter of justice. Nothing, however, is plainer from the teaching of Scripture, and nothing is more universally and joyfully acknowledged by all Christians, than that the whole plan of redemption, the mission, the incarnation, and the sufferings and death of the Son of God for the salvation of sinners, is a wonderful exhibition of the love of God which passes knowledge. But if justice demand that all men should be saved, then salvation is a matter of justice; and then all the songs of gratitude and praise from the redeemed, whether in heaven or on earth, must at once cease.

3. It is often said that sin is an infinite evil because committed against a person of infinite dignity, and therefore deserves an infinite penalty. To this it is answered, that as sin is an act or state of a finite subject, it must of necessity be itself finite. Men are apt to involve themselves in contradictions when they attempt to reason about the infinite. The word is so vague and so comprehensive, and our ideas of what it is intended to express are so inadequate, that we are soon lost when we seek to make it a guide in forming our judgments. If the evil of a single sin, and that the smallest, lasts forever, it is in one sense an infinite evil, although in comparison

with other sins, or with the whole mass of sin ever committed, it may appear a mere trifle. The guilt of sin is infinite in the sense that we can set no limits to its turpitude or to the evil which it is adapted to produce.

4. Relief on this subject is sought from the consideration that as the lost continue to sin forever they may justly be punished forever. To this, however, it is answered that the retributions of eternity are threatened for the sins done in the body. This is true; nevertheless; it is also true, first, that sin in its nature is alienation and separation from God; and as God is the source of all holiness and happiness, separation from Him is of necessity the forfeiture of all good; secondly, that this separation is from its nature final and consequently involves endless sinfulness and misery. It is thus final, unless on the assumption of the undeserved and supernatural intervention of God as in the case of the redemption of man; and thirdly, it is also true that from the nature of the case "the carnal mind is death." Degradation and misery are inseparably connected with sin. As long as rational creatures are sinful, they must be degraded and miserable. There is no law of nature more immutable than this. If men do not expect God to reverse the laws of nature to secure their exemption from wanton transgression of those laws, why should they expect Him to reverse the still more immutable laws of our moral constitution and of his moral government? The doom of the fallen angels teaches us that one act of rebellion against God is fatal, whether we say that all they have suffered since, and all they are to suffer forever, is the penalty of that one act, or the inevitable consequence of the condition into which that one act brought them, makes no difference.

The Goodness of God.

A still more formidable objection is drawn from the goodness of God. It is said to be inconsistent with his benevolence that He should allow any of his creatures to be forever miserable. The answer to this is: --

1. That it is just as impossible that God should do a little wrong as a great one. If He has permitted such a vast amount of sin and misery to exist in the world, from the fall of Adam to the present time, how can we say that it is inconsistent with his goodness, to allow them to continue to exist? How do we know that the reasons, so to speak, which constrained God to allow his children to be sinful and miserable for thousands of years, may not constrain Him to permit some of them to remain miserable forever? If the highest glory of God and the good of the universe have been promoted by the past sinfulness and misery of men, why may not those objects be promoted by what is declared to be future?

2. We have reason to believe, as urged in the first volume of this work, and as often urged elsewhere, that the number of the finally lost in comparison with the whole number of the saved will be very inconsiderable. Our blessed Lord, when surrounded by the innumerable company of the redeemed, will be hailed as the "Salvator Hominum," the Saviour of Men, as the Lamb that bore the sins of the world.

3. It should constrain us to humility, and to silence on this subject, that the most solemn and explicit declarations of the everlasting misery of the wicked recorded in the Scriptures, fell from the lips of Him, who, though equal with God, was found in fashion as a man, and humbled Himself unto death, even the death of the cross, for us men and for our salvation.

---

[888] Tusculanarum Disputationum, I. xlii. 100; Works, edit. Leipzig, 1850, p. 1057, b.

[889] See Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, iii. 517-519, edit. London, 1712, p. 144.

[890] This theory is advocated with confidence, as well as with ability and learning, by Henry Constable, A. M., Prebendary of Cork, in his tract on The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment, Reprinted from the Second London Edition, New Haven, Conn., 1872. And much more elaborately in Debt and Grace as related to the Doctrine of a Future Life. By C. F. Hudson. Fifth Edition. Boston: 1859.

[891] The Prophecies of Isaiah Translated and Explained. By Joseph Addison Alexander. New York, 1865, vol. ii. p. 482.

Indexes

Index of Scripture References

Genesis

[1]1:5 [2]2:3 [3]2:3 [4]2:3 [5]2:23 [6]2:24 [7]2:24

[8]4:19 [9]8:10 [10]8:12 [11]9:6 [12]12:3 [13]14:22

[14]15:1-21 [15]17:7 [16]17:12 [17]21:23 [18]22:2

[19]24:1-67 [20]24:3 [21]26:31 [22]27:4 [23]27:12

[24]27:34-38 [25]29:18 [26]29:27 [27]29:28 [28]30:1

[29]34:12 [30]47:31 [31]49:2-4 [32]49:10 [33]49:17

Exodus

[34]1:19 [35]1:20 [36]3:13 [37]3:14 [38]6:8 [39]6:12

[40]16:23 [41]16:26 [42]20:1-26 [43]20:2 [44]21:9 [45]21:12

[46]21:14 [47]21:17 [48]22:10 [49]22:19 [50]23:7 [51]24:8

[52]26:3 [53]26:5 [54]26:6 [55]26:17 [56]31:13 [57]31:14

[58]31:16 [59]31:17 [60]34:28

Leviticus

[61]4:17 [62]7:18 [63]10:11 [64]14:6 [65]17:1-16 [66]17:4

[67]18:1-30 [68]18:6 [69]18:8 [70]18:16 [71]18:18 [72]18:18

[73]18:18 [74]19:12 [75]20:23 [76]23:1-44 [77]24:17

[78]25:39-41 [79]26:1 [80]26:41

Numbers

[81]5:19 [82]6:3-5 [83]19:11 [84]19:11-13 [85]19:13

[86]24:17 [87]30:3-5 [88]35:21

Deuteronomy

[89]4:13 [90]5:6-21 [91]6:6 [92]6:6 [93]6:7 [94]6:7

[95]6:13 [96]6:13 [97]6:17-19 [98]10:4 [99]10:16 [100]10:20

[101]11:19 [102]13:1-3 [103]19:11 [104]19:13 [105]21:15-17

[106]21:18-21 [107]23:21-23 [108]24:1 [109]24:2 [110]24:13

[111]25:1 [112]27:15 [113]27:16 [114]29:10-12 [115]31:11

[116]31:12 [117]32:40 [118]32:40 [119]33:10

Joshua

[120]1:8 [121]3:15 [122]9:15 [123]9:19

Judges

[124]8:19 [125]11:37 [126]14:2 [127]20:27-28

Ruth

[128]1:17 [129]2:14 [130]3:13

1 Samuel

[131]14:27 [132]14:37 [133]16:1 [134]16:2 [135]22:15

[136]23:2 [137]23:4 [138]28:1-25

2 Samuel

[139]2:27 [140]3:9 [141]3:35

2 Kingdoms

[142]5:10 [143]5:14

2 Samuel

[144]7:16 [145]19:19 [146]21:1

1 Kings

[147]2:23 [148]6:29 [149]8:46 [150]9:3 [151]22:6-8

2 Kings

[152]3:11 [153]4:1 [154]4:23 [155]5:10 [156]5:10 [157]5:14

[158]5:14 [159]5:14 [160]6:14-20 [161]6:31 [162]13:21

Job

[163]9:20 [164]32:2 [165]34:17

Psalms

[166]2:1-12 [167]2:8 [168]3:25 [169]3:26 [170]6:31

[171]9:1-20 [172]10:3 [173]10:4 [174]12:3 [175]13:9

[176]15:1-5 [177]15:4 [178]16:10 [179]17:1-15 [180]17:15

[181]18:1-50 [182]19:7 [183]19:7-10 [184]19:105 [185]27:3

[186]28:3 [187]28:4 [188]32:2 [189]41:1-13 [190]41:7

[191]45:1-17 [192]51:4 [193]68:23 [194]72:1-20 [195]72:11

[196]72:17 [197]73:23 [198]73:24 [199]74:8 [200]78:5

[201]78:6 [202]78:7 [203]78:63 [204]86:9 [205]92:1-15

[206]95:11 [207]110:1-7 [208]119:1-176

Proverbs

[209]11:26 [210]12:4 [211]17:15 [212]18:22 [213]19:14

[214]20:20 [215]22:6 [216]31:10 [217]31:10-12 [218]31:28

Ecclesiastes

[219]7:20

Isaiah

[220]4:1 [221]4:4 [222]5:23 [223]9:6 [224]9:7 [225]9:19

[226]11:1-16 [227]11:10 [228]12:3 [229]13:12 [230]14:1-32

[231]21:4 [232]26:19 [233]26:19 [234]32:15 [235]33:14

[236]35:6 [237]40:28 [238]44:3 [239]45:22 [240]45:23

[241]49:6 [242]50:1 [243]51:6 [244]52:1-15 [245]53:1-12

[246]55:1 [247]58:13 [248]58:14 [249]59:4 [250]62:5

[251]63:1-3 [252]64:6 [253]65:16 [254]65:17 [255]66:22

[256]66:23 [257]66:24

Jeremiah

[258]1:5 [259]2:13 [260]4:2 [261]4:4 [262]5:14 [263]12:16

[264]17:20-27 [265]23:29 [266]38:16 [267]42:5

Ezekiel

[268]1:9 [269]3:13 [270]20:5 [271]20:12 [272]36:25

[273]37:1 [274]37:12 [275]44:7 [276]47:1-5

Daniel

[277]4:30 [278]4:33 [279]7:1-28 [280]7:1-28 [281]7:14

[282]7:17 [283]7:22 [284]7:23 [285]11:1-45 [286]11:1-45

[287]11:36 [288]11:36-45 [289]12 [290]12:2 [291]12:2

Hosea

[292]2:23 [293]6:6 [294]10:4

Joel

[295]2:28 [296]2:28 [297]2:29

Amos

[298]5:2

Micah

[299]1:7 [300]4:1-13

Habakkuk

[301]2:14

Zechariah

[302]12 [303]12:10 [304]13:9 [305]14:1-21 [306]14:8

Malachi

[307]1:11 [308]1:11 [309]2:7 [310]3:2 [311]4:1-6

Matthew

[312]3:5 [313]3:6 [314]3:11 [315]3:11 [316]3:11 [317]3:11

[318]3:11 [319]3:11 [320]3:12 [321]3:16 [322]5:21 [323]5:22
[324]5:28 [325]5:31 [326]5:31 [327]5:32 [328]5:32 [329]5:32
[330]5:32 [331]5:34 [332]5:34 [333]5:37 [334]5:45 [335]6:6
[336]7:15-17 [337]8:5-13 [338]10:31 [339]10:32 [340]10:39
[341]11:13 [342]11:19 [343]11:24 [344]11:25 [345]11:26
[346]12:5 [347]12:12 [348]13:30 [349]13:37-43 [350]13:39
[351]13:39 [352]13:41 [353]13:41-43 [354]13:49 [355]14:4
[356]15:4 [357]15:4-6 [358]15:22 [359]16:11 [360]16:15
[361]16:16 [362]16:17 [363]16:19 [364]16:19 [365]16:27
[366]17:11 [367]18:3 [368]18:17 [369]18:18 [370]18:19
[371]18:25 [372]19:1-30 [373]19:3-9 [374]19:3-9 [375]19:4-9
[376]19:5 [377]19:9 [378]19:10 [379]19:10 [380]19:11
[381]19:11 [382]19:28 [383]20:28 [384]22:37 [385]22:38
[386]23:39 [387]24:1-25:46 [388]24:3 [389]24:6 [390]24:6
[391]24:14 [392]24:14 [393]24:14 [394]24:24 [395]24:29-35
[396]24:30 [397]24:30 [398]24:31 [399]24:31 [400]24:34
[401]24:34 [402]24:36 [403]25:31 [404]25:31 [405]25:31-46
[406]25:31-46 [407]25:31-46 [408]25:31-46 [409]25:32
[410]25:32 [411]25:41 [412]25:46 [413]26:26 [414]26:26-28
[415]26:27 [416]26:63 [417]26:64 [418]27:24 [419]27:43
[420]28:19 [421]28:19 [422]28:19 [423]28:19 [424]28:19
[425]28:19 [426]28:20 [427]28:20 [428]28:20 [429]28:24

Mark

[430]1:8 [431]1:15 [432]3:4 [433]6:18 [434]6:48 [435]7:4
[436]7:4 [437]7:4 [438]7:28 [439]9:42-48 [440]10:2-12
[441]10:4-9 [442]10:7 [443]10:8 [444]10:11 [445]10:12
[446]10:13 [447]12:26 [448]13:7 [449]13:10 [450]13:30
[451]14:22-24 [452]16:15 [453]16:15 [454]16:16 [455]16:17

Luke

[456]1:5 [457]2:36 [458]2:37 [459]2:51 [460]3:3 [461]3:16
[462]3:17 [463]4:43 [464]6:43 [465]6:44 [466]7:29 [467]8:1
[468]10:29 [469]11:5-8 [470]11:38 [471]13:27 [472]14:1-14
[473]14:26 [474]16:10 [475]16:15 [476]16:18 [477]16:18
[478]16:18 [479]16:22 [480]16:24 [481]17:10 [482]18:5-8
[483]21:9 [484]21:27 [485]21:32 [486]21:33 [487]22:19
[488]22:19 [489]22:20 [490]22:30 [491]23:43 [492]24:28
[493]24:28 [494]24:28 [495]24:48

John

[496]1:12 [497]1:33 [498]1:33 [499]3:1-21 [500]3:5 [501]3:5
[502]3:5 [503]3:5 [504]3:5 [505]3:5 [506]3:5 [507]3:5
[508]3:6 [509]3:6 [510]3:8 [511]3:11 [512]3:14-16 [513]3:15
[514]3:16 [515]3:16 [516]3:17 [517]3:18 [518]3:18 [519]3:18
[520]3:18 [521]3:18 [522]3:31-33 [523]3:36 [524]3:36
[525]3:36 [526]3:36 [527]4:10 [528]5:22 [529]5:23 [530]5:24
[531]5:27 [532]5:28 [533]5:28 [534]5:29 [535]5:29 [536]5:43
[537]5:43 [538]6 [539]6:1-71 [540]6:7 [541]6:29 [542]6:35
[543]6:37 [544]6:39 [545]6:40 [546]6:40 [547]6:40 [548]6:40
[549]6:44 [550]6:44 [551]6:45 [552]6:47-51 [553]6:48-65
[554]6:48-65 [555]6:50-58 [556]6:51 [557]6:51-58 [558]6:53
[559]6:53 [560]6:53-58 [561]6:53-58 [562]6:54 [563]7:17
[564]7:23 [565]7:24 [566]7:37 [567]7:38 [568]7:38 [569]7:39
[570]8:43 [571]8:47 [572]10:10 [573]10:26 [574]10:27
[575]10:28 [576]11:24 [577]11:25 [578]11:26 [579]12:48
[580]12:48 [581]13:26 [582]14:2 [583]14:13 [584]14:13
[585]14:19 [586]14:19 [587]14:19 [588]14:20 [589]14:21
[590]14:22 [591]14:23 [592]14:28 [593]15 [594]15
[595]15:1-6 [596]15:1-8 [597]15:1-12 [598]15:5 [599]15:16
[600]16:7 [601]16:8 [602]16:24 [603]17:8 [604]17:9

[605]17:17 [606]17:17 [607]18:37 [608]20:23 [609]20:23

Acts

[610]1:5 [611]1:5 [612]1:8 [613]1:11 [614]1:22 [615]2:3

[616]2:16-21 [617]2:32 [618]2:34 [619]2:38 [620]2:38

[621]2:41 [622]2:41 [623]2:42 [624]3:1-26 [625]3:15

[626]3:19-21 [627]3:20 [628]3:21 [629]3:21 [630]3:21

[631]4:4 [632]4:32-35 [633]5:1 [634]5:4 [635]5:15 [636]5:32

[637]7:38 [638]7:51 [639]7:51 [640]8:27-38 [641]8:38

[642]8:39 [643]9:36 [644]10:34 [645]10:34-43 [646]10:35

[647]10:39-43 [648]11:16 [649]15 [650]15:1 [651]15:9

[652]15:24 [653]16:15 [654]16:31 [655]16:33 [656]16:33

[657]17:7 [658]17:11 [659]17:31 [660]18:31 [661]19:1-6

[662]19:4 [663]19:11 [664]19:12 [665]20:28 [666]20:28

[667]20:28 [668]20:28 [669]21:21 [670]22:16 [671]22:16

[672]23:6 [673]24:15 [674]25:11 [675]26:6 [676]26:6

[677]26:6 [678]26:6-8 [679]26:7 [680]26:7 [681]26:7

[682]26:7 [683]26:17 [684]26:18 [685]26:18 [686]28:23

Romans

[687]1:9 [688]1:16 [689]1:18 [690]1:21 [691]1:22 [692]1:26

[693]1:28 [694]1:28 [695]1:29 [696]1:32 [697]2:2 [698]2:5

[699]2:14 [700]2:14 [701]2:14 [702]2:15 [703]2:18 [704]2:26

[705]2:28 [706]2:28 [707]2:28 [708]2:29 [709]2:29 [710]2:29

[711]3:19 [712]3:19 [713]3:20 [714]3:21 [715]3:21 [716]3:21

[717]3:22 [718]3:22 [719]3:25 [720]3:25 [721]3:26

[722]4:1-25 [723]4:3 [724]4:3 [725]4:4 [726]4:4 [727]4:5

[728]4:5 [729]4:6 [730]4:6 [731]4:6 [732]4:6-8 [733]4:7

[734]4:8 [735]4:9 [736]4:9-12 [737]4:11 [738]4:11 [739]4:11

[740]4:17 [741]4:19 [742]4:20 [743]4:22 [744]4:24 [745]4:24

[746]4:24 [747]5:1 [748]5:1 [749]5:1 [750]5:1-3 [751]5:1-3

[752]5:3-5 [753]5:5 [754]5:9 [755]5:9 [756]5:9 [757]5:9

[758]5:10 [759]5:10 [760]5:12 [761]5:12-21 [762]5:12-21

[763]5:16 [764]5:16 [765]5:17 [766]5:18 [767]5:18 [768]5:18

[769]5:18 [770]5:18 [771]5:18 [772]5:19 [773]5:19 [774]5:19

[775]5:19 [776]5:19 [777]5:19 [778]5:19 [779]5:21

[780]6:1-8 [781]6:1-23 [782]6:1-23 [783]6:3 [784]6:3

[785]6:3 [786]6:4-10 [787]6:5 [788]6:8 [789]6:14 [790]6:14

[791]6:14 [792]6:14 [793]7:1 [794]7:1 [795]7:1-6

[796]7:1-25 [797]7:2 [798]7:2 [799]7:3 [800]7:3 [801]7:4

[802]7:4 [803]7:4 [804]7:4-6 [805]7:4-6 [806]7:6 [807]7:7

[808]7:7 [809]7:7 [810]7:7 [811]7:7-25 [812]7:7-25

[813]7:12 [814]7:14 [815]7:24 [816]7:33 [817]7:34

[818]8:1-39 [819]8:3 [820]8:9-11 [821]8:9-11 [822]8:10

[823]8:11 [824]8:12 [825]8:16 [826]8:16 [827]8:17 [828]8:17

[829]8:19-21 [830]8:19-23 [831]8:21 [832]8:25 [833]8:30

[834]8:33 [835]8:34 [836]8:34 [837]9:1-33 [838]9:4 [839]9:4

[840]9:4 [841]9:8 [842]9:8 [843]10:3 [844]10:3 [845]10:4

[846]10:8 [847]10:9 [848]10:9 [849]10:10 [850]10:10

[851]10:10 [852]10:11-15 [853]10:14 [854]10:14 [855]10:15

[856]11:1-36 [857]11:6 [858]11:11 [859]11:11 [860]11:15

[861]11:16 [862]11:17 [863]11:25 [864]11:25 [865]11:31

[866]12:5 [867]12:15 [868]13:1-5 [869]13:1-14 [870]13:4

[871]13:9 [872]14:3 [873]14:4 [874]14:5 [875]14:5

[876]14:17 [877]14:20 [878]14:21 [879]15:8 [880]15:18

[881]15:19 [882]16:17 [883]1749

1 Corinthians

[884]1:7 [885]1:13 [886]1:16 [887]1:18-31 [888]1:21

[889]1:23 [890]1:24 [891]1:26-29 [892]1:30 [893]1:30

[894]1:30 [895]1:30 [896]2:1-16 [897]2:2 [898]2:6 [899]2:7

[900]2:8 [901]2:8 [902]2:9 [903]2:10 [904]2:11 [905]2:12

[906]2:14 [907]2:14 [908]2:14 [909]2:14 [910]3:15 [911]3:16

[912]4:5 [913]4:5 [914]4:5 [915]5:1 [916]5:1 [917]5:1

[918]5:1-13 [919]5:9 [920]5:10 [921]6:9 [922]6:9 [923]6:10

[924]6:10 [925]6:10 [926]6:19 [927]7:1-40 [928]7:2 [929]7:2

[930]7:2 [931]7:15 [932]7:15 [933]8:9 [934]8:12 [935]10:1

[936]10:2 [937]10:2 [938]10:3 [939]10:3 [940]10:14-21

[941]10:15-17 [942]10:15-22 [943]10:16 [944]10:16 [945]10:16

[946]11:23-29 [947]11:24 [948]11:26 [949]12:11-27 [950]12:12

[951]12:12-27 [952]12:13 [953]12:13 [954]12:26 [955]12:27

[956]14:9-16 [957]14:13 [958]14:22 [959]15:1-58 [960]15:1-58

[961]15:1-58 [962]15:1-58 [963]15:20 [964]15:22 [965]15:22

[966]15:23 [967]15:23 [968]15:24 [969]15:24 [970]15:24

[971]15:25 [972]15:44 [973]15:45-50 [974]15:50 [975]15:50

[976]15:51 [977]15:52 [978]16:22

2 Corinthians

[979]1:14 [980]1:22 [981]1:22 [982]1:23 [983]2:10

[984]3:1-18 [985]3:6-11 [986]3:11 [987]3:18 [988]4:3-6

[989]4:4 [990]4:4 [991]5:2 [992]5:4 [993]5:10 [994]5:19

[995]5:19 [996]5:21 [997]12:4 [998]12:10 [999]12:12

Galatians

[1000]1:8 [1001]1:8 [1002]1:15 [1003]1:16 [1004]1:16

[1005]1:16 [1006]2:6 [1007]2:16 [1008]2:16 [1009]2:16

[1010]2:16 [1011]2:19 [1012]2:20 [1013]2:20 [1014]2:20

[1015]2:20 [1016]2:20 [1017]2:20 [1018]2:20 [1019]2:20

[1020]3:1-29 [1021]3:6 [1022]3:7 [1023]3:8 [1024]3:10

[1025]3:13 [1026]3:13 [1027]3:14 [1028]3:14 [1029]3:14

[1030]3:14 [1031]3:16 [1032]3:16 [1033]3:23 [1034]3:24

[1035]3:26 [1036]3:26 [1037]3:26 [1038]3:26 [1039]3:26

[1040]3:26 [1041]3:27 [1042]3:27 [1043]3:27 [1044]3:27

[1045]3:27-29 [1046]3:29 [1047]3:29 [1048]3:29 [1049]4:4

[1050]4:4 [1051]4:5 [1052]4:5 [1053]5:6 [1054]5:6

[1055]5:16 [1056]5:16-26 [1057]5:16-26 [1058]5:16-26

[1059]5:17 [1060]5:21 [1061]6:15

Ephesians

[1062]1:4 [1063]1:6 [1064]1:9 [1065]1:10 [1066]1:12

[1067]1:13 [1068]1:13 [1069]1:14 [1070]1:15 [1071]1:17

[1072]1:18 [1073]1:18 [1074]1:19 [1075]1:19 [1076]1:20

[1077]1:22 [1078]1:22 [1079]1:23 [1080]1:23 [1081]2:1

[1082]2:1-6 [1083]2:1-22 [1084]2:5 [1085]2:6 [1086]2:6

[1087]2:8 [1088]2:10 [1089]2:11-22 [1090]2:12 [1091]2:19

[1092]3:3-9 [1093]3:7 [1094]3:9 [1095]3:17 [1096]3:19

[1097]3:20 [1098]4:11-13 [1099]4:15 [1100]4:15 [1101]4:15

[1102]4:16 [1103]4:16 [1104]4:16 [1105]4:16 [1106]4:16

[1107]4:22-24 [1108]4:22-24 [1109]4:30 [1110]5:5 [1111]5:5

[1112]5:21 [1113]5:21 [1114]5:22-33 [1115]5:22-33 [1116]5:23

[1117]5:25 [1118]5:25 [1119]5:25-27 [1120]5:28 [1121]5:30

[1122]5:30 [1123]5:30 [1124]5:31 [1125]5:32 [1126]5:32

[1127]5:32 [1128]6:1 [1129]6:1 [1130]6:3 [1131]6:4

[1132]6:4 [1133]6:10 [1134]6:10-18 [1135]46

Philippians

[1136]1:6 [1137]1:8 [1138]1:23 [1139]2:6 [1140]2:6-8

[1141]2:6-11 [1142]2:9 [1143]2:13 [1144]2:16 [1145]2:17

[1146]3:3 [1147]3:3 [1148]3:8 [1149]3:8 [1150]3:9 [1151]3:9

[1152]3:9 [1153]3:20 [1154]3:20 [1155]3:21 [1156]3:21

[1157]4:11 [1158]4:18

Colossians

[1159]1:18 [1160]1:20 [1161]1:27 [1162]1:27 [1163]2:10

[1164]2:10 [1165]2:12 [1166]2:14 [1167]2:16 [1168]2:19

[1169]2:19 [1170]3:3 [1171]3:4 [1172]3:4 [1173]3:4

[1174]3:10 [1175]3:20 [1176]1871

1 Thessalonians

[1177]1:10 [1178]2:10 [1179]2:19 [1180]3:13 [1181]4:15-17

[1182]4:15-17 [1183]4:16 [1184]5:1 [1185]5:2 [1186]5:23

[1187]14:4

2 Thessalonians

[1188]1:4-10 [1189]1:7 [1190]1:7-10 [1191]1:7-10 [1192]1:7-10

[1193]1:9 [1194]2 [1195]2:1-3 [1196]2:1-17 [1197]2:1-17

[1198]2:1-17 [1199]2:2 [1200]2:4 [1201]2:7 [1202]3:6

1 Timothy

[1203]1:12 [1204]2:4 [1205]2:4 [1206]2:5 [1207]2:6

[1208]3:2 [1209]3:2 [1210]3:2 [1211]3:2 [1212]3:16

[1213]3:16 [1214]3:16 [1215]4:1 [1216]4:3 [1217]5:14

[1218]6:14

2 Timothy

[1219]1:10 [1220]1:12 [1221]3:15 [1222]3:16 [1223]3:17

[1224]4:1 [1225]4:8

Titus

[1226]1:5 [1227]1:6 [1228]1:6 [1229]1:6 [1230]2:13

[1231]2:14 [1232]2:14 [1233]3:5 [1234]3:5 [1235]3:5

[1236]3:5 [1237]3:5 [1238]3:5 [1239]3:10

Hebrews

[1240]1:1-14 [1241]1:3 [1242]1:3 [1243]2:1-18 [1244]2:4

[1245]2:4 [1246]2:11 [1247]2:14 [1248]2:16 [1249]2:17

[1250]4:1-10 [1251]4:12 [1252]4:15 [1253]6:13 [1254]7:21

[1255]9:10 [1256]9:10 [1257]9:13 [1258]9:15 [1259]9:15

[1260]9:15 [1261]9:28 [1262]9:28 [1263]10:24 [1264]10:25

[1265]11:1 [1266]11:1-40 [1267]11:10 [1268]11:10

[1269]11:13-16 [1270]11:16 [1271]12:14 [1272]12:24 [1273]13:4

[1274]13:7 [1275]13:15 [1276]13:17 [1277]13:20 [1278]13:21

James

[1279]3:2

1 Peter

[1280]1:2 [1281]1:5 [1282]1:5-7 [1283]1:23 [1284]2:13-15

[1285]2:24 [1286]2:24 [1287]3:18 [1288]3:19 [1289]3:21

[1290]4:5 [1291]4:7 [1292]4:13 [1293]4:14

2 Peter

[1294]1:16 [1295]2:4 [1296]3:3-10 [1297]3:6-13 [1298]3:6-13

[1299]3:10 [1300]3:12 [1301]3:13

1 John

[1302]1:7 [1303]1:7 [1304]1:8 [1305]2:2 [1306]2:18

[1307]2:18 [1308]2:18 [1309]2:20 [1310]2:20 [1311]2:22

[1312]2:27 [1313]2:27 [1314]4:3 [1315]4:6 [1316]4:6

[1317]5:1 [1318]5:1 [1319]5:5 [1320]5:9 [1321]5:10

[1322]5:10 [1323]5:11 [1324]5:12 [1325]5:15 [1326]5:19

2 John

[1327]1:7

3 John

[1328]1:6 [1329]1:7 [1330]1:9

Jude

[1331]1:6 [1332]1:12 [1333]1:13

Revelation

[1334]1:1-3:22 [1335]1:5 [1336]1:6 [1337]1:7 [1338]1:9-3:22

[1339]1:20 [1340]2:7 [1341]2:16 [1342]4:1-8:1 [1343]4:1-11:14

[1344]5:13 [1345]6:9 [1346]7 [1347]7:5 [1348]8:2-11:19

[1349]10:4-6 [1350]11:1-19 [1351]11:2 [1352]11:3 [1353]11:3

[1354]11:3 [1355]11:8 [1356]11:15-13:10 [1357]12:1-14:20

[1358]12:18-13:18 [1359]13:1-18 [1360]13:3 [1361]13:5

[1362]13:11-19:21 [1363]13:14 [1364]14:1-20 [1365]14:9-11

[1366]14:13 [1367]15:1-22:21 [1368]17:1-18 [1369]17:6

[1370]17:7 [1371]17:12 [1372]17:15 [1373]18:1-24 [1374]18:7

[1375]19:1-3 [1376]19:7 [1377]19:9 [1378]19:13 [1379]19:20

[1380]20:1-6 [1381]20:1-22:21 [1382]20:4 [1383]20:4-6

[1384]20:10 [1385]20:11 [1386]20:12 [1387]20:12 [1388]20:13

[1389]20:13 [1390]21:1 [1391]21:6 [1392]21:9 [1393]21:21

[1394]22:2-5 [1395]22:6 [1396]22:11 [1397]22:17

Judith

[1398]12:7

2 Maccabees

[1399]12:43

Sirach

[1400]34:27 [1401]44:1-23 [1402]48:1-25

Index of Greek Words and Phrases

* [1403]baptizo

* [1404]palingenesias

* [1405]soma

* [1406]agora

* [1407]akropolis

* [1408]ametameleta tou Theou dora

* [1409]aniptois

* [1410]anagennesis

* [1411]apoka tastasis

* [1412]apokatastasis

* [1413]apoluein, aphienai, chorizein

* [1414]apolutrosis tou somatos hemon apo tes douleias tes phthoras

* [1415]apolutrosis, lutroun, agorazein, exagorazein

* [1416]apousian

* [1417]aspasmos kai timetike proskunesis

* [1418]hamartian ouk echomen

* [1419]artos

* [1420]ean me baptisontai

* [1421]ebaphe

* [1422]ebaphesan

* [1423]ebaptizeto en te parembole epi tes peges tou hudatos

* [1424]ebaptisato

* [1425]ezoopoiese

* [1426]ek pisteos

* [1427]ekeruxen

* [1428]elenchos

* [1429]eloueto hudati

* [1430]embapsas

* [1431]en

* [1432]en onomati

* [1433]en hudati eis metanoian

* [1434]en hud.

* [1435]en Pneumati hagio

* [1436]en pneumati

* [1437]en pn.

* [1438]en puri

* [1439]en te eschate hemera

* [1440]en to onomati

* [1441]en to Pneumati

* [1442]en tois epouraniois

* [1443]energeiai

* [1444]energeisthai

* [1445]enousian

* [1446]exorkizo

* [1447]exousia

* [1448]epi to onomati

* [1449]epi

* [1450]epi ti hudor

* [1451]episkopoi

* [1452]epi, eis, en

* [1453]episteme

* [1454]ebapsen

* [1455]echthesis

* [1456]heteron euangelion

* [1457]he anomia me baptizei

* [1458]he genea haute

* [1459]he gune koinonos esti biou, enoumene eis hen soma ek duo para Theou

* [1460]he marturian

* [1461]He tes eikonos time epi to prototupon diabainei kai ho proskunon ten eikona proskunei en aute tou engraphomenou ten hupostasin

* [1462]hina

* [1463]ho antikeimenos

* [1464]ho dikaios dikaiotheto eti

* [1465]ho dikaios, dikaiotheto eti

* [1466]ho kakologon

* [1467]ho louon

* [1468]ho planos kai ho antichristos

* [1469]horkizo

* [1470]horkiei auten

* [1471]hupo elaiou

* [1472]hupo ton phantasion

* [1473]hupodeigma tes apeitheias

* [1474]hupodikos

* [1475]hupostasis

* [1476]huperdouleia

* [1477]hudati

* [1478]horkise me

* [1479]rhaino

* [1480]rhantizo

* [1481]Baptizei Iesous, all' en tneumati

* [1482]Bapt. en pneumati hagio kai puri

* [1483]Battizo

* [1484]Dikaios

* [1485]Dikaoun

* [1486]Eulogia

* [1487]Eucharistia

* [1488]Exorkizo se kata tou Theou tou zontos

* [1489]Theou

* [1490]Thusia

* [1491]Musterion

* [1492]Ou lepse to onoma kuriou tou theou sou epi matio

* [1493]Parakletos

* [1494]Pneuma

* [1495]Porneia

* [1496]Prosphora

* [1497]Sunaxis

* [1498]Upotuposis

* [1499]Christou

* [1500]aition poietikon

* [1501]baptein

* [1502]baptisma

* [1503]baptomai

* [1504]bapto

* [1505]bapto, baptizo

* [1506]bapse

* [1507]bapsas

* [1508]bapsei

* [1509]bapseis

* [1510]baprizo tina eis tina (eis ti)

* [1511]baprizomenos apo nekrou

* [1512]baptizein

* [1513]baptizo

* [1514]baptizo tina eis Christon

* [1515]baptizo tina eis to onoma tou Patros, ktl.

* [1516]baptisontai

* [1517]baptismos

* [1518]baptismous

* [1519]baphe

* [1520]gnosis

* [1521]gunaika ep adelphe autes

* [1522]gunaika echein

* [1523]dikaios

* [1524]dia

* [1525]dia pistin

* [1526]dia tes pisteos en Christo Iesou

* [1527]diakonoi

* [1528]diaphoroi baptismoi

* [1529]dia dakruon

* [1530]didaskaloi

* [1531]dikaiosis

* [1532]dikaioo

* [1533]dikaiosune

* [1534]dikaiosunen poiesato eti

* [1535]douleia

* [1536]ei thelei auton

* [1537]eis

* [1538]eis aphesin hamartion

* [1539]eis Christon Iesoun

* [1540]eis Christon

* [1541]eis zoen aionion

* [1542]eis kolasin aionion

* [1543]eis metanoian

* [1544]eis to onoma

* [1545]eis to onoma Paulou

* [1546]eis to Mosen

* [1547]eis (eis to onoma)

* [1548]heimarmene

* [1549]eimi

* [1550]euangelion

* [1551]eulogeo

* [1552]eulogesas

* [1553]eulogia

* [1554]euschemosunes

* [1555]eucharisteo

* [1556]eucharistesas

* [1557]eucharistia

* [1558]eusemon logon

* [1559]ei' tis estin . . . mias gunaikos, aner

* [1560]echthesis

* [1561]zoe

* [1562]zoopoiesei

* [1563]zoopoiein

* [1564]thanatos

* [1565]thelei

* [1566]thanatos

* [1567]theou

* [1568]thumiama prosagetai

* [1569]thusia aineseos

* [1570]kai sphragides

* [1571]kalos poiein

* [1572]kalei porneian ten ou kata gamon ginomenen sunousian

* [1573]kata pneuma

* [1574]kata sarka

* [1575]kata sarka

* [1576]kat' exochen

* [1577]kat' exochen

* [1578]keimelion

* [1579]kene

* [1580]klesis

* [1581]klinon

* [1582]koinonia

* [1583]krima

* [1584]krima eis katakrima

* [1585]ktisis

* [1586]kuriou

* [1587]kuriou kai theou

* [1588]logos

* [1589]latreia

* [1590]leitourgia

* [1591]lousai

* [1592]logike

* [1593]loidorias

* [1594]loutron palingenesias

* [1595]loutron

* [1596]metanoia

* [1597]metousian

* [1598]mnemosuna

* [1599]moicheia

* [1600]musterion

* [1601]niptomai

* [1602]nipsontai

* [1603]nomos

* [1604]nouthesia

* [1605]oikonomia

* [1606]hoi bebaptismenoi

* [1607]oinos

* [1608]ouk aphanismon apeilei, alla ten kaitharsin hupophainei

* [1609]ousia

* [1610]hou pepisteuken eis ten marturian hen memartureken ho Theos

peri tou huiou hautou

* [1611]pistei

* [1612]pistis

* [1613]pistis estin hekousios tes psuches sunkatatheitis

* [1614]pistis di' agapes energoumene

* [1615]pistis tes energeias tou Theou

* [1616]paideia

* [1617]palingenesia

* [1618]palingenesias

* [1619]parousian

* [1620]peitho

* [1621]pepleromenoi

* [1622]peribeblemenos himatioi bebammenon haimati

* [1623]pistos

* [1624]pisteuein eis

* [1625]pisteuete en to euangeli'o

* [1626]pisteuo

* [1627]pisteuo, pistis

* [1628]pistin en to Kurio Iesiou

* [1629]pleroma ton ethnon

* [1630]plerophoria

* [1631]pneuma

* [1632]pneumatikos

* [1633]pneuma, psuche

* [1634]pollon estin euergetematon anamnesis

* [1635]polupoikilos sophia tou Theou

* [1636]porneia

* [1637]proton pseudos

* [1638]prosepoieito

* [1639]proskuneo

* [1640]sarx

* [1641]su eipas

* [1642]soma

* [1643]soma pneumatikon

* [1644]soma psuchikon

* [1645]soma, psuche

* [1646]sabbatismos

* [1647]semnotes

* [1648]stoicheia

* [1649]summarturei

* [1650]sunousian

* [1651]ta elpizomena

* [1652]ta ou blepomena

* [1653]ta panta

* [1654]telos

* [1655]to musterion touto mega estin

* [1656]to paschon

* [1657]to poiou

* [1658]to poterion tes eulogias

* [1659]tous proelpikotas en to Christo

* [1660]touto

* [1661]huiothesia

* [1662]pharmakon athanasias, antidotos tou apothanein

* [1663]phusei

* [1664]phusis

* [1665]photismos

* [1666]charisma eis dikaioma

* [1667]chorizetai

* [1668]psuche

* [1669]psuchikon

* [1670][Phemi:] Tas men [psuchas] ton eusebon en kreittoni poi choro

menein, tas de adikous kai poneras en cheironi, ton tes kriseos ekdechomenas chronon tote

---

Index of Hebrew Words and Phrases

* [1671]'sh 'l'tth
* [1672]'vh
* [1673]'mn
* [1674]'tv
* [1675]vhyyh
* [1676]hshchvh
* [1677]hsby
* [1678]hyh
* [1679]chmd
* [1680]kvs hbdkh
* [1681]l
* [1682]lstr
* [1683]mqtr mgs
* [1684]tsryq
* [1685]tsvr
* [1686]s'r vsrv
* [1687]sv'
* [1688]tvrh

Index of Latin Words and Phrases

* [1689]"Error, conditio, votum, cognatio, crimen,
* [1690]culpa vacans
* [1691]Ædificarent autem aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, et de utroque igne securi essent; non solum de illo æterno qui in æternum cruciaturus est impios, sed etiam de illo qui emendabit eos qui per

ignem salvi erunt . . . . Et quia dicitur, 'salvus erit,'
contemnitur ille guis. . . . . Gravior tamen erit ille ignis quam
quidquid potest homo pati in hac vita.

* [1692]à priori

* [1693]Credimus . . . . illorum animas, qui in mortali peccato vel
cum solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis
tamen disparibus puniendas.' Ita quidem Florentinum in decreto
Unionis,' quod descripsit verba Lugdunensis in fidei professione.
De fide igitur est, (1.) parvulos ejusmodi in infernum descendere
seu damnationem incurrere; (2.) poenis puniri disparibus ab illis
quibus puniuntur adulti. Quæ proinde spectant ad hunc inferni
locum, ad poenarum disparitatem, seu in quo hæc disparitas
constituenda sit, ad parvulorum statum post judicii diem incerta
sunt omnia, nec fidem attingunt. Hinc variæ de his sunt patrum ac
theologorum sententiæ.

* [1694]Uxorem ad (i.e

* [1695]"Certum est," says Bellarmin, "Antichristi persecutionem fore
gravissimam et notissimam; ita ut cessent omnes publicæ religionis
ceremoniæ et sacrificia . . . . [Daniel xii.

* [1696]"Ego puto," he says, "quod et post resurrectionem ex mortuis
indigeamus sacramento eluente nos atque purgante: nemo enim absque
sordibus resurgere poterit: nec ullam posse animam reperiri quæ
universis statim vitiis careat."

* [1697]"Est merum mendacium," he says, "quod Catholici dicant,
sacramenta prodesse peccatoribus: omnes enim Catholici requirunt
poenitentiam, tanquam dispositionem ad gratiam rocipiendam"

* [1698]"Exemplum," he says, "esse potest in re naturali. Si ad ligna
comburenda, primum exsiccarentur ligna, deinde excuteretur ex
silice, tum applicaretur ignis ligno, et sic tandem fieret

combustio; nemo diceret, causam immediatam combustionis esse siccitatem aut excussionem ignis ex silice aut applicationem ignis ad ligna, sed solum ignem, ut causam primariam, et solum calorem seu calefactionem, ut causam instrumentalem."

* [1699]"Ille mentitur," he says, "qui aliud habet in animo, et aliud verbis vel quibuslibet significationibus enuntiat."

* [1700]"Individuam vitæ consuetudinem retinens," it is said, "indissolubilis vinculi naturam declarat quo vir, et uxor colligantur."

* [1701]"Interest quidem plurimum," he says, "qua causa, quo fine, qua intentione quid fiat: sed ea quæ constat esse peccata, nullo bonæ causæ obtentu, nullo quasi bono fine, nulla velut bona intentione facienda sunt. . . . . Cum vero jam opera ipsa peccata sunt; sicut furta, stupra, blasphemiæ, vel cætera talia; quis est qui dicat causis bonis esse facienda, ut vel peccata non sint, vel quod est absurdius, justa peccata sint? Quis est qui dicat: ut habeamus quod demus pauperibus, faciamus furta divitibus; aut, testimonia falsa vendamus, maxime si non inde innocentes læduntur, sed nocentes potius damnaturis judicibus eruuntur?"

* [1702]"Non licet mentiri (i.e

* [1703]"Restrictio mentalis," says Gury, "est actus mentis verba alicujus propositionis ad alium sensum quam naturalem et obvium detorquentis vel restringentis."

* [1704]"Sunt . . . . . sacramenta," he says, "signa vel ceremoniæ, pace tamen omnium dicam, sive neotericorum sive veteram, quibus se homo Ecclesiæ probat aut candidatum aut militem esse Christi, redduntque Ecclesiam totam potius certiorem de tua fide quam te. Si enim fides tua non aliter fuerit absoluta, quam ut signo ceremoniali egeat, fides non est: fides enim est, qua nitimur

misericordiæ Dei inconcusse, firmiter et indistracte, ut multis locis Paulus habet."

* [1705]"Tribuitur morti," he says,Loc. xxvi. p. 331.

* [1706]"Unde," says Turrettin,Institutio

* [1707]"utrum ita sit," he says, "quæri potest: et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium; quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusque salvari."

* [1708]aition poietikon

* [1709](1.) Etsi hæc oratio: bona opera sunt necessaria ad salutem in doctrina legis abstractive et de idea tolerari potest, tamen multæ sunt graves causæ, propter quas vitanda, et fugienda est non minus, quam hæc oratio: Christus est creatura. (2.) In foro justificationis hæc propositio nullo modo ferenda est. (3.) In foro novæ obedientiæ post reconciliationem nequaquam bona opera ad salutem, sed propter alias causas necessaria sunt. (4.) Sola fides justificat in principio, medio, et fine. (5.) Bona opera non sunt necessaria ad retinendam salutem. (6.) Synonyma sunt et æquipollentia, seu termini convertibiles, justificatio et salvatio, nec ulla ratione distrahi aut possunt aut debent. (7.) Explodatur ergo ex ecclesia cothurnus papisticus propter scandala multiplicia, dissensiones innumerabiles et alias causas, de quibus Apostoli Act. xv.

* [1710](Baptismi significatio) duas partes habet. Nam ibi remissio peccatorum, deinde spiritualis renovatio figuratur. . . . . Annon aliud aquæ tribuis nisi ut ablutionis tantum sit figura? Sic figuram esse sentio ut simul annexa sit veritas. Neque enim sua nobis dona pollicendo nos, Deus frustratur. Proinde et peccatorum veniam et vitæ novitatem offeri nobis in baptismo et recipi a

nobis, certum est.

* [1711](Infantes e fidelibus parentibus natos) baptizandos et signo foederis obsignandos esse credimus.

* [1712]1º Christum delere peccata sacerdotum ministerio; 2º sacerdotes sedere judices in tribunali poenitentiæ; 3º illorum sententiam ratam in coelis esse; 4º sacerdotes hac potestate præstare angelis et archangelis ipsis.

* [1713]1. Irritatione. 2. Dispensatione et relaxatione. 3. Commutatione. 4. Materiæ mutatione vel subtracione. 5. Cessante fine totali complete. 6. Ratione conditionis non adimpletæ. 7. Cessante principali obligatione cessat juramentum pure accessorium. 8. Non acceptatione, et condonatione, seu remissione. 9. Si juramentum incipiat vergere in deteriorem exitum, vel in præjudicium boni communis, vel etiam alicujus particularis, v. g. quis juravit occultare furtum alterius, sed inde alter liberius prolabitur ad alia furta: item cessat juramentum, quando directe est majoris boni impeditivum. 10. Denique cessat obligatio juramenti, licet improprie, per adimpletionem sive totalem solutionem rei juratæ: et e contra dicitur cessare ab initio, quia juramentum fuit nullum, sive quia nullam ab initio obligationem produxit.

* [1714]17. Per justificationem peccatoris intelligimus actum Dei Patris, ut judicis, quo peccatorem credentem, natura filium iræ, neque ullum jus ex se habentem bona coelestia petendi, declarat immunem esse ab omni reatu, et condemnatione, adoptat in filium, et in eum ex gratia confert jus ad suam communionem, cum salute æterna, bonisque omnibus cum ea conjunctis, postulandi.

* [1715]27. Teneamus nullam carnem in se posse reperire et ex se producere causam, et fundamentum justificationis. 29. Quærendum

igitur id, propter quod peccator justificatur, extra peccatorem in obedientia Filli Dei, quam præstitit Patri in humana natura ad mortem, imo ad mortem crucis, et ad quam præstandam se obstrinxerat in sponsione. (Rom. v. 19

* [1716]Absente fide, nudum et inefficax signum tantummodo permanet.

* [1717]Ac ne qua ambiguitas restet, quum in coelo quarendum Christum dicimus, hæc locutio locorum distantiam nobis sonat et exprimit. Tametsi enim philosophice loquendo supra coelos locus non est; quia tamen corpus Christi, ut fert humani corporis natura et modus, finitum est et coelo, ut loco, continetur, necesse est a nobis tanto locorum intervallo distare, quanto coelum abest a terra.

* [1718]Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum

* [1719]Actus fidei ordinatur ad objectum voluntatis, quod est bonum, sicut ad finem. Hoc autem bonum quod est finis fidei, scilicet bonum divinum, est proprium objectum charitatis: et ideo charitas dicitur forma fidei, in quantum per charitatem actus fidei perficitur et formatur.

* [1720]Ad hunc modum ita discerne, longe aliam rem esse baptismum, atque omnes alias aquas: non naturalis essentiæ gratia, sed quod huic aliquid præstantioris rei adjungitur. Ipse enim Deus baptismum suo honestat nomine, suaque virtute confirmat. Eam ob rem non tantum naturalis aqua, sed etiam divina, coelestis, sancta et salutifera aqua, quocunque alio laudis titulo nobilitari potest, habenda et dicenda est; hocque non nisi verbi gratia, quod coeleste ac sanctum verbum est, neque a quoquam satis ampliter, digne et cumulate laudari potest, siquidem omnem Dei virtutem et potentiam in se habet comprehensam. Inde quoque baptismus suam accipit essentiam, ut sacramenti appellationem mereatur, quemadmodum sanctus etiam docet Augustinus: Accedit, inquit, verbum ad

elementum, et fit sacramentum, hoc est, res sancta et divina.

* [1721]Adultis credentibus principaliter præstat usum obsignationis ac testificationis de gratia Dei

* [1722]Anathema Maranatha

* [1723]Apud theologos Augustanæ confessionis extra controversiam positum est

* [1724]Aqua certe tantas res non efficit, sed verbum Dei, quod in et cum aqua est, et fides, quæ verbo Dei aquæ addito credit. Quia aqua sine verbo Dei est simpliciter aqua, et non est baptismus: sed addito verbo Dei est baptismus, hoc est, salutaris aqua gratiæ et vitæ, et lavacrum regenerationis in Spiritu Sancto, sicut Paulus ait ad Tit. iii. 5

* [1725]Ars artium regimen animarum.

* [1726]Assensus, qui omnia, quamvis ignota, quæ ab ecclesia probantur, amplectitur.

* [1727]Asserimus, sacramenta non solum tesseras quasdam societatis Christianæ, sed et gratiæ divinæ symbola esse, quibus ministri, Domino, ad eum finem, quem ipse promittit, offert et efficit, cooperentur.

* [1728]At quis unquam Catholicorum reliquias invocavit? Quis unquam auditus est un precibus, aut litaniis dixisse: Sanctæ reliquiæ, orate pro me?' Et quis easdem unquam divino honore affecit, vel Christi loco adoravit: nos enim reliquias quidem honoramus, et osculamur ut sacra pignora patronorum nostrorum: sed nec adoramus ut Deum nec invocamus ut sanctos, sed minore cultu veneramur, quam sanctorum spiritus, nedum quam Deum ipsum.

* [1729]Atque ob eam rem fieri intelligimus, ut, si infidels quispiam, gentis suæ more et consuetudine, plures uxores duxisset, cum ad veram religionem conversus fuerit, jubeat eum Ecclesia

ceteras omnes relinquere, ac priorem tantum justæ et legitimæ uxoris loco habere.

* [1730]Atqui nihil aliud volumus; Nam quod addit, nos velle ita imputari nobis Christi justitiam, ut per eam formaliter justi nominemur et simus,' hoc gratis et falso supponit, ex perversa et præpostera sua hypothesi de justificatione morali. Sed quæritur, Ad quid imputatio ista fiat? An ad justificationem et vitam, ut nos pertendimus, An vero tantum ad gratiæ internæ et justitiæ inhærentis infusionem, ut illi volunt; Id est, an ita imputentur et communicentur nobis merita Christi, ut sint causa meritoria sola nostræ justificationis, nec ulla alia detur justitia propter quam absolvamur in conspectu Dei; quod volumus; An vero ita imputentur, ut sint conditiones causæ formalis, id. justitiæ inhærentis, ut ea homo donari possit, vel causæ extrinsecæ, quæ mereantur infusionem justitiæ, per quam justificatur homo; ut ita non meritum Christi proprie, sed justitia inhærens per meritum Christi acquisita, sic causa propria et vera, propter quam homo justificatur; quod illi statuunt.

* [1731]Baptismus neminem justificat, nec ulli prodest, sed fides in verbum promissionis, cui additur baptismus. . . . . Nec verum esse potest, sacramentis inesse vim efficacem justificationis seu esse signa efficacia gratiæ.

* [1732]Baptismus nobis testificandæ nostræ adoptioni datus, quoniam in eo inserimur Christi corpori, ut ejus sanguine abluti simul etiam ipsius Spiritu ad vitæ sanctimoniam renovemur.

* [1733]Baptismus pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica.

* [1734]Beatitudo, quæ etiam summum bonum aut ultimus finis nuncupatur, a BoetioConsolatio Philosophiæ

* [1735]Coenam mysticam, in qua dominus corpus et sanguinem suum, id

est, seipsum suia vere ad hoc offerat, ut magis, magisque in illis vivat, et illi in ipso. Non quod pani et vino corpus et sanguis domini vel naturaliter uniantur: vel hic localiter includantur, vel ulla huc carnali præsentia, statuantur. Sed quod panis et vinum ex institutione domini symbola sint, quibus ab ipso domino per ecclesiæ ministerium vera corporis et sanguinis ejus communicatio, non in periturum ventris cibum, sed in æternæ vitæ alimoniam exhibeatur.

* [1736]Carnem carnis suæ s. corporis sui esse cognatam propinquam, quæ est ut caro ejusdem corporis.

* [1737]Causam formalem justificationis esse justitiam, sive caritatem, quam Deus unicuique propriam infundit, secundum mensuram dispositionum, et quæ in cordibus justificatorum innæret.

* [1738]Cave, quæso, ne quando de te dicat Deus: Virgo Israel cecidit, et non est qui suscitet eam.' (Amos v. 2

* [1739]Certa fiducia, a Spiritu Sancto per evangelium in corde meo accensa, qua in Deo acquiesco, certo statuens, non solum aliis, sed mihi quoque remissionem peccatorum æternam, justitiam et vitam donatam esse idque gratis, ex Dei misericordia, propter unius Christi meritum.

* [1740]Christus quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in coelo, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentia quæ rendus est

* [1741]Cibus sum grandium; cresce, et manducabis me. Nec tu me in te mutabis, sicut cibum carnis tuæ; sed tu mutaberis in me.

* [1742]Concupiscentia, quæ ex peccato est, nihil aliud est, nisi animi appetitio, natura sua rationi repugnans: qui tamen motus si voluntatis consensum, aut negligentiam conjunctam non habeat, a vera peccati natura longe abest.

* [1743]Confessarius interrogatus a tyranno an Titius confessus sit

homicidium, respondere potest et debet: nescio;' quia confessarius id nescit scientia communicabili. Imo, etiamsi instaret tyrannus, et diceret, An hoc nescis scientia sacramentali?' Respondere adhuc posset: nescio.' Ratio est, quia tyrannus bene scit se de hoc jus interrogandi non habere, nec confessarius ut homo scit se scire, sed uti vicarius Dei et scientia incommunicabili.

* [1744]Constanter tenendum est, Deum nemini Spiritum vel gratiam suam largiri nisi per verbum et cum verbo externo et præcedente, ut ita præmuniamus nos adversum enthusiastas, i.e

* [1745]Constat quemadmodum mortuis corporibus naturale alimentum nihil prodest, ita etiam animæ, quæ spiritu non vivit, sacra mysteria non prodesse, ac propterea panis, et vini speciem habent, ut significetur, non quidem revocandæ ad vitam animæ, sed in vita conservandæ causa instituta esse.

* [1746]Conversio habitualia seu passiva, fit per habituum supernaturalium infusionem a Spiritu Sancto. Actualis vero seu activa per bonorum istorum exercitium. . . . Per illam homo renovatur et convertitur a Deo. Per istam homo a Deo renovatus et convertus convertit se ad Deum, et actus agit. Illa melius regeneratio dicitur, quia se habet ad modum novæ nativitatis, qua homo reformatur ad imaginem Creatoris sui. Ista vero conversio, quia includit hominis ipsius operationem.

* [1747]Conversio hominis talis est immutatio, per operationem Spiritus Sancti, in hominis intellectu, voluntate et corde, qua homo (operatione videlicet Spiritus Sancti) potest oblatam gratiam apprehendere.

* [1748]Corpus Christi in coelis est ad dextram patris. Sursum ergo elevanda sunt corda, et non defigenda in panem, nec adorandus dominus in pane. Et tamen non est absens ecclesiæ suæ celebranti

coenam dominus. Sol absens a nobis in coelo, nihilominus efficaciter præsens est nobis: quanto magis sol justitiæ Christus, corpore en coelis absens nobis, præsens est nobis, non corporaliter quidem, sed spiritualiter per vivificam operationem.

* [1749]Crede mihi

* [1750]Crede ut intelligas

* [1751]Crede, et manducasti

* [1752]Credentes in hac vita non perfecte, completive vel consummative (ut veteres locuti sunt) renovantur. Et quamvis ipsorum peccata Christi obedientia absolutissima contecta sint, ut credentibus non ad damnationem imputentur, et per Spiritum Sanctum veteris Adami mortificatio et renovatio in spiritu mentis eorum inchoata sit: tamen vetus Adam in ipsa natura, omnibusque illius interioribus et exterioribus viribus adhuc semper inhæret.

* [1753]Credere est actus intellectus assentientis veritati divinæ ex imperio voluntatis a Deo motæ per gratiam.

* [1754]Credere, nihil aliud est, quam cum assensione cogitare.

* [1755]Credimus . . . . illorum animas, qui post baptismum susceptum nullam omnino peccati maculam incurrerunt, illas etiam animas quæ post contractam peccati maculam vel in suis corporibus, vel eisdem exutæ corporibus sunt purgatæ in coelum mox recipi, et intueri clare ipsum Deum trinum et unum sicuti est.

* [1756]Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, hoc ipsum nostram esse coram Deo justitiam, quod Dominus nobis peccata remittit, ex mera gratia, absque ullo respectu præcedentium, præsentium, aut consequentium nostrorum operum, dignitatis, aut meriti. Ille enim donat atque imputat nobis justitiam obedientiæ Christi; propter eam justitiam a Deo in gratiam recipimur et justi reputamur.

* [1757]Credimus, sicut antea dictum est, tam in coena quam in

baptismo, Deum nobis reipsa, id est, vere et efficaciter donare quicquid ibi sacramentaliter figurat, ac proinde cum signis conjungimus veram possessionem ac fruitionem ejus rei, quæ ita nobis offertur. Itaque affirmamus eos qui ad sacram mensam Domini puram fidem tanquam vas quoddam afferunt, vere recipere quod ibi signa testificantur, nempe corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi, non minus esse cibum ac potum animæ, quam panis et vinum sunt corporis cibus.

* [1758]Credo, imo scio omnia sacramenta, tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent. . . . . Dux autem vel vehiculum Spiritui non est necessarium, ipse enim est virtus et latio qua cuncta feruntur, non qui ferri opus habeat: neque id unquam legimus in scripturis sacris, quod sensibilia, qualia sacramenta sunt, certo secum ferrent Spiritum, sed si sensibilia unquam lata sunt cum Spiritu, jam Spiritus fuit qui tulit, non sensibilia. Sic cum ventus vehemens ferretur, simul adferebantur linguæ venti virtute, non ferebatur ventus virtute linguarum.

* [1759]Crux Christi, et imagines, ac quæcunque attigerunt, adorana sunt, juxta Ecclesiæ catholicæ doctrinam, et fidem.

* [1760]Cui competit potestas dispensandi super juramento?

* [1761]Cui fidem non faciant et honoris, qui sanctis debetur, et patrocinii, quod nostri suscipiunt, mirabiles effectæ res ad eorum sepulcra, et oculis, et manibus membrisque omnibus captis, in pristinum statum restitutis, mortuis ad vitam revocatis, ex corporibus hominum ejectis demoniis? quæ non audisse, ut multi, non legisse, ut plurimi gravissimi viri, sed vidisse, testes locupletissimi sancti Ambrosius et Augustinus litteris prodiderunt. Quid multa? si vestes, sudaria, si umbra sanctorum, priusquam e vita migrarent, depulit morbos, viresque restituit, quis tandem

negare audeat, Deum per sacros cineres, ossa, ceterasque sanctorum reliquias eadem mirabiliter efficere? Declaravit id cadaver illud, quod forte illatum in sepulcrum Elisei, ejus tacto corpore, subito revixit.

* [1762]Cum antea demonstratum sit, corpus Domini, et sanguinem vere in sacramento esse, ita nulla amplius subsit panis, et vini substantia; quoniam ea accidentia Christi corpori, et sanguini inhærere non possunt: relinquitur, ut supra omnem naturæ ordinem ipsa se, nulla alia re nisa, sustentent, hæc perpetua, et constans fuit catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina.

* [1763]Cum baptismus ob eam rem expetendus sit, ut Christum induamus, et cum eo conjungamur, plane constat, merito a sacra ablutione rejiciendum esse, cui in vitiis et peccatis perseverare propositum est; præsertim vero, quia nihil eorum, quæ ad Christum, et Ecclesiam pertinent, frustra suscipiendum est: inanemque baptismum, si justitiæ, et salutis gratiam spectemus, in eo futurum esse, satis intelligimus, qui secundum carnem ambulare, non secundum Spiritum cogitat: etsi, quod ad sacramentum pertinet, perfectam ejus rationem sine ulla dubitatione consequitur, si modo, cum rite baptizatur, in animo habeat id accipere, quod a sancta Ecclesia administratur.

* [1764]Cum dicimus Christi justitiam ad justificationem nobis imputari, et nos per justitiam illam imputatam justos esse coram Deo, et non per justitiam ullam quæ nobis inhæreat; Nihil aliud volumus, quam obedientiam Christi Deo Patri nomine nostro præstitam, ita nobis a Deo donari, ut vere nostra censeatur, eamque esse unicam et solam illam justitiam propter quam, et cujus merito, absolvamur a reatu peccatorum nostrum, et jus ad vitam obtinemus; nec ullam in nobis esse justitiam, aut ulla bona opera, quibus

beneficia tanta promereamur, quæ ferre possint severum judicii divini examen, si Deus juxta legis suæ rigorem nobiscum agere vellet nihil nos illi posse opponere, nisi Christi meritum et satisfactionem, in qua sola, peccatorum conscientia territi, tutum adversus iram divinam perfugium, et animarum nostrarum pacem invenire possumus.

* [1765]Cum hodie hoc Dei verbum per prædicatores legitime vocatos annunciatur in ecclesia, credimus ipsum Dei verbum annunciari, et a fidelibus recipi, neque aliud Dei verbum fingendum vel coelitus esse expectandum. . . . . Agnoscimus interim, Deum illuminare posse homines etiam sine externo ministerio, quos et quando velit: id quod ejus potentiæ est. Nos autem loquimur de usitate ratione instituendi homines, et præcepto et exemplo tradita nobis a Deo.

* [1766]Cum homo ad Dei imaginem sit factus, æquum est, ut, qui Dei imaginem violavit et destruxit, occidatur, cum Dei imagini injuriam faciens, ipsum Deum, illius auctorem, petierit.

* [1767]Cum vero multo etiam seriora secula plena sint testimoniis ejus rei, nescio qua ratione moti quidam id donum ad prima tantum tempora restringant; quibus ut uberiorem fuisse miraculorum copiam, ad jacienda tanti ædificii fundementa contra vim mundi, facile concedo, ita cum illis expirasse hanc Christi promissionem cur credamus non video. Quare si quis nunc etiam gentibus Christi ignaris (illis enim proprie miracula inserviunt 1 Cor. xiv. 22

* [1768]Cur, inquiunt, nunc illa miracula, quæ prædicatis facta esse, non fiunt? Possem quidem dicere, necessaria fuisse priusquam crederet mundus, ad hoc ut crederet mundus.

* [1769]Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui negant baptisandos esse infantulos recens natos a fidelibus. Nam juxta doctrinam evangelicam, horum est regnum Dei, et sunt in foedere Dei, cur itaque non daretur eis

signum foederis Dei?

* [1770]Damnamus totum populum scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter Judaica opinio est, sentire, quod per ceremoniam justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide. . . . . At sacramenta sunt signa promissionum. Igitur in usu debet accedere fides. . . . . Loquimur hic de fide speciali, quæ præsenti promissioni credit, non tantum quæ in genere credit Deum esse, sed quæ credit offerri remissionem peccatoram.

* [1771]Damnant Anabaptistas qui improbant baptismum puerorum et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri.

* [1772]De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in Coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes.

* [1773]De baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei; et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblati Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri.

* [1774]De carnis etiam nostræ immortalitate securos nos reddat, siquidem ab immortali ejus carne jam vivificatur et quodammodo ejus immortalitate communicat.

* [1775]De causa meritoria justificationis hominis coram Deo, sive de ea re, quæ a Deo ad justitiam imputatur

* [1776]De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere, aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus.

* [1777]De sacramento altaris sentimus, panem et vinum in Coena esse verum corpus et sanguinem Christi, et non tantum dari et sumi a

piis, sed etiam impiis christianis.

* [1778]De transubstantione subtilitatem sophisticam nihil curamus, qua fingunt, panem et vinum relinquere et amittere naturalem suam substantiam, et tantum speciem et colorem panis, et non verum panem remanere. Optime enim cum sacra Scriptura congruit, quod panis adsit et maneat, sicut Paulus ipse nominat Panis quem frangimus. Et: Ita edat de pane.

* [1779]De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his, qui utuntur, proposita. Itaque utendum est sacramentis ita, ut fides accedat, quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur.

* [1780]Decimus articulus approbatus est, in quo confitemur, nos sentire, quod in Coena Domini vere et substantialiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi, et vere exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quæ videntur, pane et vino, his, qui sacramentum accipiunt.

* [1781]Declarat tamen hæc ipsa Sancta Synodus, non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam, et immaculatam Viriginem Mariam, Dei genetricem; sed observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Xysti papæ IV., sub poenis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat.

* [1782]Defectus charitatis, quod videlicet non faciamus opera nostra tanto fervore dilectionis, quanto faciemus in patria, defectus quidem est, sed culpa et peccatum non est. . . . . Unde etiam charitas nostra, quamvis comparata ad charitatem beatorum sit imperfecta, tamen absolute perfecta dici potest.

* [1783]Defectus charitatis, quod videlicet non faciamus opera nostra

tanto fervore dilectionis, quanto faciemus in patria, defectus quidem est, sed culpa, et peccatum non est. Unde etiam charitas nostra, quamvis comparata ad charitatem beatorum sit imperfecta, tamen absolute perfecta dici potest.

* [1784]Deinde et pro defunctis sanctis patribus et episcopis, et omnibus generatim, qui inter nos vita functi sunt, oramus, maximum hoc credentes adjumentum illis animabus fore, pro quibas oratio defertur, dum sancta et tremenda coram jacet victima

* [1785]Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ, angelorum, et sanctorum sunt imagines adorandæ (id est in honore habendæ, as it reads in the margin) tum corpora, et reliquiæ quævis.

* [1786]Descendit et lavit in Jordane septies

* [1787]Deus non judicat hominum justitiam esse perfectam, imo eam judicat esse imperfectam; sed justitiam, quam imperfectam judicat, gratiose accipit ac si perfecta esset.

* [1788]Deus panem vivificum misit, qui de coelo descendit, nempe Jesum Christum: is nutrit et sustentat vitam fidelium spiritualem, si comedatur, id est, applicetur et recipiatur Spiritu per fidem.

* [1789]Dicimus igitur ad sacramenta proprie sic dicta duo potissimum requiri, videlicet verbum et elementum, juxta vulgatum illud Augustini: Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.' Fundamentum hujus adsertionis ex ipsa natura et fine sacramentorum pendet, cum enim sacramenta id, quid in verbo evangelii prædicatur, externo elemento vestitum sensibus ingerere debeant, ex eo sponte sequitur, quod nec verbum sine elemento, nec elementum sine verbo constituat sacramentum. Per verbum intelligitur primo mandatum atque institutio divina, per quam elementum . . . . . separatur ab usu communi, et destinatur usui sacramentali; deinde promissio atque ea quidem evangelio propria, per sacramentum adplicanda et

obsignanda. Per elementum non quodvis, sed certum et verbo institutionis expressum accipitur.

* [1790]Difficile Deo non est moleculas omnes ad corpus aliquod spectantes, etiam post innumeros transitus ex uno in aliud colligere. Hæc mutatio seu transitus accidentalis est, minime vere essentialis, ut ex physiologia ac zoobiologia constat universa.

* [1791]Dilucide exprimit, se non ea justitia contentum, quæ nobis obedientia et sacrificio mortis Christi parta est, fingere nos substantialiter in Deo justos esse tam essentia quam qualitate infusa. . . . . Substantialem mixtionem ingerit, qua Deus se in nos transfundens, quasi partem sui faciat. Nam virtute Spiritus sancti fieri, ut coalescamus cum Christo, nobisque sit caput et nos ejus membra, fere pro nihilo ducit, nisi ejus essentia nobis misceatur.

* [1792]Divortiis

* [1793]Dixit: Sic tamen quasi per ignem,' ut salus hæc non sine poena sit: . . . . estendit salvum illum quidem futurum; sed poenas ignis passurum, ut per ignem purgatus fiat salvus, et non sicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueatur.

* [1794]Docemus, "baptismum esse quidem ordinarium initiationis sacramentum et regenerationis medium omnibus omnino etiam fidelium liberis ad regenerationem et salutem necessarium; interim tamen in casu privationis sive impossibilitatis salvari liberos Christianorum per extraordinariam et peculiarem dispensationem divinam."

* [1795]Docent [Apostoli] Antichristum non fore unam aliquam tantum personam, sed integrum regnum, per falsos doctores in templo Dei, hoc est in Ecclesia Dei præsidentes, in urba magna, quæ habet regnum super reges terræ id est, in Romana civitate, et imperio Romano, opera diaboli, et fraude, et deceptione comparatum.

* [1796]Docere autem oportet, Christum nomen esse Dei, et hominis, unius scilicet personæ, in qua divina, et humana natura conjuncta sit, quare utramque substantiam, et quæ utriusque substantiæ consequentia sunt, divinitatem, et totam humanam naturam, quæ exanima, et omnibus corporis partibus, et sanguine etiam constat, complectitur: quæ omnia in sacramento esse credendum est, nam cum in coelo tota humanitas divinitati, in una persona, et hypostasi conjuncta sit, nefas est suspicari, corpus, quod in sacramento inest, ab eadem divinitate sejunctum esse.

* [1797]Domina

* [1798]Ea est pretii natura, ut sui valore aut æstimatione alterum moveat ad concedendam rem, aut jus aliquod, puta impunitatem.

* [1799]Ea pecunia, quæ in judiciuin venit in litibus, sacramentum a sacro.

* [1800]Ea quæ sunt supra naturam, sola fide tenemus. Quod autem credimus, auctoritati debemus. Unde in omnibus asserendis sequi debemus naturam rerum, præter ea, quæ auctoritate divina traduntur, quæ sunt supra naturam.

* [1801]Ejusmodi vota hodie quoque nobis in usu esse possunt, quoties nos Dominus vel a clade aliqua, vel a morbo difficili, vel ab alio quovis discrimine eripuit. Neque enim a pii hominis officio tunc abhorret, votivam oblationem, velut sollenne recognitionis symbolum, Deo consecrare: ne ingratus erga ejus benignitatem videatur.

* [1802]Est gratiosa æstimatio, seu potius acceptatio justitiæ nostræ imperfectæ (quæ, si Deus rigide nobiscum agere vellet, in judicio Dei nequaquam consistere posset) pro perfecta, propter Jesum Christum.

* [1803]Est gratiosa æstimatio, seu potius acceptatio justitiæ nostræ

imperfectæ pro perfecta, propter Jesum Christum.

* [1804]Est hoc sacramentum poenitentiæ lapsis post baptismum ad salutem necessarium, ut nondum regeneratis ipse baptismus.

* [1805]Est itaque [fides] 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 peccatoram et vitæ æternæ premium conferre vult.

* [1806]Est tamen notandum, cum dicimus, non debere peti à sanctis, nisi ut orent pro nobis, nos non agere de verbis, sed de sensu verborum; nam quantum ad verba, licet dicere, S. Petre miserere mihi, salva me, aperi mihi aditum coeli: item, da mihi sanitatem corporis, da patientiam, da mihi fortitudinem.

* [1807]Estne Baptismus ad salutem omnibus necessarius?

* [1808]Et Elisæum qui semel et iterum suscitavit, dum viveret, et post mortem: vivus resurrectionem per suam ipsius animam operatus est, ut autem non animæ solum justorum honorarentur, sed crederetur etiam in justorum corporibus jacere vim, projectus in monumentum Elisæi mortuus prophetæ corpus attingens, vitam concepit, 4 Kin. iv. 13

* [1809]Et erit sepulcrum ejus gloriosum

* [1810]Et quamvis in honorem et memoriam sanctorum nonnullas interdum missas ecclesia celebrare consueverit; non tamen illis sacrificium offerri docet, sed Deo soli, qui illos coronavit; unde nec sacerdos dicere solet, offero tibi sacrificium Petre, vel Paule; sed Deo de illorum victoriis gratias agens, eorum patrocinia implorat, ut ipsi pro nobis intercedere dignentur in coelis, quorum memoriam facimus in terris.

* [1811]Et sicut nostram terrenam imperialem potentiam, sic ejus

(Petri) sacrosanctam Romanam Ecclesiam decrevimus veneranter honorari, et amplius quam nostrum imperium terrenumque thronum, sedem sacratissimam b. Petri gloriose exaltari: tribuentes ei potestatem et gloriæ dignitatem, atque vigorem et honorificentiam imperialem. Unde ut pontificalis apex non vilescat, sed magis quam imperii dignitas, gloria et potentia decoretur, ecce tam palatium nostrum, ut prædictum est, quam Romanam urbem, et omnes Italiæ, seu occidentalium regionum provincias, loca et civitates præfato beatissimo Pontifici nostro Sylvestro, universali papæ, contradimus atque relinquimus: et ab eo et a successoribus ejus per hanc divalem nostram, et pragmaticum constitutum decernimus disponenda, atque juri sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ concedimus permansura.

* [1812]Etsi expetendum quam maxime esset, ut Græci, qui sunt in sacris ordinibus constituti, castitatem non secus ac Latini servarent. Nihilominus, ut eorum clerici, subdiaconi, diaconi et presbyteri uxores in eorum ministerio retineant, dummodo ante sacros ordines, virgines, non viduas, neque corruptas duxerint, Romana non prohibet Ecclesia. Eos autem, qui viduam vel corruptam duxerunt, vel ad secunda vota, prima uxore mortua, convolarunt, ad subdiaconatum, diaconatum et presbyteratum promoveri omnino prohibemus.

* [1813]Ex Opere Operato

* [1814]Ex opere operato

* [1815]Ex quibus hoc colligitur sacramenta dari in testimonium publicum ejus gratiæ, quæ cuique privato prius adest. . . . . Ob hanc causam sacramenta, quæ sacræ sunt cerimoniæ (accedit enim verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum), religiose colenda, hoc est in precio habenda, et honorifice tractanda sunt, ut enim gratiam facere non possunt, Ecclesiæ tamen nos visibiliter sociant, qui

prius invisibiliter sumus in illam recepti, quod cum simul cum promissionis divinæ verbis in ipsorum actione pronunciatur ac promulgatur, summa religione suscipiendum est.

* [1816]Ex quo refellitur Lutheri blasphemia, qui in libro de abolenda Missa dicit, Deo non majorem curam esse de sepulcro Domini, quam de bobus.

* [1817]Exponendum erit, hujus sacramenti virtute nos non solum a malis, quæ vere maxima dicenda sunt, liberari, verum etiam eximiis bonis augeri. Animus enim noster divina gratia repletur, qua justi, et filii Dei effecti, æternæ quoque salutis heredes instituimur.

* [1818]Extra eorum [sacramentorum] usum fidelibus constat, quæ illic figuratur veritas. Sic baptismo abluta sunt Pauli peccata, quæ jam prius abluta erant. Sic idem baptismus Cornelio fuit lavacrum regenerationis, qui tamen jam Spiritu Sancto donatus erat. Sic in coena se communiat Christus, qui tamen et prius se nobis impertierat et perpetuo manet in nobis.

* [1819]Extra eorum usum fidelibus constat, quæ illic figuratur veritas.

* [1820]Falsum est Catholicos non habere pro obice incredulitatem: omnes enim Catholici requirunt necessario in adultis actualem fidem, et sine ea dicunt neminem justificari.

* [1821]Fatemur talia esse signa hæc exteriora, ut Deus per illa Sancti sui Spiritus virtute, operetur, ne quicquam ibi frustra nobis significetur.

* [1822]Fides

* [1823]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 vitæ æternæ præmium conferre vult.

* [1824]Fides est virtus qua creduntur quæ non videntur.

* [1825]Fides qua dicitur [creditur?], si cum caritate sit, virtus est, quia caritas ut ait Ambrosius mater est omnium virtutum, quæ omnes informat, sine qua nulla vera virtus est.

* [1826]Fides subjectiva est persuasio de veritate rei, alterius testimonio nixa, quomodo fides illa generatim descripta, scientiæ et conjecturæ opponitur. . . . . Dividitur . . . . in fidem divinam, quæ nititur testimonio divino, et humanam, quæ fundata est in testimonio humano fide accepto.

* [1827]Fides vera nunquam sola est, quin caritatem et spem semper secum habeat.

* [1828]Forma consummationis hujus non in nuda qualitatum immutatione, alteratione seu innovatione, sed in ipsius substantiæ mundi totali abolitione et in nihilum reductione consistit.

* [1829]Formam consummationis dicimus fore non nudam qualitatum alterationem, sed ipsius substantiæ abolitionem, adeoque totalem annihilationem, ut sic terminus a quo consummationis sive destructionis sit esse,' terminus vero ad quem non esse' sive nihil.

* [1830]Gratiæ promissione opus est, qua nobis testificetur se propitium esse Patrem: quando nec aliter ad eum appropinquare possumus, et in eam solam reclinare cor hominis potest. . . . . Nunc justa fidei definitio nobis constabit, si dicamus esse divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ firmam certamque cognitionem, quæ gratuitæ in Christo promissionis veritate fundata, per Spiritum Sanctum et revelatur mentibus nostris et cordibus obsignatur.

* [1831]Gratiam, vero, quæ naturalem illum amorem perficeret, et

indissolubilem unitatem confirmaret, conjugesque sanctificaret, ipse Christus, venerabilium sacramentorum institutor, atque perfector, sua nobis passione promeruit.

* [1832]Hæc autem, quæ nobis imputatur, non est Christi justitia; nus quam enim Scriptura docet, Christi justitiam nobis imputari; sed tantum fidem nobis imputari in justitiam, et quidem propter Christum.

* [1833]Hæc porro veritas est corollarium dogmatis de transubstantione; panis enim et vinum per consecrationem convertuntur in illud Christi corpus et sanguinem, qui in coelis est, et in eodem statu glorioso; jam vero corpus illud inseparabile est a sanguine, anima et divinitate, et e converso pariter sanguis separari nequit a corpore, anima, et divinitate, ergo sub quavis specie totus Christus præsens fiat necesse est.

* [1834]Habet communis catholicorum omnium sententia, opera bona justorum vere, ac proprie esse merita, et merita non cujuscunque præmii, sed ipsius vitæ æternæ.

* [1835]Habet communis catholicorum omnium sententia, opera bona justorum vere, ac proprie esse merita, et merita non cujuscunque premii, sed ipsius vitæ æternæ.

* [1836]Habita est ratio rectissima charitatis, ut homines quibus esset utilis atque honesta concordia, diversarum necessitudinum vinculis necterentur; nec unus in uno multas haberet, sed singulæ spargerentur in singulos; ac sic ad socialem vitam diligentius colligandam plurimæ plurimos obtinerent.

* [1837]Hanc Dei gratiam esse initium, progressum ac perfectionem omnis boni, atque id eo quidem usque ut ipse homo regenitus absque hac præcedentia, sen adventitia excitante, consequente et cooperante gratia, neque boni quid cogitare, velle, aut facere

possit, neque etiam ulli malæ tentatione resistere; adeo quidem ut omnia bona opera, quæ excogitare possumus, Dei gratiæ in Christo tribuenda sint; quod vero modum operationis illius gratiæ, illa non irresistibilis; de multis enim dicitur eos Spiritui Sancto resistere, Act. vii. 51

* [1838]Hic actus fidei non rerum evidentia aut causarum et proprietatum notitia, sed Dei dicentis infallibili auctoritate.

* [1839]Hic articulus, de justitia fidei, præcipuus est (ut Apologia loquitur) in tota doctrina Christiana, sine quo conscientiæ perturbatæ nullam veram et firmam consolationem habere, aut divitias gratiæ Christi recte agnoscere possunt. Id D. Lutherus suo etiam testimonio confirmavit, cum inquit: Si unicus his articulus sincerus permanserit, etiam Christiana Ecclesia sincera, concors et sine omnibus sectis permanet: sin vero corrumpitur, impossibile est, ut uni errori aut fanatico spiritui recte obviam iri possit.

* [1840]Hic autem, quod ad finem proximum attinet, diversitas occurrit, respectu subjectorum diversorum. Nam infantibus quidem æque omnibus per baptismum primum confertur et obsignatur fides, per quam meritum Christi illis applicetur: Adultis vero illis tantum, qui fidem ex verbo conceperunt ante baptismi susceptionem, baptismus eam obsignat et confirmat.

* [1841]Hic præcipuus fidei cardo vertitur, ne quas Dominus offert misericordiæ promissiones, extra nos tantum veras esse arbitremur, in nobis minime: sed ut potius eas intus complectendo nostras faciamus. . . . . In summa, vere fidelis non est nisi qui solida persuasione Deum sibi propitium benevolumque patrem esse persuasus, de ejus benignitate omnia sibi pollicetur: nisi qui divinæ erga se benevolentiæ promissionibus fretus, indubitatam salutis expectationem præsumit.

* [1842]Hinc apparet, quam nihil signa sint, nisi fidei exercendæ mnemosuna

* [1843]Hoc argumentum, si quid probat, probat justitiam actualem non esse perfectam: non autem probat, justitiam habitualem, qua formaliter justi sumus, ... non esse ita perfectam, ut absolute, simpliciter, et proprie justi nominemur, et simus. Non enim formaliter justi sumus opere nostro, sed opere Dei, qui simul maculas peccatorum tergit, et habitum fidei, spei, et caritatis infundit. Dei autem perfecta sunt opera. . . . . Unde parvuli baptizati, vere justi sunt, quamvis nihil operis fecerint.

* [1844]Hoc modo non tantum refutatur Papistarum commentum de transubstantione, sed crassa omnia figmenta atque futiles argutiæ, quæ vel coelesti ejus gloriæ detrahunt vel veritati humanæ naturæ minus sunt consentaneæ. Neque enim minus absurdum judicamus, Christus sub pane locare vel cum pane copulare, quam panem transubstantiare in corpus ejus.

* [1845]Hoc primum tradere oportet, peccatum sive a primis parentibus origine contractum, sive a nobis commissum, quamvis etiam adeo nefarium sit, ut ne cogitari quidem posse videatur, admirabili hujus sacramenti virtute remitti, et condonari.

* [1846]Hominem vero salutarem fidem a se ipso non habere, nec vi liberi sui arbitrii, quandoquidem in statu defectionis et peccati nihil boni, quandoquidem vere bonum est, quale quid est fides salutaris, ex se possit cogitare, vel facere: sed necessarium esse eum a Deo in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum regigni et renovari mente, affectibus, seu voluntate et omnibus facultatibus, ut aliquid boni possit intelligere, cogitare, velle et perficere. Ev. Joann. xv. 5

* [1847]Homines non singulis quibusdam recte factis operibusque

operatis, nec propter meritum quoddam iis attribuendum, sed sola vera fide, i.e

* [1848]Hominis autem nondum renati intellectus et voluntas tantum sunt subjectum convertendum, sunt enim hominis spiritualiter mortui intellectus et voluntas, in quo homine Spiritus Sanctus conversionem et renovationem operatur, ad quod opus hominis convertendi voluntas nihil confert, sed patitur, ut Deus in ipsa operetur, donec regeneretur. Postea vero in aliis sequentibus bonis operibus Spiritui Sancto cooperatur, ea faciens, quæ Deo grata sunt.

* [1849]Hujus justificationis causæ sunt, finalis quidem, gloria Dei et Christi, ac vita æterna: efficiens vero, misericors Deus, qui gratuito abluit et sanctificat, signans et ungens Spiritu promissionis sancto, ... meritoria autem dilectissimus unigenitus suus, Dominus noster, Jesus Christus, qui, cum essemus inimici, propter nimiam caritatem, qua dilexit nos, sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem [i.e

* [1850]Hujus sacrificii eam vim esse, parochi docebunt, ut non solum immolanti, et sumenti prosit, sed omnibus etiam fidelibus, sive illi nobiscum in terris vivant, sive jam in Domino mortui, nondum plane expiati sint. Neque enim minus ex Apostolorum certissima traditione, pro his utiliter offertur, quam pro vivorum peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus, ac quibusvis calamitatibus, et angustiis.

* [1851]Id indicant hæc verba: Pro vobis datur; et: effunditur in remissionem peccatorum. Nempe nobis per verba illa in sacramento remissio peccatorum, vita, justitia et salus donentur. Ubi enim remissio peccatorum est, ibi est et vita et salus.

* [1852]Idcirco approbamus Lactantii veteris, scriptoris sententiam, dicentis, Non est dubium, quin religio nulla est, ubicunque

simulachrum est.

* [1853]Idem effectus est verbi et ritus, sicut præclare dictum est ab Augustino, sacramentum esse verbum visibile, quia ritus oculis accipitur, et est quasi pictura verbi, idem significans, quod verbum. Quare idem est utriusque effectus.

* [1854]Igitur ut intelligamus, quid sit opus operatum, notandum est, in justificatione, quam recipit aliquis, dum percipit sacramenta, multa concurrere; nimirum ex parte Dei, voluntatem utendi illa re sensibili; ex parte Christi, passionem ejus; ex parte ministri potestatem, voluntatem, probitatem; ex parte suscipientis voluntatem, fidem, et poenitentiam; denique ex parte sacramenti ipsam actionem externam, quæ consurgit, ex debita applicatione formæ et materiæ. Cæterum ex his omnibus id, quod active, et proxime atque instrumentaliter efficit gratiam justificationis, est sola actio illa externa, quæ sacramentum dicitur, et hæc vocatur opus operatum, accipiendo passive (operatum) ita ut idem sit sacramentum conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quod conferre gratiam ex [vi] ipsius actionis sacramentalis a Deo ad hoc institutæ, non ex merito agentis vel suscipientis.

* [1855]Illi qui ponunt quod sacramenta non causant gratiam, nisi per quandam concomitantiam ponunt quod in sacramento non sit aliqua virtus, quæ operetur ad sacramenti effectum, est tamen virtus divina sacramento assistens, quæ sacramentalem effectum operatur.

* [1856]Imagines porro Christi, Deiparæ Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum, in templis præsertim habendas, et retinendas; eisque debitum honorem, et venerationem impertiendam; non quod credatur inesse aliqua in eis divinitas, vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ; vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda; veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quæ in

idolis spem suam collocabant; sed quoniam honos, qui eis exhibetur refertur ad prototypa, quæ illæ representant: ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus, et procumbimus, Christum adoremus; et sanctos, quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt, veneremur.

* [1857]Impossibile est, ut res aliqua externa fidem hominis internam confirmet et stabiliat.

* [1858]In coena domini naturale ac substantiale istud corpus Christi, quo et hic passus est et nunc in coelis ad dexteram patris sedet, non naturaliter atque per essentiam editur, sed spiritualiter tantum. . . . . Spiritualiter edere, corpus Christi, nihil est aliud quam spiritu ac mente niti misericordia et bonitate Dei per Christum. . . . . Sacramentaliter edere corpus Christi, cum proprie volumus loqui, est, adjuncto sacramento, mente ac spiritu corpus Christi edere.

* [1859]In eo errant quam maxime, quod velint redemtionis pretium per omnia equivalens esse debere miseriæ illi, e qua redemtio fit: redemtionis pretium enim constitui solet pro libera æstimatione illius, qui captivum detinet, non autem solvi pro captivi merito. . . . . Ita pretium, quod Christus persolvit, juxta Dei Patris æstimationem persolutum est.

* [1860]In eo qui credit, duo sunt, apprehensio et judicium, sive assensus: sed apprehensio non est fides, sed aliud fidem præcedens. Possunt enim infideles apprehendere mysteria fidei. Præterea, apprehensio non dicitur proprie notitia. . . . . Mysteria fidei, quæ rationem superant, credimus, non intelligimus, ac per hoc fides distingintur contra scientiam, et melius per ignorantiam, quam per notitiam definitur.

* [1861]In numeris non sum Pythagoricus.

* [1862]In renatis nihil odit Deus, quia nihil est damnationis iis, qui vere consepulti sunt cum Christo per baptisma in mortem: qui non secundum carnem ambulant, sed veterem hominem exuentes, et novum, qui secundum Deum creatus est, induentes, innocentes, immaculati, puri, innoxii, ac Deo dilecti effecti sunt.

* [1863]In sacramentis novæ legis non per se requiritur, quod homo se disponat: ergo per ipsum sacramentum disponitur.

* [1864]In summa, quicquid Deus in nobis facit et operatur, tantum externis istius modi rebus et constitutionibus operari dignatur.

* [1865]Indebitum

* [1866]Infantes illos, qui vel in utero maternoRomanists, when a child is in imminent peril, baptize it in utero

* [1867]Infantibus baptismus principaliter est medium ordinarium regenerationis et mundationis a peccatis, etc. Secundario autem sigillum justitiæ et fidei confirmatio; adultis credentibus baptismus principaliter præstat usum obsignationis ac testificationis de gratia Dei, huiothesia

* [1868]Infantibus quidem æque omnibus per baptismum primum confertur et obsignatur fides, per quam meritum Christi applicatur. Adultis vero illis tantum, qui fidem ex verbo conceperunt ante baptismi susceptionem, baptismus eam obsignat et confirmat.

* [1869]Inferi

* [1870]Intellige ut credas

* [1871]Interrogatus, quid baptismus sit? ita responde: non esse prorsus aquam simplicem, sed ejusmodi, quæ verbo et præcepto Dei comprehensa, et illi inclusa sit, et per hoc sanctificata ita ut nihil aliud sit, quam Dei seu divina aqua.

* [1872]Invocandi sunt [angeli eorum]; quod et perpetuo Deum intuentur et patrocinium salutis nostræ, sibi delatum, libentissime

suscipiunt.

* [1873]Ipsi duplicem faciunt fidem, informem et formatam, hanc pestilentissimam et satanicam glossam non possum non vehementer detestari.

* [1874]Ista fratres dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem, quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem.

* [1875]Itaque utendum est sacramentum ita, ut fides accedat, quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta, ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata.

* [1876]Ite, missa est

* [1877]Jam vero sacramenta gratiam, quam significant, continere, eamque conferre virtute sibi insita, seu ex opere operato, Scripturæ, patres, constansque Ecclesiæ sensus traditionalis luculentissime docent.

* [1878]Jus dispensandi sacramenta Deus concredidit ecclesiæ, quæ exsecutionem aut exercitium hujus juris, observandi ordinis et euschemosunes

* [1879]Justificare hoc loco (Rom. v. 1

* [1880]Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et poena absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare. Etenim ad Romanos dicit apostolus, Deus est, qui justificat, quis ille, qui condemnet?' opponuntur justificare et condemnare. . . . . Etenim Christus peccata mundi in se recepit et sustulit, divinæque justitiæ satisfecit. Deus ergo propter solum Christum passum et resuscitatum, propitius est peccatis nostris, nec illa nobis

imputat, imputat autem justitiam Christi pro nostra: ita ut jam simus non solum mundati a peccatis et purgati, vel sancti, sed etiam donati justitia Christi, adeoque absoluti a peccatis, morte vel condemnatione, justi denique ac hæredes vitæ æternæ. Proprie ergo loquendo, Deus solus nos justificat, et duntaxat propter Christum justificat, non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans ejus nobis justitiam.

* [1881]Justificari significat hic non ex impio justum effici, sed usu forensi justum pronuntiari.

* [1882]Justificatio . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio, et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ, et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico amicus, ut sit heres secundum spem vitæ æternæ.

* [1883]Justificatio . . . . non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio, et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum. . . . . Quanquam nemo possit esse justus, nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicantur: id tamen in hac impii justificatione fit, dum ejusdem sanctissimæ passionis merito per Spiritum Sanctum caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus eorum, qui justificantur, atque ipsis inhæret.

* [1884]Justificatio est actio Dei, quam Deus pure pute in sua ipsius mente efficit, quia nihil aliud est, quam volitio aut decretum, quo peccata remittere, et justitiam imputare aliquando vult iis, qui credunt, id est, quo vult poenas, peccatis eorum promeritas, iis non infligere, eosque tanquam justos tractare et premio afficere.

* [1885]Justificatio est actus forensis, quo Deus, sola gratia ductus, peccatori, propter Christi meritum fide apprehensum, justitiam Christi imputat, peccata remittit, eumque sibi

reconciliat.

* [1886]Justitia enim actualis, quamvis aliquo modo sit imperfecta, propter admixtionem venalium delictorum, et egeat quotidiana remissione peccati, tamen non propterea desinit esse vera justitia, et suo etiam quodam modo perfecta.

* [1887]Lex Dei credentibus bona opera ad eum modum præscribit, ut simul, tanquam in speculo, nobis commonstret, ea omnia in nobis in hac vita adhuc imperfecta et impura esse

* [1888]Limbus Infantum

* [1889]Limbus Patrum

* [1890]Loquutio, baprizo tina eis tina (eis ti)

* [1891]Lutherus peccavit in duobus, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum.

* [1892]Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis . . . . ut . . . . fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, sanctos, una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre; bonum, atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus Jesus Christum, Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster redemptor et salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere: illos vero, qui negant sanctos, æterna felicitate in coelo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare; vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idolatriam; vel pugnare cum verbo Dei; adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse in coelo regnantibus voce, vel mente supplicare; impie sentire.

* [1893]Manducare et bibere ista certe non efficiunt, sed illa verba, quæ hic ponuntur: Pro vobis datur, et: Effunditur in remissionem peccatorum; quæ verba sunt una cum corporali manducatione caput et

summa hujus sacramenti. Et qui credit his verbis, ille habet, quod dicunt, et sicut sonant, nempe remissionem peccatorum.

* [1894]Matrimonium est viri, et mulieris maritalis conjunctio inter legitimas personas, individuam vitæ consuetudinem retinens.

* [1895]Maxima virtus maxime justificat. Dilectio est maxima virtus. Ergo maxime justificat.

* [1896]Mendacium efficiosum peccatum venale est, per se, quia in eo gravis deordinatio non apprehenditus.

* [1897]Mendacium officiosum dicitur, quod committitur solum causa utilitatis propriæ vel alienæ: v. g. quis dicit, se non habere pecunias, ne iis spolietur a militibus.

* [1898]Missa

* [1899]Nam pro defunctis quibusdam, vel ipsius Ecclesiæ, vel quorumdam piorum exauditur oratio: sed pro his quorum in Christo regeneratorum nec usque adeo vita in corpore male gesta est ut tali misericordia judicentur digni non esse, nec usque adeo bene, ut talem misercordiam reperiantur necessariam non habere. Sicut etiam facta resurrectione mortuorum non deerunt quibus post poenas, quas patiuntur spiritas mortuorum, impertiatur misericordia, ut in ignem non mittantur æternum. Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur, quod non eis remittatur neque in hoc sæculo, neque, in futuro, nisi essent quibus, etsi non in isto, tamen remittetur in futuro.

* [1900]Natus est Dei filius: non pudet quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est Dei filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est. Et sepultus, resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile est.

* [1901]Ne itaque ex eo, quod nunc signa non fiunt, argumentum ducas tunc etiam non fuisse. Etenim tunc utiliter fiebant, et nunc utiliter non fiunt.

* [1902]Neapolitani beatum Januarium revelatione commoti sustulerunt.

* [1903]Nec erit alia lex Romæ, alia Athenis, alia nunc, alia posthac; sed et omnes gentes et omni tempore una lex et sempiterna et immutabilis continebit, unusque erit communis quasi magister et imperator omnium deus.

* [1904]Nec vero baptismo nostro plus tribuere fas est, quam ipse alibi circumcisioni tribuit, quum vocat sigillum justitiæ fidei.' (Rom. iv. 11

* [1905]Nec vero si superstites hodie essent optimi et eximii Christi servi Zwinglius et Oecolampadius, verbulum in ea sententia mutarent.

* [1906]Necessarium est homini accipere per modum fidei non solum ea, quæ sunt supra rationem: sed etiam ea, quæ per rationem cognosci possunt. Et hoc propter tria, Primo quidem, ut citius homo ad veritatis divinæ cognitionem perveniat. . . . . Secundo, ut cognitio Dei sit communior. Multi enim in studio scientiæ proficere non possunt. . . . . Tertio modo proptor certitudinem. Ratio enim humana in rebus divinis est multum deficiens.

* [1907]Nemo autem dubitat mentiri eum qui volens falsum enuntiat causa fallendi: quapropter enuntiationem falsam cum voluntate ad fallendum prolatam, manifestum est esse mendacium.

* [1908]Nempe eadem illa infinita virtus, quæ essentialiter, per se et independenter in Deo est, et per quam Deus nomines illuminat et convertit, verbo communicata est: et tanquam verbo communicata, divina tamen, hic spectari debet.

* [1909]Nequaquam concedendum est, infantes, qui baptizantur, vel sine fide esse, vel in aliena fide baptizari. . . . . Aliena quidem vel parentum vel offerentium fides, parvulos ad Christum in baptismo adducit Marc. x. 13

* [1910]Neque enim hoc sacramentum in substantiam nostram, ut panis,

et vinum, mutatur; sed nos quodam modo in ejus naturam convertimur:
ut recte illud D. Augustini ad hunc locum transferri possit

* [1911]Neque sacramenta hilum proficere sine Spiritu Sancti virtute.

* [1912]Nihilo splendidius de illis Apostolus quam de his loquitur,
quum docet patres eandem nobiscum spiritualem escam manducasse; et
escam illam Christum interpretatur.

* [1913]Nimis autem longum est, convenienter disputare de varietate
signorum, quæ cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur.

* [1914]Nobis inferi non nuda cavositas, nec subdivalis aliqua mundi
sentina creduntur: sed in fossa terræ et in alto vastitas, et in
ipsis visceribus ejus abstrusa profunditas.

* [1915]Nolli enunciare nomen Jova Dei tui ad falsum sc.
comprobandum.

* [1916]Non assumes nomen Domini Dei tui in vanum.

* [1917]Non enim Deus verborum tantum actuumque nostrorum discussor
et judex, sed etiam propositi ac destinationis inspector
est. . . . . Ille tamen intimam cordis inspiciens pietatem, non
verborum sonum, sed votum dijudicat voluntatis, quia finis, operis
et affectus considerandus est perpetrantis.

* [1918]Non fides, de qua loquimur, assentit alicui, nisi quia est a
Deo revelatum.

* [1919]Non justificant signa, ut Apostolus ait, Circumcisio nihil
est: ita baptismus nihil est. Participatio mensæ Domini nihil est:
sed testes sunt kai sphragides

* [1920]Non liberari potest ecclesia a servitute laicorum, nisi
liberentur clerici ab uxoribus.

* [1921]Non licet a sanctis petere, ut nobis tanquam auctores
divinorum beneficiorum, gloriam, vel gratiam aliaque ad
beatitudinem media concedunt.

* [1922]Non multo post Apostoli mortem exorti sunt Encratitæ (qui nomen sibi a continentia indiderunt) Taciani; Cathari; Montanus cum sua secta, et tandem Manichæi, qui ab esu carnium et conjugio abhorrerent, et tanquam res profanas damnarent. . . . . Excipiunt [Papistæ] se Encratitis et Manichæis esse dissimiles, quia non simpliciter usum conjugii et carnium interdicunt, sed certis tantum diebus cogunt ad carnis abstinentiam, solos autem monachos et sacerdotes cum monialibus ad votum coelibatus cogunt. Verum hæc. . . . . nimis frivola est excusatio. Nam sanctimoniam nihilo minus in his rebus locant; deinde falsum et adulterinum Dei cultum instituunt: postrema conscientias alligant necessitati, a qua debebant esse liberæ.

* [1923]Non negamus recta nos fide caritateque sincera Christo spiritualiter conjungi; sed nullam nobis conjunctionis rationem secundum carnem cum illo esse, id profecto pernegamus, idque a divinis Scripturis omnino alienam dicimus.

* [1924]Non quæritur, An fides sit scientia, quæ habeat evidentiam: Sic enim distinguitur a scientia, quæ habet assensum certum et evidentem, qui nititur ratione clara et certa, et ab opinione, quæ nititur ratione tantum probabili; ubi fides notat assensum certum quidem, sed inevidentem, qui non ratione, sed testimonio divino nititur.

* [1925]Non quod dignitate meæ fidei Deo placeam, sed quod sola satisfactio, justitia ac sanctitas Christi, mea justitia sit coram Deo. Ego vero eam non alia ratione, quam fide amplecti, et mihi applicare queam.

* [1926]Non solum sanctos Christi loco adorant, sed etiam eorum ossa, vestes, calceos, et simulacra

* [1927]Non tollit efficaciam sacramenti error ministri circa

ecclesiam, sed do fectus intentionis.

* [1928]Nonus articulus approbatus est, in quo confitemur, quod baptismus sit necessarius ad salutem, et quod pueri sint baptizandi, et quod baptismus puerorum non sit irritus, sed necessarius et efficax ad salutem.

* [1929]Nos non de modo fidei sumus solliciti, sed in illa simplicitate acquiescimus, quod infantes vere credant.

* [1930]Nos præter illam fidem [fidem generalem] requirimus, ut credat sibi quisque remitti peccata.

* [1931]Nota, Apostolum permittere hoc casu non tantum thori divortium sed etiam matrimonii; ita ut possit conjux fidelis aliud matrimonium inire.

* [1932]Nullibi docet Scriptura justitiam Christi nobis imputari. Et id absurdum est. Nemo enim in se injustus aliena justitia potest esse formaliter justus, non magis, quam aliena albedine Æthiops esse albus.

* [1933]Nullum unquam exstitisse pii hominis opus, quod, si severo Dei judicio examinaretur, non esset damnabile.

* [1934]Nuoit genero socrus. . . . . O mulieris incredibile et præter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum!

* [1935]O quoties ego ipso in eremo constitutus in illa vasta solitudine, quæ exusta solis ardoribus, horridum monachis præstat habitaculum, putavi me Romanis interesse deliciis. . . . . Ille igitur ego, qui ob Gehennæ metum tali me carcere ipse damnaveram, scorpiorum tantum socius et ferarum, sæpe choris intereram puellarum. Pallebant ora jejuniis, et mens desideriis æstuabat in frigido corpore, et ante hominem sua jam in carne præmortuum, sola libidinum incendia bulliebant.

* [1936]Obsignantur hæc omnia baptismo. Nam intus regeneramur,

purificamaur, et renovamur a Deo per Spiritum Sanctum: foris autem accipimus obsignationem maximorum donorum, in aqua, qua etiam maxima illa beneficia representantur, et veluti oculis nostris conspicienda proponuntur.

* [1937]Officiosum autem et jocosum sunt ex genere suo peccatum veniale.

* [1938]Omnes horribiliter errant. Primo, quia verbum justificare tantum pro justum reputare et pronunciare intelligunt, atque interpretantur, et non pro eo, quod est, reipsa et in veritate justum efficere. Deinde etiam in hoc quod nullam differentiam tenent inter redemptionem et justificationem, quum tamen magna differentia sit, sicut vel inde intelligi sit, quod homines furem a suspendio redimere possunt, bonum et justum efficere non possunt. Porro etiam in hoc, quod nihil certe statuere possunt, quid tandem justitia Christi sit, quam per fidem in nobis esse, nobisque imputari oporteat. Ac postremo errant omnium rudissime etiam in hoc, quod divinam naturam Christi a justificatione separant, et Christum dividunt atque solvunt, id quod haud dubie execrandi Satanæ opus est.

* [1939]Omnes hujus dicti capaces esse negans, significat electionem non esse positam in manu nostra, acsi de re nobis subjecta esset consultatio. Si quis utile sibi esse putat uxore carere, atque ita nullo examine habito, coelibatus legem sibi edicit, longe fallitur. Deus enim, qui pronuntiavit bonum esse, ut viro adjutrix sit mulier, contempti sui ordinis poenam exiget: quia nimium sibi arrogant mortales, dum se a coelesti vocatione eximere tentant. Porro non esse omnibus liberum, eligere utrum libuerit, inde probat Christus, quia speciale sit continentiæ donum: nam quum dicit, non omnes esse capaces, sed quibus datum est, clare demonstrat non

omnibus esse datum.

* [1940]Omnia non legitima nec rite concepta, ut apud Deum nihili sunt, sic nobis irrita esse debere.

* [1941]Omnium dogmatum firmitas pendet ab auctoritate præsentis ecclesiæ.

* [1942]Oportet, quod virtus salutifera a divinitate Christi per ejus humanitatem in ipsa sacramenta derivetur. . . . . Sacramenta ecelesiæ specialiter habent virtutem ex passione Christi, cujus virtus quodammodo nobis copulatur per susceptionem sacramentorum.

* [1943]Ordo sacer et sacramentum divinitus institutum, quo tribuitur potestas consecrandi corpus et sanguinem Domini, nec non remittendi et retinendi peccata.

* [1944]Ossa, nervi, et quæcumque ad hominis perfectionem pertinent.

* [1945]Poena enim omnis propositum habet bonum commune.

* [1946]Poena purgatorii," says the angelic Doctor,See Aquinas, Summa

* [1947]Poenas infligere, aut a poenis aliquem liberare, quem punire possis, quod justificare vocat Scriptura, non est nisi rectoris, qua talis primo et per se: ut, puta, in familia patris; in republica regis, in universo Dei. . . . . Unde sequitur, omnino hic Deum considerandum, ut rectorem.

* [1948]Peccata venalia per se tam esse minuta et levia, ut non adversentur perfectioni caritatis, nec impedire possint perfectam et absolutam legis obedientiam: utpote quæ non sint ira Dei et condemnatione, sed venia digna, etiamsi Deus cum illis in judicium intret.

* [1949]Peccatores, te rogamus audi nos; Ut sanctam Ecclesiam piissima conservare digneris, Ut justis gloriam, peccatoribus gratiam impetrare digneris, Ut navigantibus portum, infirmantibus sanitatem, tribulatis consolationem, captivis liberationem,

impetrare digneris, Ut famulos et famulas tuas tibi devote servientes, consolare digneris, Ut cunctum populum Christianum filii tui pretioso sanguine redemptum, conservare digneris, Ut cunctis fidelibus defunctis, eternam requiem impetrare digneris, Ut nos exaudire digneris, Mater Dei, Filia Dei, Sponsa Dei, Mater carissima, Domina nostra, miserere, et dona nobis perpetuam pacem.

* [1950]Pelli sane potent in desertam ecclesia, regnante Antichristi, et illo momento temporis in deserta, id est, in locis abitis, in speluncis, in latibulis quo sancti se recipient, non incommode quæretur ecclesia.

* [1951]Per D. N. J. C. gratiam, quæ in baptismo confertur, reatus originalis peccati remittitur, ac tollitur totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet.

* [1952]Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere; ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur.

* [1953]Poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis Dei, actualis vero poena peccati est gehennæ perpetuæ cruciatus.

* [1954]Ponendo quod sacramentum est instrumentalis causa gratiæ, necesse est simul ponere, quod in sacramento sit quædam virtus instrumentalis ad inducendum sacramentalem effectum. . . . . Sicut virtus instrumentalis acquiritur instrumento, ex hoc ipso quod movetur ab agente principali, ita et sacramentum consequitur spiritualem virtutem ex benedictione Christi et applicatione ministri ad usum sacramenti.

* [1955]Populus vult decipi

* [1956]Porro ne impingamus in ipso limine (quod fieret si de re incognita disputationem ingrediremur) primum explicemus quid sibi velint istæ loquutiones, Hominem coram Deo justificari, Fide justificari, vel operibus. Justificari coram Deo dicitur qui

judicio Dei et censetur justus, et acceptus est ob suam justitiam: siqui dem ut Deo abominabilis est iniquitas, ita nec peccator in ejus oculis potest invenire gratiam, quatenus est peccator, et quamdiu talis censetur. Proinde ubicunque peccatum est, illic etiam se profert ira et ultio Dei. Justificatur autem qui non loco peccatoris, sed justi habetur, eoque nomine consistit coram Dei tribunali, ubi peccatores omnes corruunt. Quemadmodum si reus innocens ad tribunal æqui judicis adducatur, ubi secundum innocentiam ejus judicatum fuerit, justificatus apud judicem dicitur: sic apud Deum justificatur, qui numero peccatorum exemptus, Deum habet suæ justitiæ testem et assertorem. Justificari, ergo, operibus ea ratione dicetur, in cujus vita reperietur ea puritas ac sanctitas quæ testimonium justitiæ apud Dei thronum mereatur: seu qui operum suorum integritate respondere et satisfacere illius judicio queat. Contra, justificabitur ille fide, qui operum justitia exclusus, Christi justitiam per fidem apprehendit, qua vestitus in Dei conspectu non ut peccator, sed tanquam justus apparet. Ita nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem, qua nos Deus in gratiam receptos pro justos habet. Eamque in peccatorum remissione ac justitiæ Christi imputatione positam ease dicimus.

* [1957]Potest dividi mendacium, in quantum habet rationem culpæ, secundum ea quæ aggravant, vel diminuunt culpam mendacii ex parte finis intenti. Aggravat autem culpam mendacii, si aliquis per mendacium intendat alterius nocumentum: quod vocatur mendacium perniciosum. Diminuitur autem culpa mendacii, si ordinetur ad aliquod bonum, vel delectabile, et sic est mendacium jocosum: vel utile, et sic est mendacium officiosum, quo intenditur juvamentum alterius, vel remotio nocumenti. Et secundum hoc dividitur

mendacium in tria prædicta.

* [1958]Præsertim vero tollenda est quælibet localis præsentiæ imaginatio. Nam quum signa hic in mundo sint, oculis cernantur, palpentur manibus: Christus quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in coelo, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentia quærendus est. Quare perversa et impia superstitio est, ipsum sub elementis hujus mundi includere.

* [1959]Præsertim vero tollenda est quælibet localis præsentiæ imaginatio. Nam quum signa hic in mundo sint, oculis cernuntur, palpentur manibus: Christus quatenus homo est, non alibi quam in coelo, nec aliter quam mente et fidei intelligentia quærendus est. Quare perversa et impia superstitio est, ipsum sub elementis hujus mundi includere.

* [1960]Præter hæc justo Dei judicio relinquimus omnes curiosas, sannis virulentis tinctas, et blasphemas quæstiones, quæ honeste, pie et sine gravi offensione recitari nequeunt, aliosque sermones, quando de supernaturali et coelesti mysterio hujus sacramenti crasse, carnaliter, capernaitice, et plane abominandis modis, blaspheme, et maximo cum ecclesiæ offendiculo, Sacramentarii loquuntur.

* [1961]Præter superiorem manducationem spiritualem, est et sacramentalis manducatio corporis Domini, qua fidelis non tantum spiritualiter et interne participat vero corpore et sanguine Domini, sed, foris etiam accedendo ad mensam Domini, accipit visibile corporis et sanguinis Domini sacramentum.

* [1962]Præterea sedulo docemus, Deum non promiscue vim suam exerere in omnibus qui sacramenta recipiunt, sed tantum in electis. Nam quemadmodum non alios in fidem illuminat, quam quos preordinavit ad vitam: ita arcana Spiritus sui virtute efficit, ut percipiant

electi quæ offerunt sacramenta.

* [1963]Prima sententia, sive propositio. Imagines Christi, et sanctorum venerandæ sunt, non solum per accidens, vel improprie, sed etiam per se proprie, ita ut ipsæ terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris.

* [1964]Prima, quod imago non sit ullo modo in se colenda, sed solum coram imagine colendum exemplar.

* [1965]Primum quia cum alii mediatores præter Christum quæruntur, collocatur fiducia in alios, obruitur tota notitia Christi, idque res ostendit. Videtur initio mentio sanctorum, qualis est in veteribus orationibus, tolerabili consilio recepta esse. Postea secuta est invocatio, invocationem prodigiosi et plus quam ethnici abusus secuti sunt. Ab invocatione ad imagines ventum est, hæ quoque colebantur, et putabatur eis inesse quædam vis, sicut Magi vim inesse fingunt imaginibus signorum coelestium certo tempore sculptis.

* [1966]Primum, mors Christi nos justificat, dum per eam excitatur caritas in cordibus nostris, qua justi efficimur: deinde quod per eandem exstinctum est peccatum; quo nos captivos distinebat diabolus, ut jam non habeat unde nos damnet.

* [1967]Principaliter competit summo Pontifici; non tamen nisi ex rationabili causa, quia dispensat in jure alieno: competit etiam jure ordinario Episcopis, non Parochis. Requirit autem hæc dispensatio potestatem jurisdictionis majoris.

* [1968]Proinde Jesum Christum mundi servatorem pro omnibus et singulis mortuum esse, atque ita quidem, ut omnibus per mortem Christi reconciliationem et peccatorum remissionem impetravit: ea tamen conditione, ut nemo illa remissione peccatorum re ipsa fruatur, præter hominem fidelem, et hoc quoque secundum Evang.

Joann. iii. 16

* [1969]Proinde meminerint lectores, fuisse me de monachismo potius quam de monachis loquutum, et ea vitia notasse, non quæ in paucorum vita hærent, sed quæ ab ipso vivendi instituto separari nequeunt.

* [1970]Proinde, qui in solennibus Coenæ verbis, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus: præcise literalem, ut loquuntur, sensum urgent, eos tanquam præposteros interpretes repudiamus. Nam extra controversiam ponimus, figurate accipienda esse, ut esse panis et vinum dicantur id quod significant. Neque vero novum hoc aut insolens videri debet, ut per metonymiam ad signum transferatur rei figuratæ nomen, quum passim in Scripturis ejusmodi locutiones occurrant: et nos sic loquendo nihil asserimus, quod non apud vetustissimos quosque et probatissimos Ecclesiæ scriptores extet.

* [1971]Prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; . . . . certum est, quia impossibile est.

* [1972]Prudentia quoque hoc nomine rectorem ad poenam incitat. Augetur præterea causa puniendi, ubi lex aliqua publicata est, quæ poenam minatur. Nam tunc omissio poenæ ferme aliquid detrahit de legis authoritate apud subditos.

* [1973]Pura et vera doctrina nostrarum Ecclesiarum de Sacra Coena. (1.) Quod verba Christi: Accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum: Bibite, hic est sanguis meus simpliciter, et secundum literam, sicut sonant, intelligenda sint. (2.) Quod in sacramento duæ res sint, quæ exhibentur et simul accipiuntur: una terrena, quæ est panis et vinum; et una coelestis, quæ est corpus et sanguis Christi. (3.) Quod hæc unio, exhibitio et sumptio fiat hic inferius in terris, non superius in coelis. (4.) Quod exhibeatur et accipiatur verum et naturale corpus Christi, quod in cruce pependit, et verus ac naturalis sanguis, qui ex Christi latere

fluxit. (5.) Quod corpus et sanguis Christi non fide tantum spiritualiter, quod etiam extra coenam fieri potest, sed cum pane et vino oraliter, modo tamen imperscrutabill, et supernaturali, illic in coena accipiantur, idque in pignus et certificationem resurrectionis nostrorum corporum ex mortuis. (6.) Quod oralis perceptio corporis et sanguinis Christi non solum fiat a dignis, verum etiam ab indignis, qui sine poenitentia et vera fide accedunt; eventu tamen diverso. A dignis enim percipitur ad salutem, ab indignis autem ad judicium.

* [1974]Quæ enim justitia nostra dicitur, quia per eam nobis inhærentem justificamur; illa eadem Dei est, quia a Deo nobis infunditur per Christi meritum.

* [1975]Quæ igitur fidei sunt, non sunt tentanda probare nisi per auctoritates his, qui auctoritates suscipiunt. Apud alios vero sufficit defendere non esse impossibile quod prædicat fides

* [1976]Qualis futuris sit mundi interitus? An per ultimam conflagrationem sit annihilandus, an instaurandus et renovandus?

* [1977]Quam vere in sacra coena præsens est res terrena, panis et vinum: tam vere etiam præsens res coelestis, corpus et sanguis Christi: proinde credimus, docemus et confitemur in eucharistiæ sacramento veram, realem et substantialem corporis et sanguinis Christi præsentiam, exhibitionem, manducationem et bibitionem, quæ præsentia non est essentialis conversio panis in corpus et vini in sanguinem Christi, quam transubstantionem vocant, neque est corporis ad panem, ac sanguinis ad vinum extra usum coenæ localis aut durabilis, neque est panis et corporis Christi personalis unio, qualis est divinæ et humanæ naturæ in Christo unio, neque est localis inclusio corporis in panem, neque est impanatio, neque est incorporatio in panem, neque est consubstantio, qua panis cum

corpore Christi, et vinum cum ipsius sanguine in unam massam physicam coalescat: neque est naturalis inexistentia, neque delitescentia corpusculi sub pane, neque quidquam hujusmodi carnale aut physicum; sed est præsentia et unio sacramentalis, quæ ita comparata est, ut juxta ipsius salvaroris nostri, veracis, sapientis, et omnipotentis institutionem, pani benedicto tanquam medio divinitus ordinato corpus: et vino benedicto tanquam medio itidem divinitus ordinato, sanguis Christi modo nobis incomprehensibili uniatur, ut cum illo pane corpus Christi una manducatione sacramentali et cum illo vino sanguinem Christi una bibitione sacramentali in sublimi mysterio sumamus, manducemus ac bibamus. Breviter non apousian

* [1978]Quamvis [Christus] nunc sit in coelis, ibidem etiam mansurus donec veniat mundum judicaturus: credimus tamen, eum arcana et incomprehensibili Spiritus sui virtute per fidem apprehensa, nos nutrire et vivificare sui corporis et sanguinis substantia. Dicimur autem hoc spiritualiter fieri, non ut efficaciæ et veritatis loco imaginationem aut cogitationem supponamus, sed potius, quoniam hoc mysterium nostræ cum Christo coalitionis tam sublime est, ut omnes nostros sensus totumque adeo ordinem naturæ superet: denique quoniam sit divinum ac coeleste, non nisi fide percipi ac apprehendi potest.

* [1979]Quamvis baptismus sit fidei et resipiscentiæ sacramentum, tamen cum una cum parentibus posteritatem etiam illorum in ecclesia Deus recenseat, affirmamus, infantes sanctis parentibus natos, esse ex Christi authoritate baptizandos.

* [1980]Quamvis peccata in baptismo remittantur, es tamen prorsus non tolli, aut radicitus evelli, sed quodam modo abradi, ita ut peccatorum radices animo infixæ adhuc remaneant.

* [1981]Quanquam itaque effectus Verbi divini prædicati nonnunquam impediatur, efficacia tamen ipsa, seu virtus intrinseca a verbo tolli et separari non potest. Et ita per accidens fit inefficax, non potentiæ defectu, sed malitiæ motu, quo ejus operatio impeditur, quo minus effectum suum assequatur.

* [1982]Quanquam solus Deus sit orandus, ut vel gratiam vel gloriam nobis donet; sanctos nihilominus viros orare expedit, ut illorum precibus et meritis, nostræ orationes sortiantur effectum.

* [1983]Quantum ad me pertinet, juro, sed quantum mihi videtur, magna necessitate compulsus.

* [1984]Quantum ad prima credibilia, quæ sunt articuli fidei, tenetur homo explicite credere. Quantum autem ad alia credibilia non tenetur homo explicite credere, sed solum implicite, vel in præparatione animi, in quantum paratus est credere quidquid divina Scriptura continet.

* [1985]Quare hoc? Ideo, quod verba illic extant et hæc dant nobis. Siquidem propterea a Christo jubeor edere et bibere, ut meum sit, mihique utilitatem afferat, veluti certum pignus et arrhabo, imo potius res ipsa, quam pro peccatis meis, morte et omnibus malis ille opposuit et oppignoravit. Inde jure optimo cibus animæ dicitur, novum hominem alens atque fortificans.

* [1986]Quare in hoc nobis est, constanter perseverandum, quod Deus non velit nobiscum aliter agere, nisi per vocale verbum et sacramenta, et quod, quidquid sine verbo et sacramentis jactatur, ut spiritus, sit ipse diabolus. Nam Deus etiam Mosi voluit apparere per rubum ardentem et vocale verbum. Et nullus propheta, sive Elias, sive Elisæus, Spiritum sine decalogo sive verbo vocali accepit.

* [1987]Quare rei summam ita simplicissime complectere, hanc

videlicet baptismi virtutem, opus, fructum et finem esse, ut homines salvos faciat. Nemo enim in hoc baptizatur, ut princeps evadat, verum sicut verba sonant, ut salvus fiat. Cæterum salvum fieri scimus nihil aliud esse, quam a peccati, mortis et diaboli tyrannide liberari, in Christi regnum deferri, ac cum eo immortalem vitam agere.

* [1988]Quarta propositio. Imago per se, et proprie non est adoranda eodem cultu, quo ipsum exemplar, et proinde nulla imago est adoranda cultu latriæ per se, et proprie.

* [1989]Qui Christum dicunt ubique ut hominem, Christum dicunt non hominem, dum enim dico ubique, dico Deum, qui solus est in coelo et in terra. Similiter cum dico subjectum legi, dico hominem. Qui ergo Christum subjectum legi negant, negant ipsum esse hominem.

* [1990]Qui a nuptiarum conjunctione legibus omnino exclusi sunt, ii matrimonium inire non possunt; neque, si ineant, ratum est, exempli enim gratia: qui intra quartum gradum propinquitate conjuncti sunt, puerque ante decimum quartum annum, aut puella ante duodecimum, quæ ætas legibus constituta est, ad matrimonii justa foedera ineunda apti esse non possunt.

* [1991]Qui annum putant hic notari per tempus, falluntur meo judicio . . . . Annus sumetur figurate pro tempore aliquo indeterminato.

* [1992]Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit. Hoc est: sola fides personam dignam facit, ut hanc salutarem et divinam aquam utiliter suscipiat. Cum enim hoc in verbis una cum aqua nobis offeratur et proponatur, non alia ratione potest suscipi, quam ut hoc ex animo credamus. Citra fidem nihil prodest baptismus, tametsi per sese coelestis et inæstimabilis thesaurus esse negari non possit.

* [1993]Qui defuncta uxore alteram jam coelebs inducit, nihilominus

unius uxoris maritus censeri debet. Non enim eligendum docet qui fuerit maritus unius uxoris, sed qui sit.

* [1994]Qui fit ut vivamus Christi fide? quia nos dilexit, et se ipsum tradidit pro nobis. Amor, inquam, quo nos complexus est Christus, fecit ut se nobis coadunaret. Id implevit morte sua nam se ipsum tradendo pro nobis, non secus atque in persona nostra passus est. . . . . Neque parum energiæ habet pro me: quia non satis fuerit Christum pro mundi salute mortuum reputare, nisi sibi quisque effectum ac possessionem hujus gratiæ privatim vindicet.

* [1995]Qui potest aqua tam magnas res efficere?

* [1996]Qui potest corporalis illa manducatio tantas res efficere?

* [1997]Qui sit: non autem, Qui fuerit

* [1998]Qui uxorem repudiat, quasi dimidiam sui partem a seipso avellit. Hoc autem minime patitur natura, ut corpus suum quisque discerpat.

* [1999]Qui vero verbi Dei et doctrinæ Evangelicæ purificationem spreverit, tristibus et poenalibus purificationibus semetipsum reservat, ut iguis gehennæ in cruciatibus purget, quem nec apostolica doctrina nec evangelicus sermo purgavit.

* [2000]Quia fides affert Spiritum Sanctum, et parit novam vitam in cordibus, necesse est, quod pariat spirituales motus in cordibus. Et qui sint illi motus, ostendit propheta, cum ait: Dabo legem meam in corda eorum.' Postquam igitur fide justificati et renati sumus, incipimus Deum timere, diligere, petere, et expectare ab eo auxilium. . . . . Incipimus et diligere proximos, quia corda habent spirituales et sanctos motus. Hæc non possunt fieri, nisi postquam fide justificati sumus et renati accipimus Spiritum Sanctum. . . . . Profitemur igitur, quod necesse est, inchoari in nobis et subinde magis magisque fieri legem. Et complectimur simul

utrumque videlicet spirituales motus et externa bona opera. Falso igitur calumniantur nos adversarii, quod nostri non doceant bona opera, cum ea non solum requirant, sed etiam ostendant, quomodo fieri possint.

* [2001]Quibus modis potest cessare obligatio juramenti promissorii?

* [2002]Quibus verbis justificationis impii descriptio insinuatur, ut sit translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adæ, in statum gratiæ et adoptionis filiorum Dei, per secundum Adam Jesum Christum, salvatorem nostrum: quæ quidem translatio post evangelium promulgatum sine lavacro regenerationis, aut ejus voto fieri non potest.

* [2003]Quicunque e vita turpi, qua poenas sibi contraxit, ad virtutem emerserit, is eadem proportione, qua jam in virtutis studio progressus fuerit, in gratiam cum Deo reversus, ab eodem præmiis dignus judicabitur.

* [2004]Quicunque negat, parvulos per baptismum Christi a perditione liberari, et salutem percipere posse; anathema sit.

* [2005]Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid Academiæ et Ecelesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de portica Solomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat: Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum. Viderint qui Stoicum, et Platonicum, et Dialecticum, Christianissimum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debeamus. . . . . Cedat curiositas fidei, cedat gloria saluti. Certe aut non obstrepant, aut quiescant adversus regulam. Nihil ulta scire, omnia scire est.

* [2006]Quid est fides

* [2007]Quid est sacramentum altaris? Responsio. Sacramentum altaris

est verum corpus et verus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sub pane et vino, nobis Christianis ad manducandum ac bibendum ab ipso Christo institutum. Quid vero prodest, sic comedisse et bibisse? Responsio. Id indicant nobis hæc verba: Pro vobis datur; et: Effunditur in remissionem peccatorum. Nempe quod nobis per verba illa in sacramento remissio peccatorum, vita, justitia et salus donentur. Ubi enim remissio peccatorum est, ibi est et vita et salus. Qui potest corporalis illa manducatio tantas res efficere? Responsio. Manducare et bibere ista certe non efficiunt, sed illa verba, quæ hic ponuntur: Pro vobis datur, et: Effunditur in remissionem peccatorum; quæ verba sunt una cum corporali manducatione caput et summa hujus sacramenti. Et qui credit his verbis, ille habet, quod dicunt, et sicut sonant, nempe remissionem peccatorum.

* [2008]Quid est sacramentum? Externa divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ testificatio, quæ visibili signo spirituales gratias figurat, ad obsignandos cordibus nostris Dei promissiones, quo earum veritas melius confirmetur. . . . . Vim efficaciamque sacramenti non in externo elemento inclusam esse existimas, sed totam a Spiritu Dei manare? Sic sentio: nempe, ut virtutem suam exerere Domino placuerit per sua organa, quem in finem ea destinavit.

* [2009]Quid vero prodest, sic comedisse et bibisse?

* [2010]Quidquid in aliis scientiis invenitur veritati hujus scientiæ [sacræ doctrinæ] repugnans, totum condemnatur ut falsum.

* [2011]Quin etiam illud pro certo constat, Christi corpus et sanguinem nequaquam rem otiosam et infrugiferam esse posse, quæ nihil fructus aut utilitatis afferat.

* [2012]Quinque ex causis provenire, quod aliquid non sit apta materia voti; 1º. quia est impossibile; 2º. quia est necessarium;

3º. quia est illicitum; 4º. quia est indifferens vel inutile; 5º. quia non est bonum melius.

* [2013]Quinta conclusio, Cultus, qui per se, proprie debetur imaginibus, est cultus quidam imperfectus, qui analogice et reductive pertinet ad speciem ejus cultus, qui debetur exemplari.

* [2014]Quod autem carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potione, quæ hic figurantur, Christus animas nostras per fidem Spiritus sancti virtute pascit, id non perinde accipiendum, quasi fiat aliqua substantiæ vel commixtio vel transfusio: sed quoniam ex carne semel in sacrificium oblata et sanguine in expiatione effuso vitam hauriamus.

* [2015]Quod autem carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potione, quæ hic figurantur, Christus animas nostras per fidem Spiritus sancti virtute pascit, id non perinde accipiendum, quasi fiat aliqua substantiæ vel commixtio vel transfusio: sed quoniam ex carne semel in sacrificium oblata et sanguine in expiationem effuso vitam hauriamus.

* [2016]Quod baptismus puerorum non sit irritus, sed necessarius et efficax ad salutem.

* [2017]Quod deinde prosequimur, fidelibus spiritualium bonorum effectum quæ figurant sacramenta, extra eorum usum constare, quando et quotidie verum esse experimur et probatur Spirituræ testimoniis, mirum est si cui displiceat.

* [2018]Quod si charitas est forma fidei, et fides non justificat formaliter, nisi ab ipsa caritate formata certe multo magis charitas ipsa justificat. . . . . Fides quæ agitur, ac movetur, formatur, et quasi animatur per dilectionem. . . . . Apostolus Paulus . . . . explicat dilectionem formam esse extrinsecam fidei non intrinsecam, quæ det illi, non ut sit, sed ut moveatur.

* [2019]Quod verbum Dei non est falsum, aut mendax.

* [2020]Quodsi expenderent illud Pauli, Corde creditur ad justitiam (Rom. x. 10

* [2021]Ratio [cur rectori relaxare legem talem non liceat, nisi causa aliqua accedat, si non necessaria, certe sufficiens'] . . . . est, quod actus ferendi aut relaxandi legem non sit actus absoluti dominii, sed actus imperii, qui tendere debeat ad boni ordinis conservationem.

* [2022]Reatus

* [2023]Recte Apologia Augustanæ confessionis dicit, eundem esse effectum, eandem virtutem, seu efficaciam, et verbi et sacramentorum, quæ sunt sigilla promissionum. . . . . Sicut igitur Evangelium est potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti: non quod magica quædam vis characteribus, syllabis, aut sono verborum inhæreat, sed quia est medium, organon seu instrumentum, per quod Spiritus Sanctus efficax est, proponens, offerens, exhibens, distribuens et applicans meritum Christi, et gratiam Dei, ad salutem omni credenti: ita etiam sacramentis tribuitur vis et efficacia: non quod in sacramentis extra sen præter meritum Christi, misericordiam Patris, et efficaciam Spiritus Sancti, quærenda sit gratia ad salutem; sed sacramenta sunt causæ instrumentales ita, quod per illa media seu organa, Pater vult gratiam suam exhibere, donare, applicare: Filius meritum suum communicare credentibus: Spiritus Sanctus efficaciam suam exercere, ad salutem omni credenti.

* [2024]Redemtionis pretium constitui solet pro libera æstimatione illius, qui captivum detinet.

* [2025]Rejicimus errorem eorum qui fingunt, Deum in conversione et regeneratione hominis substantiam et essentiam veteris Adami, et

præcipue animam rationalem penitus abolere, novamque anima essentiam ex nihilo, in illa conversione et regeneratione creare.

* [2026]Rejicimus non modo gentium idola, sed et Christianorum simulachra. Tametsi enim Christus humanam assumpserit naturam, non ideo tamen assumpsit, ut typum præferret statuariis atque pictoribus. . . . . Et quando beati spiritus et divi coelites, dum hic viverent, omnem cultum sui averterunt, et statuas oppugnarunt, cui verisimile videatur divis coelestibus et angelis suas placere imagines, ad quas genua flectunt homines, detegunt capita, allisque prosequuntur honoribus?

* [2027]Reliquæ sanctorum refertæ multis mendaciis, ineptis et fatuitatibus. Canum et equorum ossa ibi sæpe reperta sunt.

* [2028]Rem esse sensibus subjectam, quæ ex Dei institutione sanctitatis et justitiæ tum significandæ, tum efficiendæ vim habet.

* [2029]Renovatio fit non quoad essentiam ut deliravit Illyricus, sed quoad qualitates inhærentes.

* [2030]Restat, ut dicamus, Deum gratiam suam per sacramenta nobis exhibere, non eam actu per illa conferendo; sed per illa tanquam signa clara ac evidentia eam repræsentando et ob oculos ponendo non eminus aut sub figuris quibusdam tanquam multo post futuram, sed tanquam præsentem: ut ita in signis istis tanquam in speculo quodam, exhibitionem iliam gratiæ, quam Deus nobis concessit, quasi conspiciamus. Estque hæc efficacia nulla alia quam objectiva, quæ requirit facultatem cognitivam rite dispositam, ut apprehendere possit illud, quod signum objective menti offert. Hinc videmus, quomodo sacramenta in nobis operentur, nimirum tanquam signa repræsentantia menti nostræ rem cujus signa sunt. Neque alia in illis quæri debet efficacia.

* [2031]Sacramenta Dei sunt prædicare, benedicere ac confirmare,

communionem reddere, visitare infirmos, orare.

* [2032]Sacramenta Judæorum in signis fuere diversa: in re quæ significatur, paria, diversa specie visibili, paria virtute spirituali.

* [2033]Sacramenta cum dicimus, externas ecclesiæ ceremonias seu ritus illos sacros ac solennes intelligimus, quibus veluti foederalibus signis ac sigillis visibilibus Deus gratiosa beneficia sua, in foedere præsertim evangelico promissa, non modo nobis repræsentat 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.

* [2034]Sacramentum

* [2035]Sacramentum æs significat, quod poenæ nomine penditur, sive eo quis interrogatur sive contenditur.

* [2036]Sacramentum dicitur conferre gratiam ex opere operato, ita quod ex eo ipso, quod opus illud, puta sacramentum, exhibitur, nisi impediat obex peccati mortalis, gratia confertur utentibus, sic quod præter exhibitionem signi foris exhibiti non requiritur bonus motus seu devotio interior in suscipiente.

* [2037]Sacramentum enim sine re sacramenti sumenti mors est: res vero sacramenti, etiam, præter sacramentum, sumenti vita æterna est.

* [2038]Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma.

* [2039]Sacramentum hoc magnum est

* [2040]Sacramentum novæ legis, quo significatur conjunctio Christi cum Ecclesia, et gratia confertur ad sanctificandam viri et mulieris legitimam conjunctionem, ad uniendos arctius conjugum

animos, atque ad prolem pie sancteque in virtutis officiis et fide christiana instituendam.

* [2041]Salvator Hominum

* [2042]Sancti non sunt immediati intercessores nostri apud Deum, sed quidquid a Deo nobis impetrant, per Christum impetrant.

* [2043]Sancti orant pro nobis saltem in genere, secundum Scripturas.

* [2044]Sancti qui regnant cum Christo, pro nobis orant, non solum in genere, sed etiam in particulari.

* [2045]Sanctorum animas, sicut etiam angelos, mira quadam celeritate naturæ, quodammodo esse ubique; et per se audire preces supplicantium.

* [2046]Sanctorum quoque martyrum, et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quæ viva membra fuerunt Christi, et templum Spiritus Sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda, et glorificanda, a fideibus veneranda esse; per quæ multa beneficia a Deo hominibus præstantar: ita ut affirmantes, sanctorum reliquiis venerationem, atque honorem non deberi; vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari; atque eorum opis impetrandæ causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari; omnino damnandos esse; prout jampridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia.

* [2047]Sanctos videre in Deo omnia a principio suæ beatitudinis, quæ ad ipsos aliquo modo pertinent, et proinde etiam orationes nostras ad se directas.

* [2048]Sanctum crucis lignum testatur, quod ad hodiernum usque diem apud nos conspicitur, ac per eos qui fide impellente ex eo frusta decerpunt orbem fere totum hinc jam opplevit.

* [2049]Scholasticum autem illud dogma, quo tam longum discrimen inter veteris ac novæ Legis sacramenta notatur, perinde acsi illa

non aliud quam Dei gratiam adumbrarint, hæc vero præsentem conferant, penitus explodendum est. Siquidem nihilo splendidius de illis Apostolus quam de his loquitur, quum docet patres eandem nobiscum spiritualem escam manducasse: et escam illam Christum interpretatur (1 Cor. x. 3

* [2050]Sciendum, quando dicimus, nos fide justificari, nos non excludere opera, quæ fides exigit et tanquam foecunda mater producit; sed ea includere.

* [2051]Scriptura autem, quem de fidei justitia loquitur, longe alio nos ducit: nempe ut ab intuitu operum nostrorum aversi, in Dei misericordiam ac Christi perfectionem, tantum respiciamus. . . . . Hic est fidei sensus, per quem peccator in possessionem venit suæ salutis, dum ex Evangeli doctrina agnoscit Deo se reconciliatum: quod intercedente Christi justitia, impetrata peccatorum remissione, justificatus sit: et quanquam Spiritu Dei regeneratus, non in bonis operibus, quibus incumbit, sed sola Christi justitia repositam sibi perpetuam justitiam cogitat.

* [2052]Secunda opinio est, quod idem honor debeatur imagini ut exemplari, et proinde Christi imago sit adoranda cultu latriæ, Beatæ Mariæ cultu hyperduliæ, sanctorum aliorum, cultu duliæ.

* [2053]Secunda propositio. Quantum ad modum loquendi præsertim in concione ad populum, non est dicendum imagines ullas adorari debere latria, sed e contrario non debere sic adorari.

* [2054]Sed an illi ipsi negligentia sua initium sui esse in Christo deserere non possint, et præsentem mundum iterum amplecti, a sancta doctrina ipsis semel tradita deficere, conscientiæ naufragium facere, a gratia excidere; penitus ex sacra Scriptura esset expendum, antequam illud cum plena animi tranquillitate et plerophoria

* [2055]Sed cum ceterarum rerum cognitio, quæ hactenus expositæ sunt, fidelibus utillissima habenda sit, tum vero nihil magis necessarium videri potest, quam ut doceantur, omnibus hominibus baptismi legem a Domino præscriptam esse, ita ut, nisi per baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur, in sempiternam miseriam, et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fideles, sive infideles sint, procreentur.

* [2056]Sed unus etiam atque idem sacerdos est Christus dominus, nam ministri, qui sacrificium faciunt, non suam, sed Christi personam suscipiunt, cum ejus corpus et sanguinem conficiunt, id quod et ipsius consecrationis verbis ostenditur, neque enim sacerdos inquit, Hoc est corpus Christi, sed, Hoc est corpus meum:' personam videlicet Christi domini gerens, panis, et vini substantiam, in veram ejus corporis, et sanguinis substantiam convertit.

* [2057]Seligat ex tota sua vita sanctus Dei servus, quod in ejus cursu maxime eximium se putabit edidisse, bene revolvat singulas partes: deprehendet procul dubio alicubi quod carnis putredinem sapiat, quando numquam ea est nostra alacritas ad bene agendum quæ esse debet, sed in cursu retardando multa debilitas. Quanquam non obscuras esse maculas videmus, quibus respersa sint opera sanctorum, fac tamen minutissimos esse nævos duntaxat: sed an oculos Dei nihil offendent, coram quibus ne stellæ quidem puræ sunt? Habemus, nec unum a sanctis exire opus, quod, si in se censeatur, non mereatur justam opprobrii mercedem.

* [2058]Si [Protestantes hoc] solum vellent, nobis imputari Christi merita, quia [a Deo] nobis donata sunt, et possumus ea [Deo] Patri offere pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi, recta esset eorum sententia.

* [2059]Si conjugium instituit Deus in communem humani generis

salutem, licet quædem minus grata secum trahat, non ideo protinus spernendum est. Discamus ergo, si quid in Dei beneficiis nobis non arridet, non tam lauti esse ac morosi, quin reverenter illis utamur. Præsertim nobis in sancto conjugio cavenda est hæc pravitas: nam quia multis molestiis implicitum est, semper conatus est Satan odio et infamia gravare, ut homines ab eo subduceret. Et Hieronymus nimis luculentum maligni perversique ingenii specimen in eo edidit, quod non tantum calumniis exagitat sacrum illum et divinum vitæ ordinem, sed quascunque potest ex profanis auctoribus loidorias

* [2060]Si enim Deo cultus reliquiarum non placeret, cur ipse servis suis corpora sanctorum, quæ latebant, ostenderet?

* [2061]Si id efficere propositum eis fuerit, quod ecclesia Catholica in eo administrationis genere efficit.

* [2062]Si omnes consentiunt, ego non dissentio.

* [2063]Si quis dixerit Ecclesiam non potuisse constituere impedimenta, matrimonium dirimentia, vel in iis constituendis errasse; anathema sit.

* [2064]Si quis dixerit baptismum liberum esse, hoc est non necessarium ad salutem; anathema sit.

* [2065]Si quis dixerit in sacrosancto eucharistiæ sacramento remanere substantiam panis, et vini, una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri, Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis, et vini, quam quidem conversionem catholica ecclesia aptissime transubstantionem appellat; anathema sit.

* [2066]Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant; aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non

conferre; quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptæ per fidem gratiæ, vel justitiæ, et notæ quædam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit.

* [2067]Si quis dixerit, Christianos omnes in verbo, et omnibus sacramentis administrandis habere potestatem; anathema sit.

* [2068]Si quis dixerit, Christum, in eucharistia exhibitum, spiritualiter tantum manducari, et non etiam sacramentaliter, et realiter; anathema sit.

* [2069]Si quis dixerit, amissa per peccatum gratia, simul et fidem semper amitti, aut fidem, quæ remanet, non esse veram fidem, licet non sit viva; aut eum, qui fidem sine caritate habet, non esse Christianum; anathema sit.

* [2070]Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio, in cruce peracto, per missæ sacrificium; aut illi per hoc derogari; anathema sit.

* [2071]Si quis dixerit, cæremonias, vestes, et externa signa, quibus in missarum celebratione ecclesia catholica utitur, irritabula impietatis esse, magis quam officia pietatis; anathema sit.

* [2072]Si quis dixerit, canones missæ errores continere, ideoque abrogandum; anathema sit.

* [2073]Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto: et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium; posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voterint, habere donum; anathema sit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id, quod possumus, tentari.

* [2074]Si quis dixerit, ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum, quo summissa voce

pars canonis, et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere; aut aquam non miscendam esse vino in calice offerendo, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem; anathema sit.

* [2075]Si quis dixerit, ecclesiam errare, cum docuit et docet, juxta evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam, propter adulterium alterius conjugum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi; et utrumque, vel etiam innocentem, qui causam adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjuge vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere; moecharique eum, qui, dimissa adultera, aliam duxerit, et eam, quæ, dimisso adultero, alii nupserit; anathema sit.

* [2076]Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus, quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam et Jesu Christi meritum, cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum; anathema sit.

* [2077]Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus, quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam, et Jesu Christi meritum cujus vivum membrum est, fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, et ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum; anathema sit.

* [2078]Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem;' Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi, aliique sacerdotes offerent corpus, et sanguinem suum; anathema sit.

* [2079]Si quis dixerit, imposturam esse, missas celebrare in honorem sanctorum, et pro illorum intercessione, apud Deum obtinenda, sicut ecclesia intendit; anathema sit.

* [2080]Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramentis conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit ecclesia; anathema sit.

* [2081]Si quis dixerit, in missa non offerri Deo verum, et proprium sacrificium; aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari; anathema sit.

* [2082]Si quis dixerit, in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum, unigenitum Dei filium, non esse cultu latriæ, etiam externo, adorandum; atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum; neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem, et universalem ecclesiæ ritum, et consuetudinem, solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et ejus adoratores esse idololatras; anathema sit.

* [2083]Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit.

* [2084]Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale, et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit.

* [2085]Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis, et gratiarum actionis, aut nudum commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis, et defunctis, pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit.

* [2086]Si quis dixerit, missas, in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas esse, ideoque abrogandas; anathema sit.

* [2087]Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando, et aliquibus anathema sit.

* [2088]Si quis dixerit, non licere sacerdoti celebranti seipsum communicare; anathema sit.

* [2089]Si quis dixerit, non licere sacram eucharistiam in sacrario reservari, sed statim post consecrationem adstantibus necessario distribuendam, aut non licere, ut illa ad infirmos honorifice deferatur; anathema sit.

* [2090]Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum, ac proinde frustra episcopos dicere: Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; aut per eam non imprimi characterem; vel eum, qui sacerdos semel fuit, laicum rursus fieri posse; anathema sit.

* [2091]Si quis dixerit, peracta consecratione, in admirabili eucharistiæ sacramento non esse corpus, et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sed tantum in usu dum sumitur, non autem ante, vel post; et in hostiis, seu particulis consecratis, quæ post communionem reservantur, vel supersunt, non remanere verum corpus Domini; anathema sit.

* [2092]Si quis dixerit, presbyteros Ecclesiæ, quos B. Jacobus adducendos esse infirmum inunguendum hortatur, non esse sacerdotes ab Episcopo ordinatos, sed ætate seniores, in quavis communitate; ob idque proprium extremæ unctionis ministrum non esse solum sacerdotem; anathema sit.

* [2093]Si quis dixerit, sacram infirmorum unctionem non conferre gratiam, nec remittere peccata, nec alleviare infirmos; sed jam

cessasse, quasi olim tantum fuerit gratia curationum; anathema sit.

* [2094]Si quis dixerit, solam fidem esse sufficientem præparationem ad sumendum sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramentum, anathema sit. Et ne tantum sacramentum indigne atque ideo in mortem, condemnationem sumatur, statuit, atque declaret ipsa sancta synodus, illis, quos conscientia peccati mortalis gravat, quantumcunque etiam se contritos existiment, habita copia confessoris, necessario præmittendam esse confessionem sacramentalem. Si quis autem contrarium docere, prædicare, vel pertinaciter asserere, seu etiam publice disputando defendere præsumpserit eo ipso excommunicatus existat.

* [2095]Si quis dixerit, statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis, vel coelibatus, et non esse melius, et beatius manere in virginitate aut coelibatu, quam jungi matrimonio: anathema sit.

* [2096]Si quis dixerit, vel præcipuum fructum sanctissimæ eucharistiæ esse remissionem peccatorum, vel ex ea non alios effectus provenire; anathema sit.

* [2097]Si quis in quolibet bono opere justum saltem venaliter peccare dixerit . . . . anathema sit.

* [2098]Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino; aut dixerit, modum secreti confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia catholica ab initio semper observavit, et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum; anathema sit.

* [2099]Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri vere, realiter, et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem una cum anima, et divinitate Domini nostri, Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum, sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura aut virtute; anathema sit.

* [2100]Si quis negaverit, in venerabili sacramento eucharistiæ sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri; anathema sit.
* [2101]Si quis negaverit, omnes, et singulos Christi fideles utriusque sexus, cum ad annos discretionis pervenerint, teneri singulis annis, saltem in paschate, ad communicandum, juxta præceptum sanctæ matris ecclesiæ; anathema sit.
* [2102]Si quis parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, etiam si a baptizatis parentibus orti; aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro necesse sit expiari ad vitam æternam consequendam.. . . . . anathema sit.
* [2103]Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini gratiam; quæ in baptismate confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit, non tolli totum id, quod veram, et propriam peccati rationem habet; sed illud dicit tantum radi, aut non imputari: anathema sit. In renatis enim nihil odit Deus, quia nihil est damnationis iis qui vere consepulti sunt cum Christo per baptisma in mortem: qui non secundum carnem ambulant, sed veterem hominem exuentes, et novum, qui secundum Deum creatus est, induentes, innocentes, immaculati, puri, innoxii, ac Deo dilecti effecti sunt, heredes quidem Dei, coheredes autem Christi, ita ut nihil prorsus eos ab ingressu coeli remoretur.
* [2104]Si sacramenta vocamus ritus, qui habent mandatum Dei, et quibus addita est promissio gratiæ, facile est judicare, quæ sint proprie sacramenta. Nam ritus ab hominibus instituti non erunt hoc modo proprie dicta sacramenta. Non est enim auctoritatis humanæ, promittere gratiam. Quare signa sine mandato Dei instituta, non sunt certa sigua gratiæ, etiamsi fortasse rudes docent, aut

admonent aliquid.

* [2105]Sic ergo dicendum est, quod imagini Christi in quantum est res quædam (puta lignum vel pictum) nulla reverentia exhibetur; quia reverentia nonnisi rationali naturæ debetur. Relinquitur ergo quod exhibeatur ei reverentia solum, in quantum est imago: et sic sequitur, quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda.

* [2106]Sicut enim circumcisio etiam parvulorum in V. T. fuit signaculum justitiæ fidei, ita, quia in N. T. infantes baptizati Deo placent, et salvi sunt, non possunt, nec debent inter infideles rejici, sed recte annumerantur fidelibus.

* [2107]Sicut igitur homo, qui corporaliter mortuus est, seipsum propriis viribus præparare aut accommodare non potest, ut vitam externam recipiat: ita homo spiritualiter in peccatis mortuus, seipsum propriis viribus ad consequendam spiritualem et coelestem justitiam et vitam præparare, applicare, aut vertere non potest, nisi per Filium Dei a morte peccati liberetur et vivificetur.

* [2108]Signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile in anima impressum. Qui eo insigniti sunt, deputantur ad recipienda vel tradenda aliis ea, quæ pertinent ad cultum Dei.

* [2109]Sola fide in Jesum Christum, adeo ut licet mea me conscientia accuset, quod adversus omnia mandata Dei graviter peccaverim, nec ullum eorum servaverim, adhæc etiamnum ad omne malum propensus sim, nihilominus tamen (modo hæc beneficia vera animi fiducia amplectar), sine ullo meo merito, ex mera Dei misericordia, mihi perfecta satisfactio, justitia, et sanctitas Christi, imputetur ac donetur; perinde ac si nec ullum ipse peccatum admisissem, nec ulla mihi labes inhæreret; imo vero quasi eam obedientiam, quam pro me

Christus præstitit, ipse perfecte præstitissem.

* [2110]Solam esse habitualem justitiam, per quam formaliter justi nominamur, et sumus: justitiam vero actualem, id est, opera vere justa justificare quidem, ut sanctus Jacobus loquitur, cum ait cap. 2 ex operibus hominem justificari, sed meritorie, non formaliter.

* [2111]Spiritus Sanctus (quem non omnibus promiscue sacramenta advehunt, sed quem Dominus peculiariter suis confert) is est qui Dei gratias secum affert, qui dat sacramentis in nobis locum, qui efficit ut fructificent.

* [2112]Status conversionis aut regenerationis

* [2113]Summa sit, non aliter animas nostras carne et sanguine Christi pasci, quam panis et vinum corporalem vitam tuentur et sustinent. Neque enim aliter quadraret analogia signi, nisi alimentum suum animæ in Christo reperirent: quod fieri non potest, nisi nobiscum Christus vere in unum coalescat nosque reficiat carnis suæ esu et sanguinis potu. Etsi autem incredibile videtur, in tanta locorum distantia penetrare ad nos Christi carnem, ut nobis sit in cibum, meminerimus, quantum supra sensus omnes nostros emineat arcana Spiritus sancti virtus et quam stultum sit, ejus immensitatem modo nostro velle metiri. Quod ergo mens nostra non comprehendit, concipiat fides, Spiritum vere unire, quæ locis disjuncta sunt. Jam sacram illam carnis et sanguinis sui communicationem, qua vitam suam in nos transfundit Christus non secus acsi in ossa et medullas penetraret, in coena etiam testatur et obsignat; et quidem non objecto inani aut vacuo signo, sed efficaciam Spiritus sui illic proferens, qua impleat quod promittit.

* [2114]Sunt enim qui manducare Christi carnem, et sanguinem ejus bibere, uno verbo definiunt, nihil esse aliud, quam in Christum

ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus in præclara illa concione, ubi carnis suæ manducationem nobis commendat: nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari, quam manducandi etiam ac bibendi verbis ideo designavit, ne, quam ab ipso vitam percipimus, simplicii cognitione percipi quispiam putaret. Quemadmodum enim non aspectus, sed esus panis corpori alimentum sufficit, ita vere ac penitus participem Christi animam fieri convenit, ut ipsius virtute in vitam spiritualem vegetetur. Interim vero hanc non aliam esse, quam fidei manducationem fatemur, ut nulla alia fingi potest. Verum hoc inter mea et isotrum verba interest, quod illis manducare est duntaxat credere: ego credendo manducari Christi carnem, quia fide noster efficitur, eamque manducationem fructum effectamque esse fidei dico.

* [2115]Sunt enim sacramenta signa, ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis operatur. Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt, ant vacua: nec ad nos decipiendos aut frustrandos instituta.

* [2116]Sunt qui manducare Christi carnem, et sanguinem ejus bibere, uno verbo definiunt, nihil esse aliud, quam in Christum ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus . . . . nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari. . . .Quemadmodum enim non aspectus sed esus panis corpori alimentum sufficit, ita vere ac penitus participem Christi animam fieri convenit, ut ipsius virtute in vitam spiritualem vegetetur.

* [2117]Sunt sacramenta symbola mystica, vel ritus sancti, aut sacræ actiones, a Deo ipso institutæ, constantes verbo suo, signis, et

rebus significatis, quibus in ecclesia summa sua beneficia, homini exhibita, retinet in memoria, et subinde renovat, quibus item promissiones suas obsignat, et quæ ipse nobis interius præstat, exterius repræsentat, ac veluti oculis contemplanda subiicit, adeoque fidem nostram, Spiritu Dei in cordibus nostris operante, roborat et auget: quibus denique nos ab omnibus aliis populis et religionibus separat, sibique soli consecrat et obligat, et quid a nobis requirat, significat.

* [2118]Tenebræ stupefecerunt me

* [2119]Tenendum est certissimum hoc fundamentum, quod justificare sit vocabulum forense, notetque in Scriptura actum judicis, quo causam alicujus in judicio justam esse declarat; sive eum a crimine, cujus postulatus est, absolvat (quæ est genuina, et maxime propria vocis significatio), sive etiam jus ad hanc, vel illam rem ei sententia addicat, et adjudicet.

* [2120]Terminum localis præsentiæ esse ambiguum. Corpus Christi præsens esse dicimus in illo loco, in quo celebratur coena, sed modo locali et circumscriptivo præsens esse negamus. Si præsentiam localem sensu posteriori intelligunt habent nos sibi consentientes; si priori, repugnamus.

* [2121]Tertia opinio versatur in medio, estque eorum, qui dicunt, ipsas imagines in se, et proprie honorari debere, sed honore minori, quam ipsum exemplar, et proinde nullam imaginem adorandam esse cultu latriæ.

* [2122]Tertia propositio. Si de re ipsa agatur, admitti potest, imagines posse coli improprie, vel per accidens, eodem genere cultus, quo exemplar ipsum colitur.

* [2123]Totum hanc periodum. Declarat-innovat,' omnes fere editiones ante Romanas omittunt.

* [2124]Tribus in rebus ab hæreticis Catholici dissentiunt; Primum, in objecto fidei justificantis, quod hæretici restringunt ad solam promissionem misericordiæ specialis, Catholici tam late patere volunt, quam late patet verbam. . . . Deinde in facultate et potentia animi quæ sedes est fidei. Siquidem illi fidem collocant in voluntate [seu in corde] cum fiduciam esse definiunt; ac per hoc eam cum spe confundunt. Fiducia enim nihil est aliud, nisi spes roborata. . . . Catholici fidem in intellectu sedem habere docent. Denique, in ipso actu intellectus. Ipsi enim per notitiam fidem definiunt, nos per assensum. Assentimur enim Deo, quamvis ea nobis credenda proponat, quæ non intelligimus.

* [2125]Una est vera et sola causa tuendi coelibatus, ut opes commodius administrentur et splendor ordinis retineatur.

* [2126]Unanimi consensu, docemus et confitemur. . . . . quod homo peccator coram Deo justificetur, hoc est, absolvatur ab omnibus suis peccatis et a judicio justissimæ condemnationis, et adoptetur in numerum filiorum Dei atque hæres æternæ vitæ scribatur, sine ullis nostris meritis, aut dignitate, et absque ullis præcedentibus, præsentibus, aut sequentibus nostris operibus, ex mera gratia, tantummodo propter unicum meritum, perfectissimam obedientiam, passionem acerbissimam, mortem et resurrectionem Domini nostri, Jesu Christi, cujus obedientia nobis ad justitiam imputatur.

* [2127]Unde constat et aliam quamlibet, extra conjugium, societatem coram ipso [Deo] maledictam esse; et illam ipsam conjugalem in necessitatis remedium esse ordinatam, ne in effrenem libidinem proruamus. . . . . Jam quum per naturæ conditionem et accensa post lapsum libidine, mulieris consortio bis obnoxii simus, nisi quos singulari gratia Deus inde exemit; videant singuli quid sibi datum

sit. Virginitas, fateor, virtus est non contemnenda: sed quoniam aliis negata est, allis nonnisi ad tempus concessa, qui ab incontinentia vexantur, et superiores in certamine esse nequeunt ad matrimonii subsidium se conferant, ut ita in suæ vocationis gradu castitatem colant.

* [2128]Unde ista tanta virtus aquæ, ut corpus tangat, et cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo: non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur.

* [2129]Uno verbo poenitentiam interpretor regenerationem, cujus non alius est scopus nisi ut imago Dei, quæ per Adæ transgressionem foedata et tantum non obliterata fuerat, in nobis reformetur. . . . Atque hæc quidem instauratio non uno momento, vel die, vel anno impletur, sed per continuos, imo etiam lentos interdum profectus abolet Deus in electis suis carnis corruptelas.

* [2130]Unum itaque et idem sacrificium esse fatemur, et haberi debet, quod in missa peragitur, et quod in cruce oblatum est: quemadmodum una est et eadem hostia Christus, videlicet Dominus noster, qui se ipsum in ara crucis semel tantummodo cruentum immolavit. Neque enim cruenta, et incruenta hostia, duæ sunt hostiæ, sed una tantum, cujus sacrificium, postquam Dominus ita præcepit, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem,' in eucharistia quotidie instauratur.

* [2131]Ut autem rectius et perspicacius intelligatur, quomodo caro et sanguis Christi sint cibus et potus fidelium, percipianturque a fidelibus ad vitam æternam, paucula hæc adjiciemus. Manducatio non est unius generis. Est enim manducatio corporalis, qua cibus in os percipitur ab homine, dentibus atteritur, et in ventrem deglutitur. . . . . Est et spiritualis manducatio corporis Christi, non ea quidem, qua existimemus cibum ipsum mutari in spiritum, sed qua, manente in sua essentia et proprietate corpore et sanguine

Domini, ea nobis communicantur spiritualiter, utique non corporali modo, sed spirituali, per Spiritum Sanctum, qui videlicet ea, quæ per carnem et sanguinem Domini pro nobis in mortem tradita, parata sunt, ipsam inquam remissionem peccatorum, liberationem, et vitam æternam, applicat et confert nobis, ita ut Christus in nobis vivat, et nos in ipso vivamus, efficitque ut ipsum, quo talis sit cibus et potus spiritualis noster, id est, vita nostra, vera fide percipiamus. . . . . Et sicut oportet cibum in nosmetipsos edendo recipere, ut operetur in nobis, suamque in nobis efficaciam exerat, cum extra nos positus, nihil nobis prosit: ita necesse est nos fide Christum recipere, ut noster fiat, vivatque in nobis, et nos in ipso. . . . . Ex quibus omnibus claret nos, per spiritualem cibum, minime intelligere imaginarium, nescio quem, cibum, sed ipsum Domini corpus pro nobis traditum, quod tamen percipiatur a fidelibus, non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter per fidem. . . . .
Fit autem hic esus et potus spiritualis, etiam extra Domini coenam, quoties, aut ubicunque homo in Christum crediderit. Quo fortassis illud Augustini pertinet, Quid paras dentem et ventrem? crede, et manducasti.
* [2132]Ut iis nobis [Christus] testificatur, quam vere accipimus et tenemus manibus nostris hoc sacramentum, illudque ore comedimus (unde et postmodum vita hæc nostra sustentatur), tam vere etiam nos fide (quæ animæ nostræ est instar et manus et oris) recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, in animis nostris, ad vitam spiritualem in nobis fovendam. . . . . Dicimus itaque id quod comeditur esse ipsissimum Christi corpus naturale, et id quod bibitur verum ipsius sanguinem: at instrumentum seu medium quo hæc comedimus et bibimus non est os corporeum, sed spiritus ipse noster, idque per fidem.

* [2133]Ut unus homo haberet alteram sororem, alteram uxorem, alteram consobrinam, alterum patrem, alterum avunculum, alterum socerum, alteram matrem, alteram amitam, alteram socrum: atque ita se non in paucitate coarctatum, sed latius atque numerosius propinquitatibus crebris vinculum sociale diffunderet.

* [2134]Uxorem ad sororem ejus ne ducas, duas sorores ne ducas in matrimonium, scil. vhyyh

* [2135]Vade et lavare septies in Jordane

* [2136]Verbo Dei virtus divina non extrinsecus in ipso usu demum, accedit, sed . . . . in se et per se, intrinsice ex divina ordinatione et communicatione, efficacia et vi conversiva et regeneratrice præditum est, etiam ante et extra omnem usum.

* [2137]Verbum Dei non agit solum persuasiones morales, proponendo nobis objectum amabile; sed vero, reali, divino et ineffabili influxu potentiæ suæ gratiosæ.

* [2138]Vere sunt sacramenta, baptismus, Coena Domini, absolutio, quæ est sacramentum poenitentiæ. Nam hi ritus habent mandatum Dei et promissionem gratiæ, quæ est propria Novi Testamenti.

* [2139]Verum observemus, fidei sedem non in cerebro esse, sed in corde: neque vero de eo contenderim, qua in parte corporis sita sit fides: sed quoniam cordis nomen pro serio et sincero affectu fere capitur, dico firmam esse et efficacem fiduciam, non nudam tantum notionem.

* [2140]Virgo Dei genitrix, Angeli, et Sancti religiose coli debent, et invocari, ut eorum meritis, et precibus juvemur.

* [2141]Virtualis dicitur, cum actualis intentio in præsenti non adest ob aliquam evagationem mentis, tamen paulo ante adfuit et in virtute illius sit operatio.

* [2142]Vocabulum justificationis in hoc negotio significat justum

pronuntiare, a peccatis et æternis peccatorum suppliciis absolvere, propter justitiam Christi, quæ a Deo fidei imputatur.

* [2143]Vocabulum regenerationis interdum in eo sensu accipitur, ut simul et remissionem peccatorum (quæ duntaxat propter Christam contingit) et subsequentem renovationem complectatur, quam Spiritus Sanctus in illis, qui per fidem justificati sunt, operatur, quandoque etiam solam remissionem peceatorum, et adoptionem in filios Dei significat. Et in hoc posteriore usu sæpe multumque id vocabulam in Apologia Confessionis ponitur. Verbi gratia, cum dicitur: Justificatio est regeneratio. . . . Quin etiam vivificationis vocabulum interdum ita accipitur, ut remissionem peccatorum notet. Cum enim homo per fidem (quam quidem solus Spiritus Sanctus operatur) justificatur, id ipsum revera est quædam regeneratio, quia ex filio iræ fit filius Dei, et hoc modo e morte in vitam transfertur. . . . Deinde etiam regeneratio sæpe pro sanctificatione et renovatione (quæ fidei justificationem sequitur) usurpatur. In qua significatione D. Lutherus hac voce, tum in libro de ecelesia et conciliis, tum alibi etiam, multum usus est.

* [2144]Voluntas, fides, et poenitentia in suscipiento adulto necessario requiruntur, ut dispositiones ex parte subjecti, non ut causæ activæ: non enim fides et poenitentia efficiunt gratiam sacramentalem, neque dant efficaciam sacramento; sed solum tollunt obstacula quæ impedirent, ne sacramenta suam efficaciam exercere possent; unde in pueris, ubi non requiritur dispositio, sine his rebus fit justificatio.

* [2145]Vota quæ sunt de rebus vanis et inutilibus, sunt magis deridenda, quam servanda.

* [2146]a mensa et thoro

* [2147]a vinculo

* [2148]a vinculo matrimonii

* [2149]a vinculo paternitatis

* [2150]ab extra

* [2151]ab initio

* [2152]ab objecto proprio, sed per quandam electionem, voluntarie declinans in unam partem magis quam in alteram. Et siquidem hæc sit cum dubitatione et formidine alterius partis, erit opinio. Si autem sit cum certitudine absque tali formidine, erit fides.

* [2153]acceptilatio

* [2154]acceptio

* [2155]actia directa

* [2156]actus reflexi

* [2157]ad inferos

* [2158]ad sensum

* [2159]ad sui vindictam in compensationem injuriæ Deo per peccatum illatæ

* [2160]ad vanum

* [2161]adjuro

* [2162]aliquid pro aliquo

* [2163]anima

* [2164]animus imponentis

* [2165]baptismi figura

* [2166]baptizo

* [2167]bonum melius

* [2168]coena mystica

* [2169]capernaitice

* [2170]caritate perfecta

* [2171]causa efficiens

* [2172]causa medians

* [2173]causa sine qua non

* [2174]caveat emptor

* [2175]conversio actualis

* [2176]conversio habitualis

* [2177]corporaliter

* [2178]crede et manucabis

* [2179]credere

* [2180]credere, fidem dare sive habere.

* [2181]crucis lignum, quod per particulas ex hoc loco per totum orbem distributum est.

* [2182]cultus

* [2183]cultus civilis

* [2184]cultus reliquiarum

* [2185]cupido impuræ voluptatis

* [2186]cupido impuri lucri

* [2187]de facto

* [2188]de jure

* [2189]de meliore bono

* [2190]de novo

* [2191]de uno Deo colendo

* [2192]deificata

* [2193]dies non

* [2194]differentia

* [2195]dispensatio rei familiaris

* [2196]divinæ amoenitatis recipiendis sanctorum spiritibus destinatum, materia [maceria] quadam igneæ illius zonæ a notitia orbis communis segregatum.

* [2197]dum vivimus vivamus

* [2198]duo sanctæ ecclesiæ sacramenta.

* [2199]e converso

* [2200]effecta ad conversionem sive regenerationem prævia.

* [2201]elementum

* [2202]enunciatio falsi

* [2203]essentia animæ humanæ

* [2204]est relatio

* [2205]ex abscondito Deitatis fonte in Christi carnem mirabiliter infusa est vita, ut inde ad nos flueret.

* [2206]ex cathedra

* [2207]ex fide et devotione suscipientis

* [2208]ex matre sua Maria

* [2209]ex nihilo

* [2210]ex opere operato

* [2211]ex opere operato, scl. a Christo

* [2212]ex pede Hercules

* [2213]ex vi verbi

* [2214]exemplum poenæ

* [2215]exhibere

* [2216]externa divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ testificatio, quæ visibili signo spirituales gratias figurat, ad obsignandas cordibus nostris Dei promissiones, quo earum veritas melius confirmetur.

* [2217]extrinsecus accidens

* [2218]foederati

* [2219]fidens, fidelis, fiducia

* [2220]fides formata

* [2221]fides generalis

* [2222]fides informis

* [2223]fides non justificat formaliter, nisi ab ipsa caritate formata.

* [2224]fides obsequiosa

* [2225]fides specialis

* [2226]fido

* [2227]fiducia supplex

* [2228]finis hujus sæculi

* [2229]fontes solutionum

* [2230]foro conscientiæ

* [2231]foro humano

* [2232]genus hominum

* [2233]gratia gratum faciens, sanctificans

* [2234]hostia

* [2235]illos in Christo, propter Christum et per Christum servare, qui Spiritus Sancti gratia, in eundem ejus filjum credunt, et in ea, fideique obedientia, per eandem gratiam in finem perseverant: contra vero eos, qui non convertentur et infideles, in peccato et iræ subjectos relinquere, et condemnare, secundum illud Evang. Joann. iii. 36

* [2236]illustrando mentem, commovendo voluntatem

* [2237]immergo

* [2238]imperium in imperio

* [2239]improbos atque impios

* [2240]improprie

* [2241]imputatio justitiæ

* [2242]in aliqua requie degere, donec post corporum resurrectionem adipiscantur æternam beatitudinem, quam interim expectant.

* [2243]in extenso

* [2244]in foro Dei

* [2245]in foro conscienti

* [2246]in foro conscientiæ

* [2247]in pignus et certificationem resurrectionis nostrorum corporum ex mortuis
* [2248]in terra adesse
* [2249]in thesi
* [2250]inanes larvæ
* [2251]infernum
* [2252]insons
* [2253]instar omnium
* [2254]inter legitimas personas
* [2255]ipso facto
* [2256]judicandus
* [2257]judicio Dei insons
* [2258]judicium contradictionis
* [2259]judicium in jurante, justitia in objecto, veracitas in mente.
* [2260]judicium in vovente, justitia in objecto, veritas in mente.
* [2261]jure bellare, militare
* [2262]jure divino
* [2263]jus divinum
* [2264]jus in rem
* [2265]jus naturale
* [2266]jus relictæ
* [2267]jusjurandum legitimum, quo Deum cordium inspectorem, ut veritatis testem, et falsitatis vindicem appellamus. Denique votum sacrum, quo vel nos ipsos, vel res aut actiones nostras Deo, velut sacrificium quoddam spirituale, consecramus et devovemus.
* [2268]justam opprobrii mercedem
* [2269]justitia in objecto
* [2270]latriæ cultu
* [2271]leges observans

* [2272]legitim

* [2273]legitima portio

* [2274]locutio contra mentem loquentis

* [2275]magnum pietatis sacramentum

* [2276]materia medica

* [2277]mediator salutis

* [2278]meliora bona

* [2279]mendacia

* [2280]mendacia officiosa

* [2281]mendacium

* [2282]mens

* [2283]meritum condigni

* [2284]missa

* [2285]missa catechumenorum

* [2286]missa fidelium

* [2287]missa infidelium

* [2288]modus existendi

* [2289]monstra sunt non homines

* [2290]monstrum nescio quod essentialis justitiæ

* [2291]mors immortalis

* [2292]ne Christiani, relicto Christo, Polycarpum adorare inciperent; omni idcirco qua poterant ratione martyrum corpora, ne a Christianis colerentur, ethnici gladiatorum corporibus commiscebant; in amphitheatris feris, in aquis piscibus ut vorarentur exponebant; aut saltem igne illa cremabant, cinere dispergentes, uti ex martyrum actis constat.

* [2293]necessario fons omnium gratiarum dicenda est, cum fontem ipsum coelestium charismatum, et donorum, omniumque sacramentorum auctorem Christum dominum admirabili modo in se contineat.

* [2294]nihil sint quam inanes larvæ

* [2295]nisi credere quod non vides.

* [2296]nisi vitæ periculum immineat

* [2297]nisus formativus

* [2298]non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis realem et corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam in eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

* [2299]non ponentibus obicem

* [2300]non potest . . . . fieri, nisi homo per remissionem peccati desinat esse impius; et per infusionem justitiæ incipiat esse pius. Sed sicut aër cum illustratur a sole per idem lumen, quod recipit, desinit esse tenebrosus et incipit esse lucidus: sic etiam homo per eandem justitiam sibi a sole justitiæ donatam atque infusam desinit esse injustus, delente videlicet lumine gratiæ tenebras peccatorum.

* [2301]non potest nisi orali, non autem de crassa, carnali, capernaitica, sed de supernaturali et incomprehensibili manducatione corporis Christi intelligi.

* [2302]non quia mentis suæ assensione credant, sed quia parentum fide, si parentes fideles fuerint, sin minus, fide (ut D. Augustini verbis loquamur) universæ societatis sanctorum muniuntur.'

* [2303]non quod aqua hæc per sese quavis alia sit præstantior, sed quod ei verbum ac præceptum Dei accesserit. Quocirca mera sycophantia est et diaboli illusio, quod hodie nostri novi spiritus, ut blasphement et contumelia afficiant baptismum, verbum et institutionem Dei ab eo divellunt, nec aliter intuentur eum, quam aquam e putreo haustam ac deinceps ita blasphemo ore blaterant: Quid vero utilitatis manus aquæ plena præstaret animæ? Quis vero adeo vecors et inops animi est, qui hoc ignoret, divulsis baptismi partibus, aquam esse aquam? Qua vero fronte tu tibi tantum

sumis, ut non verearis ab ordinatione Dei pretiosissimum keimelion

* [2304]non solum in utraque specie, sed in quavis utriusque speciei particula totum Christum contineri.

* [2305]non sunt solutiones debitorum, neque plenariæ pro peccatis satisfactiones; sed illis peractis conceditur gratuita peccati remissio.

* [2306]non tantum naturalis aqua sed etiam divina, coelestis, sancta et salutifera aqua (est) . . . . hocque nonnisi verbi gratia, quod coeleste ac sanctum verbum est.

* [2307]non-ens

* [2308]notæ ac tesseræ

* [2309]nullo prorsus modo

* [2310]nunc hæc nunc illa proponere. Argumentari ut libet, aliud loqui, aliud agere, panem, ut dicitur, ostendere, lapidem tenere.

* [2311]obedientiam fidei, hoc est, non rigidam et ab omnibus æqualem, prout exigebat lex; sed tantam, quantam fides, id est, certa de divinis promissionibus persuasio, in unoquoque efficere potest.

* [2312]obedientiam fidei, hoc est, non rigidam et omnibus æqualem, prout exigebat lex; sed tantam, quantam fides, id est, certa de divinis promissionibus persuasio, in unoquoque efficere potest; in qua etiam Deus multas imperfectiones et lapsus condonat, modo animo sincero præceptorum ipsius observationi incumbamus, et continuo in eadem proficere studeamus.

* [2313]omne naturalis aquæ genus, sive ea maris sit, sive fluvii, sive paludis, sive putei, aut fontis, quæ sine ulla adjunctione aqua dici solet.

* [2314]onus probandi

* [2315]poenam damni

* [2316]poenam sensus

* [2317]poenitentia

* [2318]panis et vinum vere sint corpus et sanguis Christi.

* [2319]partam a Christo salutem baptismus nobis obsignat

* [2320]per

* [2321]per fus et nefas

* [2322]per modum instrumenti ad infusionem justitiæ habitualis.

* [2323]per se

* [2324]per unctionem olei benedicti

* [2325]placentulæ orbiculares

* [2326]populus vult decipi

* [2327]potentia absoluta

* [2328]potentia ordinata

* [2329]præ sensibus

* [2330]præsensibus

* [2331]præsides et judices

* [2332]præstitit

* [2333]præter istam (primam causam meritoriam sc. Christum) non oportet dare aliam intrinsecam in recipiente, qua conjungatur Deo, antequam recipiat gratiam

* [2334]pro meritorum diversitate

* [2335]propria eorum virtute

* [2336]proprie

* [2337]proprie mentalis

* [2338]propter mysticam verbi cum Spiritu Sancto unionem intimam et individuam.

* [2339]propter quam

* [2340]propter unionem sacramentalem

* [2341]quæ est ignis arcani subterraneus ad poenam thesaurus;

* [2342]qui maledixerit

* [2343]quod est res corporea visibilis . . . . ordinata ad hoc, ut sit rei coelestis vehiculum et medium exhibitivum.

* [2344]quod operatus est Christus

* [2345]quod scilicet viri, et mulieris conjunctio, cujus Deus auctor est, sanctissimi illius vinculi, quo Christus dominus cum Ecclesia conjungitur, sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum sit.

* [2346]quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus

* [2347]quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.

* [2348]quoddam indelebile

* [2349]ratione humanitatis suæ

* [2350]reatus

* [2351]reatus culpæ

* [2352]reatus poenæ

* [2353]reliquiæ sanctorum

* [2354]remissio peccatorum

* [2355]remissio peccatorum jam impetrata

* [2356]res coelestis

* [2357]res invisibilis et intelligibilis, re terrena visibili, tanquam medio divinitus ordinato exhibita, a qua fructus sacramenti principaliter dependet.

* [2358]res terrena

* [2359]reus, satisfactionem alteri debens

* [2360]sacra et in oculos incurrentia signa, ac sigilla, ob eam causam a Deo instituta, ut per ea nobis promissionem Evangelii magis declarat et obsignet: quod scilicet non universis tantum, verum etiam singulis credentibus, propter unicum illud Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, gratis donet remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam.

* [2361]sacramentum

* [2362]sacramentum altaris

* [2363]sacramentum baptismi, quod est sacramentum fidei, sine qua nulli umquam contigit justificatio.

* [2364]sacramentum dicere

* [2365]sacramentum regenerationis per aquam in verbo

* [2366]sacrificatur

* [2367]sancti Josephi

* [2368]sanctitas antecedens voluntatem

* [2369]scientia communicabili

* [2370]sensus communis ecclesiæ

* [2371]sicut patet in principiis primis, ... vel . . . . sicut patet de conclusionibus

* [2372]simpliciter mendacium

* [2373]simulatio non fuerit in verbis veritati contradicentibus, sed in gestibus veritati consentientibus. Christus . . . . agebat, ut qui iturus esset longius, et revera iturus fuerat, nisi rogatus fuisset a discipulis, alia fortasse ratione se iis manifesturus. . . . . Alii dicunt, simulationem fuisse tentatoriam, æque ac illam, quæ in Abrahami historia a scriptore sacro commemoratur Gen. xxii. 2

* [2374]sine qua non

* [2375]solutio

* [2376]sororem uxoris tuæ

* [2377]status gratiæ

* [2378]status quæstionis

* [2379]sua essentia supernaturalia. . . . . Illa indigent novo motu et elevatione nova ad effectum novum ultra propriam suam et naturalem virtutem producendum; hæc vero a prima institutione et

productione sufficienti, hoc est, divina et summa vi ac efficacia prædita sunt, nec indigent nova et peculiari aliqua elevatione ultra efficaciam ordinariam, jamdum ipsis inditam ad producendum spiritualem effectum.

* [2380]sub voce

* [2381]sui

* [2382]summopere commendatur

* [2383]suscipiant ex contactu carnis Christi vim quandam ad gloriosam resurrectionem et vitam æternam

* [2384]syngraphæ

* [2385]tantum in coelis, et præterea nullibi esse, ideoque Christum nobis cum pane et vino verum corpus et verum sanguinem manducandum et bibendum dare, spiritualiter, per fidem, sed non corporaliter ore sumendum.

* [2386]totam justitiam nostram extra nos, et extra omnium hominum merita, opera, virtutes atque dignitatem quærendam, eamque in solo Domino nostro, Jesu Christo consistere.

* [2387]totius Christianæ religionis, ac nexus, quo omnia corporis doctrinæ Christianæ membra continentur, quoque rupto solvuntur.

* [2388]ubi

* [2389]univira

* [2390]usus loquendi

* [2391]ut edere corpus Christi nihil aliud ipsis significet, quam credere in Christum, et vocabulum corporis illis nil nisi symbolum, hoc est, signum seu figuram corporis Christi denotet, quod tamen non in terris in sacra coena præsens, sed tantum in coelis sit.

* [2392]ut sepulcrum Domini, ab omnibus honoraretur.

* [2393]veracitas in mente

* [2394]verbum visibile

* [2395]verbum vocale

* [2396]verum et substantiale corpus et sanguis Christi ore accipiuntur atque participantur ab omnibus, qui panem illum benedictum et vinum in coena Dominica edunt et bibunt.

* [2397]vim suam exserere

* [2398]vinculum matrimonii

* [2399]virtus Spiritus Sancti extrinsecus accidens

* [2400]virtus Spiritus sancti extrinsecus accedens

* [2401]virtute sibi insita

* [2402]vis divina

* [2403]vita angelica

* [2404]vivere

* [2405]vocis baptisma

* [2406]voluntarie declinans in unam partem magis quam in alteram.

* [2407]vox Dei

* [2408]vox populi

Index of German Words and Phrases

* [2409]"Wenn der Tanz," says Strauss,Dogmatik

* [2410]Auctoritäts-Glaube

* [2411]Bevollmächter

* [2412]Bewusstseyn der Versöhnung mit Gott

* [2413]Bitte

* [2414]Das Heiligthum (reliquiæ sanctorum

* [2415]Das diese Worte Christi, das ist mein Leib u. s. w.,' noch fest stehen wider die Schwarmgeister

* [2416]Denkrichtigkeit

* [2417]Denn er wolle in keiner Weise, läugnen, dass Gottes Gewalt nicht scllte so viel vermögen, dass ein Leib zugleich an vielen

Orten sein möge, auch leiblicher, begreiflicher Weise.

* [2418]Der sich wäscht von einem Todten, einer Leiche, sich reinigt von der Befleckung, die ihm die Berührung des Leichen aus zugezogen

* [2419]Die Einheit des Gefühls und der Erkenntniss

* [2420]Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht

* [2421]Die originellste und selbständigste religiös-politische Secte der neuesten Zeit aber, von einem Manne gegründet, dem erst durch verunglückten, Selbstmord der göttliche Mensch sich kund that' (dem französischen Grafen Claude Henri St. Simon, geb. zu Paris 1760, gest. 19. Mai 1825), und sodann durch die Juli-Revolution 1830 erst in rechten Schwung gebracht, welche, als die Quintessenz des tief verderbten antichristischen Zeitgeistes, als die einzig ganz consequente unter allen widergöttlichen Richtungen der Zeit, Welt und Gott, Staat und Kirche, Fleisch und Geist, Diesseits and Jenseits, Böse and Gut, (auch Weib und Mann) sowohl wissenschaftlisch als praktisch unirte und identificirte, unbeschränkte vollständig organisirte Herrschaft des widergöttlichen Fleisches, ungebundenes systematisches Leben nur für diesseitige (die einzige) Welt, unbedingte Geltung eines consequenten politisch-religiösen Materialismus in glühender Beredtsamkeit predigte, und auf den Thron des heiligen Gottes den reizenden' Fürsten dieser Welt setzte, wollte nicht etwa eine christliche Parthei oder Secte, sondern die neue Welt-religion sein; und diese seligen Menshen der Zukunft,' so verschollen auch mit all ihrer abenteuerlich glänzenden Aeusserllchkeit sie wieder fur den Moment sind, -- aber in einem Jüngen-Deutschland,' (zuerst 1834 and besonders 1835) sowie im vollkommen organisirten englischen Socialisten- und in den continentalischen Communisten-Vereinen, und nun nach modischerem Schnitt, verjüngt

auch bereits wider erstanden, und in allerlei neuen Formen stets neu erstehend, -- bahnten so einer fürchterlichen Weltepoche den grässlich ammuthigen Weg.

* [2422]Du sollist den Namen des Herrn, deines Gottes, nicht missbrauchen.

* [2423]Du sollst den Namen Jehova's nicht zur Lüge aussprechen; nicht falsch schwören.

* [2424]Ehe

* [2425]Ein Lämmlein geht und trägt die Schuld

* [2426]Ein vom Denken, Fühlen und Wollen verschiedenes, eigenthümliches Organ für das Ewige und Heilige

* [2427]Entsündigung

* [2428]Er [Jehu] behielt den Kälberdienst in Dan und Bethel, als in Israel einheimisch gewordenen Jehovahdienst.

* [2429]Glaube

* [2430]Incarnationstrieb des Geistes

* [2431]Jemandem auf Jemanden (aut etwas) taufen.

* [2432]Jemanden unter Beziehung, Hindeutung auf jemanden (etwas) taufen.

* [2433]Leben

* [2434]Lieber Herr

* [2435]Lieber Herr Gott

* [2436]Lieber Herr,

* [2437]Man versteht unter Glauben eine jede Gewissheit, die geringer ist als das Wissen, und etwa stärker ist als ein blesses Meinen oder Fürmöglichhalten (z. B. ich glaube, dass es heute regnen wird

* [2438]Nicht sollst du erheben den Namen Jehova's zur Nichtigkeit

* [2439]Regelmässigkeit

* [2440]Sühne

* [2441]Schema des Leibes

* [2442]So wie die That geschehen ist, mit diesem Glauben, mit dieser Zuversicht, ist sie ein schönes Zeichen der Zeit. -- Die That ist -- allgemein betrachtet -- unsittlich und der sittlichen Gesetzgebung zuwiderlaufend. Das Böse soll nicht durch das Böse überwunden werden, sondern allein durch das Gute. Durch Unrecht, List und Gewalt kann kein Recht gestiftet werden, und der gute Zweck heiligt nicht das ungerechte Mittel.

* [2443]Stimmung

* [2444]Substanzmittheilung

* [2445]Verleztung

* [2446]Vollendung

* [2447]Wörterbuch

* [2448]Was nun der Vernunft entgegen ist, ist gewiss dass es Gott viehmehr entgegen ist. Denn wie sollte es nicht wider die göttliche Wahrheit seyn, das wider Vernunft und menschliche Wahrheit ist.

* [2449]allerrealsten

* [2450]auf eine abbildlich-lebendige Weise

* [2451]das Urwollen

* [2452]das reale Zusammensein beider Substanzen

* [2453]dass der Mensch an sich mit Gott Eins ist

* [2454]der Zustand des Gemüthes, da man eine Sache für wahr hält und sich darauf verlässt

* [2455]die Wiederherstellung aller Dinge in ihren frühern vollkommnern Zustand

* [2456]die Wirklichkeit

* [2457]die substantielle Lebenseinheit mit der Person Christi

* [2458]die von Gott empfangene (aus Gnaden zugerechnete) Gerechtigkeit um des Glaubenswillen.

* [2459]ein Gottesfleisch, ein Geistfleisch

* [2460]ein substantielles Centrum seines mikrokosmischen Lebens, ... ein Centrum, welches da war, ehe der Mensch bewusste Gedanken hatte, und welches bleiben wird, wenn der Leib dem Tode verfällt, welches also an sich weder Gedanke (mens) noch materieller Stoff ist.

* [2461]erworben hat

* [2462]göttliche Sache

* [2463]gefühlsmassiges Erkennen

* [2464]geräuchert

* [2465]gottmenschlichen Lebenspotenz

* [2466]in Nichts sich auflösen

* [2467]man muss es naiv nennen

* [2468]mit oder neben

* [2469]mittheilen

* [2470]raumerfüllende und vom Raum umschollene

* [2471]seelischen Centrum

* [2472]straflos

* [2473]unmittelbar Fürwahrhalten, ohne Vermittelung eines Schlussbeweises, durch Neigung und Bedürfniss,

* [2474]verdäut

* [2475]wirklich und wahrhaftig und wesentlich

* [2476]wirklich und wesentlich

* [2477]zerbissen

* [2478]zwei Werthe fur dieselbe Forderung

Index of French Words and Phrases

* [2479]"On voit," says Cardinal Gousset in the place referred to, "que le signe eucharistique est un signe qui a la vertu de produire

la grace; mais il n'a cette vertu que par l'institution de Jesus Christ."

* [2480]C'est un feinte innocente et pleine d'amour, par laquelle Jésus-Christ veut éprouver la foi de ses disciples. Ainsi en usent les medicins à l'égard des malades, et les pères à l'égard de leurs enfans.

* [2481]Dieu est tout ce qui est; Tout est in lui, tout est par lui, Nui de nous n'est hors de lui

* [2482]Je suppose, que deux vérités ne sauroient se contredire; que l'objet de la foi est la vérité que Dieu a révélée d'une manière extraordinaire, et que la raison est l'enchainment des vérités, mais particulièrement (lorsqu'elle est comparés avec la foi) de celles où l'esprit humain peut atteindre naturellement, sans être aidé des lumières de la foi.

* [2483]Le sacrement de l'eucharistie n'est point nécessaire au salut, d'une necessité de moyen; on peut être sauvé sans avoir reçu la communion. La raison, c'est que se sacrement n'a point été institué comme moyen de conférer la première grace sanctifiante ou de remettre le péché mortel, ce qui est réservé aux sacrements de baptême et de pénitence.

* [2484]Offrez le sacrifice que je vien d'offrir moi-meme

* [2485]dont le sentiment est assez suivi

* [2486]en oûtre

Index of Pages of the Print Edition

[2487]i [2488]ii [2489]iii [2490]iv [2491]v [2492]vi [2493]vii [2494]viii [2495]3 [2496]4 [2497]5 [2498]6 [2499]7 [2500]8 [2501]9 [2502]10 [2503]11 [2504]12 [2505]13 [2506]14 [2507]15 [2508]16 [2509]17 [2510]18 [2511]19 [2512]20 [2513]21 [2514]22

[2515]23 [2516]26 [2517]25 [2518]26 [2519]27 [2520]28 [2521]29

[2522]30 [2523]31 [2524]32 [2525]33 [2526]34 [2527]35 [2528]36

[2529]38 [2530]39 [2531]40 [2532]41 [2533]42 [2534]43 [2535]44

[2536]45 [2537]46 [2538]47 [2539]48 [2540]49 [2541]50 [2542]51

[2543]52 [2544]53 [2545]54 [2546]55 [2547]56 [2548]57 [2549]58

[2550]59 [2551]60 [2552]61 [2553]62 [2554]63 [2555]64 [2556]65

[2557]66 [2558]67 [2559]68 [2560]69 [2561]70 [2562]71 [2563]72

[2564]73 [2565]74 [2566]75 [2567]76 [2568]77 [2569]78 [2570]79

[2571]80 [2572]81 [2573]82 [2574]83 [2575]84 [2576]85 [2577]86

[2578]87 [2579]88 [2580]89 [2581]90 [2582]91 [2583]92 [2584]93

[2585]94 [2586]95 [2587]96 [2588]97 [2589]98 [2590]99 [2591]100

[2592]101 [2593]102 [2594]103 [2595]104 [2596]105 [2597]106

[2598]107 [2599]108 [2600]109 [2601]110 [2602]111 [2603]112

[2604]113 [2605]114 [2606]115 [2607]116 [2608]117 [2609]118

[2610]119 [2611]120 [2612]121 [2613]122 [2614]123 [2615]124

[2616]125 [2617]126 [2618]127 [2619]128 [2620]129 [2621]130

[2622]131 [2623]132 [2624]133 [2625]134 [2626]135 [2627]135

[2628]137 [2629]138 [2630]139 [2631]140 [2632]141 [2633]142

[2634]143 [2635]144 [2636]145 [2637]146 [2638]147 [2639]148

[2640]149 [2641]150 [2642]151 [2643]152 [2644]153 [2645]154

[2646]155 [2647]156 [2648]157 [2649]158 [2650]159 [2651]160

[2652]161 [2653]162 [2654]163 [2655]164 [2656]165 [2657]166

[2658]167 [2659]168 [2660]169 [2661]170 [2662]171 [2663]172

[2664]173 [2665]174 [2666]175 [2667]176 [2668]177 [2669]178

[2670]179 [2671]180 [2672]181 [2673]182 [2674]183 [2675]184

[2676]185 [2677]186 [2678]187 [2679]188 [2680]189 [2681]190

[2682]191 [2683]192 [2684]193 [2685]194 [2686]195 [2687]196

[2688]197 [2689]198 [2690]199 [2691]200 [2692]201 [2693]202

[2694]203 [2695]204 [2696]205 [2697]206 [2698]207 [2699]208

[2700]209 [2701]210 [2702]211 [2703]212 [2704]213 [2705]214

[2706]215 [2707]216 [2708]217 [2709]218 [2710]219 [2711]220

[2712]221 [2713]223 [2714]224 [2715]225 [2716]226 [2717]227

[2718]228 [2719]229 [2720]230 [2721]231 [2722]232 [2723]233

[2724]234 [2725]235 [2726]236 [2727]237 [2728]238 [2729]239

[2730]240 [2731]241 [2732]242 [2733]243 [2734]244 [2735]245

[2736]246 [2737]247 [2738]248 [2739]249 [2740]250 [2741]251

[2742]252 [2743]253 [2744]264 [2745]255 [2746]256 [2747]257

[2748]258 [2749]259 [2750]260 [2751]261 [2752]262 [2753]263

[2754]264 [2755]265 [2756]266 [2757]267 [2758]268 [2759]269

[2760]270 [2761]271 [2762]272 [2763]273 [2764]274 [2765]275

[2766]276 [2767]277 [2768]278 [2769]279 [2770]280 [2771]281

[2772]282 [2773]283 [2774]284 [2775]285 [2776]286 [2777]287

[2778]288 [2779]289 [2780]290 [2781]291 [2782]292 [2783]293

[2784]295 [2785]296 [2786]297 [2787]298 [2788]299 [2789]300

[2790]301 [2791]302 [2792]303 [2793]304 [2794]305 [2795]306

[2796]307 [2797]308 [2798]309 [2799]310 [2800]311 [2801]312

[2802]313 [2803]314 [2804]315 [2805]316 [2806]317 [2807]318

[2808]319 [2809]320 [2810]321 [2811]322 [2812]323 [2813]324

[2814]325 [2815]326 [2816]327 [2817]328 [2818]329 [2819]330

[2820]331 [2821]332 [2822]333 [2823]334 [2824]335 [2825]336

[2826]337 [2827]338 [2828]339 [2829]340 [2830]341 [2831]342

[2832]343 [2833]344 [2834]345 [2835]346 [2836]347 [2837]348

[2838]349 [2839]350 [2840]351 [2841]352 [2842]353 [2843]354

[2844]355 [2845]356 [2846]357 [2847]358 [2848]359 [2849]360

[2850]361 [2851]362 [2852]363 [2853]364 [2854]365 [2855]366

[2856]367 [2857]368 [2858]369 [2859]370 [2860]371 [2861]372

[2862]373 [2863]374 [2864]375 [2865]376 [2866]377 [2867]378

[2868]379 [2869]380 [2870]381 [2871]382 [2872]383 [2873]384

[2874]385 [2875]386 [2876]387 [2877]388 [2878]389 [2879]390

[2880]391 [2881]392 [2882]393 [2883]394 [2884]395 [2885]396

[2886]397 [2887]398 [2888]399 [2889]400 [2890]401 [2891]402

[2892]403 [2893]404 [2894]405 [2895]406 [2896]407 [2897]408

[2898]409 [2899]410 [2900]411 [2901]412 [2902]413 [2903]414

[2904]415 [2905]416 [2906]417 [2907]418 [2908]419 [2909]420

[2910]421 [2911]422 [2912]423 [2913]424 [2914]425 [2915]426

[2916]427 [2917]428 [2918]429 [2919]430 [2920]431 [2921]432

[2922]433 [2923]434 [2924]435 [2925]436 [2926]437 [2927]438

[2928]439 [2929]440 [2930]441 [2931]442 [2932]443 [2933]444

[2934]445 [2935]446 [2936]447 [2937]448 [2938]449 [2939]450

[2940]451 [2941]452 [2942]453 [2943]454 [2944]455 [2945]456

[2946]457 [2947]458 [2948]459 [2949]460 [2950]461 [2951]462

[2952]463 [2953]464 [2954]465 [2955]466 [2956]467 [2957]468

[2958]469 [2959]470 [2960]471 [2961]472 [2962]473 [2963]474

[2964]475 [2965]476 [2966]477 [2967]478 [2968]479 [2969]480

[2970]481 [2971]482 [2972]483 [2973]484 [2974]485 [2975]486

[2976]487 [2977]488 [2978]489 [2979]490 [2980]491 [2981]492

[2982]493 [2983]494 [2984]495 [2985]496 [2986]497 [2987]498

[2988]499 [2989]500 [2990]501 [2991]502 [2992]503 [2993]504

[2994]505 [2995]506 [2996]507 [2997]508 [2998]509 [2999]510

[3000]511 [3001]512 [3002]513 [3003]514 [3004]515 [3005]516

[3006]517 [3007]518 [3008]519 [3009]520 [3010]521 [3011]522

[3012]523 [3013]524 [3014]525 [3015]526 [3016]527 [3017]528

[3018]529 [3019]530 [3020]531 [3021]532 [3022]533 [3023]534

[3024]535 [3025]536 [3026]537 [3027]538 [3028]539 [3029]540

[3030]541 [3031]542 [3032]543 [3033]544 [3034]545 [3035]546

[3036]547 [3037]548 [3038]549 [3039]550 [3040]551 [3041]552

[3042]553 [3043]554 [3044]555 [3045]556 [3046]557 [3047]558

[3048]559 [3049]560 [3050]561 [3051]562 [3052]563 [3053]564

[3054]565 [3055]566 [3056]567 [3057]568 [3058]569 [3059]570

[3060]571 [3061]572 [3062]573 [3063]574 [3064]575 [3065]576

[3066]577 [3067]578 [3068]579 [3069]580 [3070]581 [3071]582

[3072]583 [3073]584 [3074]585 [3075]586 [3076]587 [3077]588

[3078]589 [3079]590 [3080]591 [3081]592 [3082]593 [3083]594

[3084]595 [3085]596 [3086]597 [3087]598 [3088]599 [3089]600

[3090]601 [3091]602 [3092]603 [3093]604 [3094]605 [3095]606

[3096]607 [3097]608 [3098]609 [3099]610 [3100]611 [3101]612

[3102]613 [3103]614 [3104]615 [3105]616 [3106]617 [3107]618

[3108]619 [3109]620 [3110]621 [3111]622 [3112]623 [3113]624

[3114]625 [3115]626 [3116]627 [3117]628 [3118]629 [3119]630

[3120]631 [3121]632 [3122]633 [3123]634 [3124]635 [3125]636

[3126]637 [3127]638 [3128]639 [3129]640 [3130]641 [3131]642

[3132]643 [3133]644 [3134]645 [3135]646 [3136]647 [3137]648

[3138]649 [3139]650 [3140]651 [3141]652 [3142]653 [3143]654

[3144]655 [3145]656 [3146]657 [3147]658 [3148]659 [3149]660

[3150]661 [3151]662 [3152]663 [3153]664 [3154]665 [3155]666

[3156]667 [3157]668 [3158]669 [3159]670 [3160]671 [3161]672

[3162]673 [3163]674 [3164]675 [3165]676 [3166]677 [3167]678

[3168]679 [3169]680 [3170]681 [3171]682 [3172]683 [3173]684

[3174]685 [3175]686 [3176]687 [3177]688 [3178]689 [3179]690

[3180]691 [3181]692 [3182]693 [3183]694 [3184]695 [3185]696

[3186]697 [3187]698 [3188]699 [3189]700 [3190]701 [3191]702

[3192]703 [3193]704 [3194]705 [3195]706 [3196]707 [3197]708

[3198]709 [3199]710 [3200]711 [3201]712 [3202]713 [3203]714

[3204]715 [3205]716 [3206]717 [3207]718 [3208]719 [3209]720

[3210]721 [3211]722 [3212]723 [3213]724 [3214]725 [3215]726

[3216]727 [3217]728 [3218]729 [3219]730 [3220]731 [3221]732

[3222]733 [3223]734 [3224]735 [3225]736 [3226]737 [3227]738

[3228]739 [3229]740 [3230]741 [3231]742 [3232]743 [3233]744

[3234]745 [3235]746 [3236]747 [3237]748 [3238]749 [3239]750

[3240]751 [3241]752 [3242]753 [3243]754 [3244]755 [3245]756

[3246]757 [3247]758 [3248]759 [3249]760 [3250]761 [3251]762

[3252]763 [3253]764 [3254]765 [3255]766 [3256]767 [3257]768

[3258]769 [3259]770 [3260]771 [3261]772 [3262]773 [3263]774

[3264]775 [3265]776 [3266]777 [3267]778 [3268]779 [3269]780

[3270]781 [3271]782 [3272]783 [3273]784 [3274]785 [3275]786

[3276]787 [3277]788 [3278]789 [3279]771 [3280]791 [3281]792

[3282]793 [3283]794 [3284]795 [3285]796 [3286]797 [3287]798

[3288]799 [3289]800 [3290]801 [3291]802 [3292]803 [3293]804

[3294]805 [3295]806 [3296]807 [3297]808 [3298]809 [3299]810

[3300]811 [3301]812 [3302]813 [3303]814 [3304]815 [3305]816

[3306]817 [3307]818 [3308]819 [3309]820 [3310]821 [3311]822

[3312]823 [3313]824 [3314]825 [3315]826 [3316]827 [3317]828

[3318]829 [3319]830 [3320]831 [3321]832 [3322]833 [3323]834

[3324]835 [3325]836 [3326]837 [3327]838 [3328]839 [3329]840

[3330]841 [3331]642 [3332]843 [3333]844 [3334]845 [3335]846

[3336]847 [3337]848 [3338]849 [3339]850 [3340]851 [3341]862

[3342]853 [3343]854 [3344]855 [3345]856 [3346]857 [3347]858

[3348]859 [3349]860 [3350]861 [3351]862 [3352]863 [3353]864

[3354]865 [3355]866 [3356]867 [3357]868 [3358]869 [3359]870

[3360]871 [3361]872 [3362]873 [3363]874 [3364]875 [3365]876

[3366]877 [3367]878 [3368]879 [3369]880

This document is from the Christian Classics Ethereal

Library at Calvin College, http://www.ccel.org,

generated on demand from ThML source.

References

1. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.16

2. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p14.1

3. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p15.1

4. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p16.1

5. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p29.1

6. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.9

7. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p29.1

8. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.1

9. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p18.1

10. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p18.1

11. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.1

12. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p21.1

13. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.15

14. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.5

15. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p21.2

16. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p17.1

17. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.1

18. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.13

19. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.1

20. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.2

21. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.3

22. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.9

23. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.9

24. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.9

25. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.4

26. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p18.2

27. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p18.2

28. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.4

29. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.4
30. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.4
31. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.10
32. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.1
33. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p50.1
34. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.2
35. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.2
36. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-p4.1
37. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-p4.1
38. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.18
39. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.4
40. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p20.1
41. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p20.3
42. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p3.1
43. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p4.1
44. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.2
45. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.4
46. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.4
47. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.3
48. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.20
49. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.5
50. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.2
51. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.1
52. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.3
53. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.4
54. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.5
55. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.6
56. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.3
57. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p8.1

58. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.5
59. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.5
60. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p2.1
61. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.2
62. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.3
63. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.5
64. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.4
65. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p130.1
66. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.4
67. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p138.1
68. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p147.1
69. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p121.1
70. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p136.3
71. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.1
72. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.9
73. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p136.9
74. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.7
75. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p121.2
76. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.1
77. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.5
78. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.5
79. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p9.3
80. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.5
81. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.18
82. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p40.6
83. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.13
84. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.15
85. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.17
86. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.2

87. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p39.5

88. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.6

89. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p2.2

90. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p3.2

91. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.2

92. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.1

93. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.2

94. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.1

95. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.2

96. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p67.1

97. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.2

98. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p2.3

99. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.1

100. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p67.2

101. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.2

102. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p53.1

103. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.7

104. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.7

105. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p17.1

106. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p9.1

107. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p39.4

108. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.3

109. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.3

110. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.8

111. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.1

112. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p9.6

113. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.4

114. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p24.4

115. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.7

116. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.7
117. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-p5.2
118. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.17
119. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.4
120. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.3
121. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.8
122. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p32.4
123. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p32.4
124. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.8
125. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.1
126. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.3
127. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p16.1
128. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.2
129. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.7
130. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.7
131. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.10
132. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p16.2
133. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.3
134. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.3
135. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.1
136. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p16.3
137. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p16.3
138. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p11.1
139. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.9
140. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.3
141. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.3
142. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.5
143. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.7
144. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.3

145. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.2
146. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p32.5
147. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.4
148. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p3.1
149. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p7.3
150. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p3.2
151. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p16.4
152. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.10
153. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.6
154. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.10
155. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.1
156. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.9
157. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.3
158. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.11
159. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.2
160. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.4
161. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.5
162. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.4
163. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p13.1
164. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.10
165. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p13.2
166. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.9
167. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.2
168. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.1
169. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.1
170. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.7
171. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.2
172. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p5.3
173. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.5

174. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.2
175. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.5
176. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.4
177. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p32.1
178. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p5.2
179. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.5
180. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p12.1
181. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.6
182. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p6.2
183. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p6.9
184. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p6.3
185. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.5
186. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.5
187. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.5
188. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.5
189. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.7
190. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.3
191. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.10
192. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.11
193. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.12
194. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.11
195. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.3
196. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.4
197. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p10.1
198. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p10.1
199. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.11
200. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.3
201. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.3
202. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.3

203. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.2
204. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.5
205. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.12
206. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.1
207. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.12
208. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p6.10
209. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p40.1
210. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.2
211. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.4
212. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.6
213. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.2
214. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.5
215. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.4
216. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.6
217. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.3
218. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.6
219. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p7.2
220. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.3
221. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.3
222. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.3
223. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.4
224. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.4
225. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.5
226. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.5
227. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.5
228. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.9
229. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p6.3
230. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p11.2
231. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.3

232. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p12.2
233. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p16.4
234. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.5
235. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p22.1
236. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.10
237. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-p5.3
238. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.11
239. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p3.2
240. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p3.2
241. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.6
242. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.7
243. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.2
244. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.6
245. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.7
246. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.8
247. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p9.4
248. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p9.4
249. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.4
250. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.1
251. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.9
252. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p6.1
253. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.3
254. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.3
255. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p17.4
256. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p17.4
257. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p22.2
258. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p19.1
259. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.13
260. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.4

261. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.2
262. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.4
263. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.4
264. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p34.2
265. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p6.11
266. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.10
267. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.11
268. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.7
269. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.8
270. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.19
271. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.6
272. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.12
273. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p17.1
274. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p16.5
275. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.3
276. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.15
277. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p14.3
278. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p14.1
279. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p26.1
280. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p55.1
281. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.1
282. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.1
283. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.3
284. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.2
285. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p52.1
286. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p55.2
287. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p29.2
288. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p29.1
289. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p51.3

290. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p12.3
291. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.1
292. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p3.1
293. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p41.1
294. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.5
295. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.9
296. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.6
297. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.9
298. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p54.4
299. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p49.2
300. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p4.8
301. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.7
302. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p6.1
303. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.5
304. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p51.1
305. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p17.3
306. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.14
307. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.4
308. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p10.8
309. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p37.6
310. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.5
311. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.1
312. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p21.4
313. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p21.4
314. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.2
315. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.6
316. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p39.2
317. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.2
318. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.7

319. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p42.1
320. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p39.2
321. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p21.2
322. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p3.1
323. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p3.1
324. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.6
325. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.4
326. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.6
327. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p32.4
328. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.4
329. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.6
330. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.3
331. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.11
332. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p18.1
333. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p19.1
334. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p7.2
335. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p29.1
336. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.5
337. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p17.1
338. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p13.2
339. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p18.2
340. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p13.2
341. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p123.3
342. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.7
343. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.1
344. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.2
345. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-p12.2
346. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p42.1
347. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p41.3

348. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.2
349. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.1
350. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.9
351. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.3
352. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p5.1
353. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p13.1
354. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.4
355. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p123.2
356. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.6
357. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.7
358. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p23.1
359. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.6
360. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p18.1
361. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p18.1
362. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.1
363. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p39.2
364. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p48.2
365. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.2
366. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.4
367. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.3
368. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p34.2
369. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p39.3
370. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p25.2
371. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p10.8
372. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.1
373. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.4
374. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.7
375. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p32.1
376. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.7

377. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.4
378. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.7
379. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.10
380. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.4
381. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.7
382. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p5.2
383. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p20.1
384. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.2
385. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.2
386. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.3
387. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p11.1
388. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.8
389. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.4
390. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.8
391. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p4.1
392. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.5
393. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.8
394. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.5
395. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.3
396. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p4.3
397. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.1
398. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p17.2
399. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.1
400. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p15.1
401. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p17.1
402. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p14.1
403. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.3
404. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.2
405. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.2

406. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.4
407. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p15.1
408. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p2.1
409. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.3
410. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.2
411. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.3
412. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.3
413. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p4.1
414. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p2.1
415. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p18.2
416. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.8
417. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p4.2
418. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.7
419. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p17.4
420. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.1
421. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.1
422. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p4.1
423. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p4.3
424. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.5
425. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p5.1
426. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.1
427. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p5.1
428. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.10
429. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.11
430. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.3
431. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.16
432. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p41.4
433. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p123.1
434. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.10

435. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p24.1
436. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.1
437. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p28.3
438. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.5
439. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p22.5
440. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.5
441. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p32.2
442. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.8
443. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p29.2
444. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.4
445. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.4
446. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p12.4
447. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p2.1
448. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.6
449. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p4.2
450. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p15.3
451. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p3.1
452. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.2
453. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p5.2
454. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.2
455. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.4
456. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.4
457. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.5
458. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.5
459. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.1
460. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p56.5
461. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.9
462. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p22.4
463. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p11.1

464. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p3.1
465. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p3.1
466. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.12
467. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p11.1
468. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.5
469. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p23.3
470. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.4
471. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.7
472. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p43.1
473. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p13.3
474. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.3
475. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.6
476. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p32.3
477. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.6
478. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.5
479. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p31.1
480. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.2
481. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-p12.1
482. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p23.2
483. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.7
484. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p4.4
485. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p15.4
486. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.4
487. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p4.1
488. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p10.1
489. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p4.1
490. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.9
491. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p31.2
492. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.8

493. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.11
494. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.14
495. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.3
496. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.1
497. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.4
498. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.10
499. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p50.1
500. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p8.1
501. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p37.1
502. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p39.1
503. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.1
504. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p41.1
505. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p51.1
506. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.1
507. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.2
508. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p15.2
509. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p19.1
510. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p11.1
511. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.1
512. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.1
513. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.1
514. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.1
515. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p14.2
516. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p15.3
517. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p26.4
518. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.2
519. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p21.1
520. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p15.3
521. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p5.3

522. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.2

523. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.3

524. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p13.2

525. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.2

526. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.4

527. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.16

528. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.1

529. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.1

530. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.2

531. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.2

532. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.2

533. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.1

534. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.2

535. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.1

536. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.2

537. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p50.3

538. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.8

539. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p18.3

540. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.10

541. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.6

542. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.3

543. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.4

544. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.2

545. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.4

546. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.4

547. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.4

548. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.3

549. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.3

550. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.3

551. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.3
552. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p7.5
553. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p24.1
554. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p25.1
555. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p18.5
556. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.3
557. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.7
558. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.3
559. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.6
560. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p52.1
561. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p52.2
562. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.3
563. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p26.2
564. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p42.2
565. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p42.2
566. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.17
567. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.11
568. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.17
569. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.11
570. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p16.2
571. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p16.2
572. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.8
573. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p26.1
574. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.5
575. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p24.5
576. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.1
577. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.5
578. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.5
579. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.4

580. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.5
581. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.4
582. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p17.1
583. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p25.1
584. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p26.3
585. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.17
586. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.2
587. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.5
588. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p8.2
589. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.2
590. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p2.1
591. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p2.1
592. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p37.1
593. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.8
594. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p8.4
595. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.6
596. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.19
597. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.6
598. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p15.2
599. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p26.2
600. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.13
601. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.1
602. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p26.1
603. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.5
604. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p9.1
605. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p9.1
606. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.4
607. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p11.2
608. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p39.1

609. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p48.1
610. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.5
611. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.25
612. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.4
613. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p4.1
614. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p7.1
615. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.6
616. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.10
617. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.5
618. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p5.1
619. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.3
620. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p56.2
621. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.1
622. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p61.1
623. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p26.1
624. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p73.1
625. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.6
626. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.6
627. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p3.2
628. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p3.2
629. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p11.1
630. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p5.4
631. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.2
632. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p19.2
633. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p30.5
634. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p19.1
635. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.9
636. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.7
637. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p10.1

638. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p16.2
639. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.6
640. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p26.2
641. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p21.3
642. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p21.3
643. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p15.1
644. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p9.1
645. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.3
646. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p9.1
647. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p60.8
648. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.6
649. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p4.2
650. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p3.1
651. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p15.3
652. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p3.1
653. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p27.2
654. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.6
655. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p26.1
656. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p27.3
657. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p11.4
658. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.4
659. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.4
660. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.6
661. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p41.3
662. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.19
663. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.10
664. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.10
665. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.2
666. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.8

667. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.12

668. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p6.1

669. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p17.1

670. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.2

671. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p56.1

672. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p16.1

673. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.4

674. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p8.2

675. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p15.2

676. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.2

677. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-p15.2

678. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p16.2

679. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.5

680. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.2

681. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p15.2

682. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-p15.2

683. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.1

684. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p15.1

685. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.1

686. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p11.3

687. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.7

688. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.4

689. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p20.1

690. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.4

691. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p18.4

692. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.4

693. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-p11.5

694. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p25.1

695. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.6

696. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p20.2

697. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p2.2

698. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.7

699. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p5.1

700. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p11.2

701. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p9.2

702. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p9.2

703. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.8

704. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.4

705. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.1

706. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.7

707. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p62.1

708. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.1

709. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.7

710. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p62.1

711. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p20.3

712. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p11.3

713. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p11.5

714. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p7.1

715. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p6.3

716. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.5

717. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p11.1

718. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p16.1

719. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.6

720. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.2

721. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.6

722. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.1

723. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.1

724. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.1

725. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p14.1
726. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-p3.1
727. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.14
728. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p10.1
729. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p15.1
730. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.6
731. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.6
732. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p13.1
733. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p15.2
734. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p15.2
735. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.1
736. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p22.1
737. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.5
738. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p11.4
739. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.10
740. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.9
741. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.6
742. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.6
743. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.2
744. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.6
745. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.1
746. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.2
747. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p10.1
748. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p6.5
749. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p32.1
750. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.1
751. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.5
752. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p13.2
753. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.1

754. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.1

755. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.1

756. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p5.5

757. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.6

758. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p33.1

759. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.7

760. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.2

761. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p34.2

762. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p4.2

763. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p16.4

764. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p10.1

765. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.7

766. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p16.1

767. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.10

768. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.3

769. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p5.3

770. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p10.2

771. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p16.1

772. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.8

773. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.2

774. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p4.1

775. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p9.2

776. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.8

777. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p5.4

778. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p10.2

779. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.2

780. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.8

781. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p17.1

782. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p16.1

783. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.7

784. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.12

785. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.4

786. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.1

787. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.16

788. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.2

789. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p26.2

790. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p6.1

791. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.6

792. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.3

793. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p12.1

794. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p5.2

795. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p17.2

796. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p2.1

797. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p33.1

798. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p65.1

799. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p33.1

800. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p50.1

801. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.16

802. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.3

803. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p4.3

804. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p4.5

805. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.2

806. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.1

807. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.1

808. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p10.1

809. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p28.1

810. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p6.1

811. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p7.1

812. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p11.1
813. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.3
814. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.2
815. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.1
816. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p12.2
817. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p12.2
818. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p26.1
819. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p32.3
820. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.14
821. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.10
822. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.4
823. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p9.1
824. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p53.6
825. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p53.2
826. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.3
827. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p7.2
828. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p34.1
829. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.5
830. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.5
831. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p5.5
832. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.9
833. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p65.1
834. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p5.4
835. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p13.1
836. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p5.4
837. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.2
838. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p10.2
839. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p24.1
840. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p53.1

841. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.3
842. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.4
843. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.3
844. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.6
845. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.3
846. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p5.1
847. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.3
848. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p18.3
849. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p9.2
850. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p9.6
851. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p18.3
852. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-p10.5
853. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p39.1
854. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p8.1
855. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p8.1
856. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p7.2
857. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p14.2
858. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.11
859. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.1
860. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p16.3
861. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p12.1
862. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p12.1
863. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.5
864. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p10.1
865. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.2
866. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.21
867. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p8.1
868. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p25.2
869. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p17.2

870. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p8.1
871. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p10.2
872. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.4
873. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.4
874. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.4
875. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p30.2
876. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.1
877. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.2
878. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.2
879. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p21.3
880. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.1
881. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.1
882. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.2
883. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.11
884. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.1
885. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.4
886. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p27.4
887. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p18.5
888. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.5
889. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.6
890. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.6
891. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p19.1
892. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-p12.1
893. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p16.1
894. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.11
895. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p19.2
896. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p12.1
897. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.3
898. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p30.1

899. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p30.1

900. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.1

901. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p6.2

902. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p18.1

903. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p57.1

904. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p57.1

905. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p8.2

906. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p17.1

907. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p8.3

908. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p18.1

909. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p16.1

910. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.13

911. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.25

912. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.5

913. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p9.8

914. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.5

915. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.10

916. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p124.1

917. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p150.1

918. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p45.1

919. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.1

920. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.1

921. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p8.2

922. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.4

923. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p8.2

924. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p5.1

925. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.4

926. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.26

927. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.2

928. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.2
929. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p33.2
930. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p106.1
931. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p66.3
932. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p73.2
933. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.1
934. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.1
935. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p23.1
936. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p23.1
937. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.5
938. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p11.2
939. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p48.3
940. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p67.7
941. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p5.1
942. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p3.1
943. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.9
944. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p24.1
945. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.2
946. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p6.1
947. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p10.2
948. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p32.1
949. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.20
950. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.5
951. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.8
952. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.7
953. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.7
954. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p34.1
955. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.5
956. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p33.2

957. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.12

958. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.6

959. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p2.2

960. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p10.1

961. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.12

962. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.8

963. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p38.4

964. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.3

965. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p16.2

966. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.6

967. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.1

968. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.1

969. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p6.2

970. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p9.1

971. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p17.1

972. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.10

973. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p60.4

974. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p26.1

975. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p18.1

976. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p4.3

977. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p4.3

978. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p26.1

979. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.7

980. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.7

981. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p30.5

982. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.10

983. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p45.2

984. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p9.1

985. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p24.2

986. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p9.2

987. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p23.1

988. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p21.2

989. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p26.3

990. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p24.1

991. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p32.1

992. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.5

993. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.5

994. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p6.2

995. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p2.7

996. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p16.2

997. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p31.3

998. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p3.2

999. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.2

1000. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p40.2

1001. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p37.2

1002. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.5

1003. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.3

1004. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.5

1005. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p27.1

1006. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.9

1007. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p11.2

1008. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.8

1009. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p5.1

1010. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p13.1

1011. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.2

1012. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.15

1013. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p11.5

1014. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p25.1

1015. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p26.1

1016. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.5

1017. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.7

1018. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.4

1019. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p40.2

1020. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.3

1021. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.3

1022. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.4

1023. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p17.1

1024. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p11.4

1025. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.5

1026. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.5

1027. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.5

1028. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p8.4

1029. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.1

1030. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p21.4

1031. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p9.10

1032. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.1

1033. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p6.2

1034. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p11.3

1035. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p11.4

1036. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p7.1

1037. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p33.2

1038. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p12.1

1039. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.18

1040. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.3

1041. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.9

1042. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.18

1043. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.1

1044. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.3

1045. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p20.2

1046. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.4

1047. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p14.3

1048. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.8

1049. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.6

1050. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p4.4

1051. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.6

1052. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p4.4

1053. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p4.2

1054. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p15.2

1055. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p2.2

1056. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p14.1

1057. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p15.1

1058. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p12.1

1059. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p2.2

1060. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.5

1061. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p11.2

1062. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.1

1063. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p24.1

1064. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.4

1065. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p15.1

1066. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.4

1067. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.5

1068. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p30.6

1069. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.5

1070. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.20

1071. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.6

1072. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p8.1

1073. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.6

1074. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.4

1075. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p17.1

1076. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.4

1077. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.7

1078. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.22

1079. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.4

1080. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.22

1081. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p36.2

1082. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.9

1083. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p16.2

1084. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p36.2

1085. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.4

1086. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p31.6

1087. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p3.1

1088. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p15.2

1089. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p20.1

1090. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-p15.1

1091. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p8.2

1092. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.4

1093. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p17.2

1094. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.5

1095. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.3

1096. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.13

1097. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p17.3

1098. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p6.1

1099. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.22

1100. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.24

1101. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.9

1102. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.24

1103. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.22

1104. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p7.9

1105. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.4

1106. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.6

1107. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p16.1

1108. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p17.1

1109. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.6

1110. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p5.2

1111. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p12.6

1112. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.5

1113. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.7

1114. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.4

1115. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p37.1

1116. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p12.2

1117. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p12.4

1118. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p3.1

1119. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-p22.1

1120. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p36.2

1121. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.22

1122. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p36.1

1123. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.9

1124. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.10

1125. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.1

1126. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.11

1127. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.6

1128. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.2

1129. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.4

1130. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p14.2

1131. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p16.1

1132. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p20.5

1133. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p16.1

1134. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p2.3

1135. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.4

1136. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.8

1137. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.8

1138. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p33.1

1139. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.11

1140. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p6.3

1141. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p8.2

1142. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.11

1143. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p18.4

1144. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.9

1145. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.14

1146. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p23.8

1147. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.7

1148. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.4

1149. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p15.1

1150. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p15.1

1151. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.5

1152. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p5.2

1153. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.10

1154. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.9

1155. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p9.2

1156. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.9

1157. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-p3.1

1158. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.15

1159. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.23

1160. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p15.2

1161. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.10

1162. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.7

1163. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p30.12

1164. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p36.2

1165. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.3

1166. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.5

1167. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p30.1

1168. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.23

1169. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p40.4

1170. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.18

1171. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.18

1172. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p40.3

1173. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.11

1174. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.1

1175. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.3

1176. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p4.8

1177. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.12

1178. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p25.9

1179. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.13

1180. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.14

1181. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.15

1182. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p5.1

1183. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p4.2

1184. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p5.3

1185. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p5.3

1186. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p12.1

1187. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.ii-p5.3

1188. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p5.2

1189. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.16

1190. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.4

1191. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.3

1192. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.6

1193. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.5

1194. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p44.2

1195. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p2.1

1196. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p51.7

1197. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p54.1

1198. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p55.3

1199. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p51.1

1200. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p29.3

1201. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p6.1

1202. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.3

1203. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p18.1

1204. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.2

1205. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p17.2

1206. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p20.2

1207. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p20.2

1208. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p48.1

1209. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p48.2

1210. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.4

1211. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.7

1212. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.6

1213. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.9

1214. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.8

1215. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.6

1216. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.4

1217. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.3

1218. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.17

1219. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p6.1

1220. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p20.1

1221. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.2

1222. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.2

1223. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p15.3

1224. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p11.7

1225. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.18

1226. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.1

1227. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p48.3

1228. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.1

1229. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.5

1230. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.2

1231. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p15.4

1232. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p12.3

1233. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p12.4

1234. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p30.5

1235. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p52.1

1236. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p55.1

1237. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p6.3

1238. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p8.4

1239. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p72.4

1240. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p6.4

1241. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.9

1242. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p8.1

1243. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p6.5

1244. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p53.1

1245. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p64.1

1246. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p41.2

1247. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.10

1248. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p15.3

1249. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p41.3

1250. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p3.2

1251. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p5.7

1252. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p41.1

1253. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.7

1254. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.6

1255. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.13

1256. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p28.2

1257. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.16

1258. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.7

1259. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p15.1

1260. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p48.1

1261. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p3.1

1262. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.3

1263. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p13.1

1264. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p13.1

1265. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p20.2

1266. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.6

1267. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p15.3

1268. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p17.2

1269. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p18.1

1270. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p17.3

1271. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p8.1

1272. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.3

1273. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.1

1274. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p34.1

1275. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.16

1276. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p34.1

1277. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p12.2

1278. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p12.2

1279. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p7.4

1280. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.2

1281. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-p33.1

1282. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.19

1283. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p7.3

1284. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p25.1

1285. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-p13.1

1286. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p27.4

1287. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p6.1

1288. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p6.1

1289. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.2

1290. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.20

1291. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p5.3

1292. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.21

1293. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p22.3

1294. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.22

1295. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p12.1

1296. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.23

1297. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.7

1298. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p4.1

1299. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-p9.2

1300. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p7.4

1301. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p17.5

1302. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p20.3

1303. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p32.2

1304. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p7.1

1305. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p14.3

1306. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p10.6

1307. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.1

1308. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p24.1

1309. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.5

1310. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.4

1311. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.1

1312. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.5

1313. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p37.4

1314. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.2

1315. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p40.1

1316. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p37.3

1317. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.5

1318. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.7

1319. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p59.8

1320. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.3

1321. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.3

1322. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p62.3

1323. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p62.3

1324. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p9.4

1325. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p25.3

1326. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p9.4

1327. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.3

1328. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p20.1

1329. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p20.1

1330. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p19.1

1331. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.6

1332. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.7

1333. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.7

1334. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p32.2

1335. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p18.2

1336. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p18.2

1337. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p8.4

1338. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.3

1339. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.9

1340. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p31.4

1341. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p2.2

1342. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.4

1343. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p32.3

1344. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p18.3

1345. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p17.1

1346. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p50.2

1347. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.8

1348. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.5

1349. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p4.1

1350. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p50.5

1351. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.5

1352. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.5

1353. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.5

1354. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.7

1355. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p50.4

1356. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p32.4

1357. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.6

1358. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.7

1359. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p54.3

1360. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.3

1361. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.4

1362. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p32.5

1363. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.3

1364. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.8

1365. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.8

1366. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p30.1

1367. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p33.9

1368. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p54.4

1369. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.7

1370. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.10

1371. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.2

1372. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.1

1373. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p34.1

1374. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.9

1375. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.9

1376. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.3

1377. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.3

1378. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.7

1379. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.9

1380. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p19.2

1381. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p32.6

1382. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p17.2

1383. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p13.1

1384. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.10

1385. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.8

1386. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.5

1387. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.3

1388. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p2.5

1389. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p9.3

1390. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p2.9

1391. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.18

1392. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.2

1393. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p24.2

1394. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p17.4

1395. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.14

1396. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.14

1397. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p40.19

1398. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.6

1399. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.1

1400. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.7

1401. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.2

1402. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p49.3

1403. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p18.2

1404. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p50.1

1405. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p33.5

1406. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.3

1407. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p8.3

1408. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.7

1409. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.6

1410. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.8

1411. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p5.3

1412. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p11.2

1413. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p69.1

1414. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p12.4

1415. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p32.1

1416. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.3

1417. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p22.6

1418. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-p7.5

1419. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p4.3

1420. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.2

1421. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p14.2

1422. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.9

1423. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p17.1

1424. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.10

1425. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p36.1

1426. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p11.3

1427. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p6.2

1428. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p20.4

1429. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.3

1430. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.6

1431. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.22

1432. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.7

1433. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.8

1434. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.11

1435. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.27

1436. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.23

1437. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.12

1438. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.24

1439. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p10.5

1440. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.1

1441. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.29

1442. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p12.2

1443. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p6.1

1444. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p4.3

1445. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.4

1446. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.14

1447. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p19.3

1448. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.5

1449. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.6

1450. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p26.3

1451. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.2

1452. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p17.1

1453. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.4

1454. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.11

1455. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p28.2

1456. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p25.1

1457. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.4

1458. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-p15.2

1459. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p36.5

1460. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p62.2

1461. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p22.7

1462. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.8

1463. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.4

1464. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.17

1465. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.15

1466. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.1

1467. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.7

1468. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p3.4

1469. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.13

1470. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.19

1471. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p8.2

1472. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p8.3

1473. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p15.4

1474. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p15.3

1475. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p20.3

1476. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p22.3

1477. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.28

1478. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.17

1479. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p29.1

1480. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p29.2

1481. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.4

1482. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.7

1483. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.10

1484. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.1

1485. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.2

1486. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.4

1487. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.1

1488. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.9

1489. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.8

1490. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.13

1491. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.19

1492. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p3.1

1493. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.12

1494. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p33.11

1495. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.5

1496. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.12

1497. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p17.4

1498. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p19.1

1499. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p11.9

1500. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.8

1501. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.1

1502. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.2

1503. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.9

1504. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.14

1505. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p7.1

1506. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.3

1507. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.5

1508. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.5

1509. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.6

1510. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.14

1511. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.11

1512. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.5

1513. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p31.1

1514. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.17

1515. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.20

1516. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.8

1517. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.12

1518. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.9

1519. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p15.13

1520. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p8.2

1521. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.10

1522. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p124.2

1523. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.6

1524. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p11.2

1525. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p11.1

1526. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.19

1527. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.3

1528. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p28.1

1529. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.5

1530. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p33.2

1531. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.7

1532. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.1

1533. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p14.4

1534. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p9.16

1535. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p22.2

1536. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p17.5

1537. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.10

1538. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p56.3

1539. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.8

1540. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p4.2

1541. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.2

1542. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p23.1

1543. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p56.4

1544. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p3.2

1545. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.3

1546. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.6

1547. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.2

1548. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p52.3

1549. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p5.2

1550. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.2

1551. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.6

1552. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p2.2

1553. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.8

1554. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p43.2

1555. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.5

1556. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p2.3

1557. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.7

1558. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p33.1

1559. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.2

1560. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.7

1561. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p20.3

1562. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p22.2

1563. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p19.1

1564. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p20.4

1565. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p17.3

1566. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p18.3

1567. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.4

1568. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.8

1569. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.17

1570. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p18.4

1571. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p41.2

1572. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.7

1573. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.6

1574. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p19.5

1575. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p26.3

1576. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p48.1

1577. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.7

1578. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p20.6

1579. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p24.1

1580. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p19.4

1581. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p24.3

1582. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p33.1

1583. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p28.1

1584. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p16.5

1585. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p7.5

1586. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.6

1587. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p18.5

1588. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p19.2

1589. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p22.5

1590. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.31

1591. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.8

1592. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p33.1

1593. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.9

1594. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p46.1

1595. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p45.4

1596. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.7

1597. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.6

1598. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p18.7

1599. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.8

1600. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.23

1601. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.10

1602. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.7

1603. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p21.3

1604. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p16.3

1605. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p29.1

1606. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p10.2

1607. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p17.1

1608. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.6

1609. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p5.2

1610. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p62.1

1611. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p11.4

1612. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p8.1

1613. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p22.2

1614. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p4.1

1615. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-p16.2

1616. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p16.2

1617. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p5.1

1618. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p45.3

1619. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.7

1620. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.10

1621. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p36.1

1622. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p20.8

1623. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.14

1624. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p17.2

1625. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.17

1626. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.2

1627. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.13

1628. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p22.21

1629. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-p10.2

1630. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p17.2

1631. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p34.1

1632. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p33.13

1633. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p49.4

1634. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.2

1635. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-p15.5

1636. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p62.9

1637. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p35.1

1638. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.9

1639. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p2.2

1640. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.2

1641. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.14

1642. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.3

1643. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p35.8

1644. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p35.7

1645. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p33.1

1646. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p16.3

1647. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.4

1648. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p13.2

1649. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p27.4

1650. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.5

1651. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.7

1652. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.8

1653. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-p8.3

1654. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p6.1

1655. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.2

1656. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p52.1

1657. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p52.2

1658. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.10

1659. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p13.3

1660. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p4.5

1661. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.10

1662. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p61.2

1663. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p23.1

1664. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p5.1

1665. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p20.6

1666. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p16.6

1667. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p66.5

1668. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p35.5

1669. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p35.1

1670. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p10.3

1671. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.2

1672. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p3.5

1673. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.1

1674. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p28.13

1675. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p136.6

1676. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p2.1

1677. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.12

1678. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p5.1

1679. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p3.4

1680. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.11

1681. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.6

1682. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.8

1683. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.6

1684. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.11

1685. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p7.1

1686. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p146.1

1687. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p5.1

1688. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p21.1

1689. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p81.1

1690. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.5

1691. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.17

1692. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p7.3

1693. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p7.1

1694. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p136.1

1695. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p51.2

1696. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p53.4

1697. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p34.1

1698. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p18.8

1699. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p17.1

1700. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p75.4

1701. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p30.1

1702. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.4

1703. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p21.1

1704. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p23.1

1705. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p10.5

1706. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p20.4

1707. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p54.1

1708. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.7

1709. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p4.1

1710. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p6.1

1711. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p57.2

1712. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.9

1713. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p35.5

1714. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p8.1

1715. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p9.1

1716. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p10.2

1717. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p23.1

1718. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p6.2

1719. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.6

1720. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p8.6

1721. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p11.2

1722. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p15.2

1723. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.4

1724. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p8.3

1725. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p27.1

1726. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p42.3

1727. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p9.7

1728. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p37.3

1729. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p53.2

1730. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p6.3

1731. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p18.1

1732. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p5.1

1733. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p42.2

1734. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p14.1

1735. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p6.3

1736. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p146.2

1737. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.7

1738. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p54.3

1739. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p21.2

1740. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p56.3

1741. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p3.5

1742. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p3.6

1743. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.10

1744. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p27.2

1745. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p3.1

1746. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.5

1747. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p2.1

1748. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p49.2

1749. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.7

1750. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p19.4

1751. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.3

1752. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p6.5

1753. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p22.4

1754. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p5.2

1755. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p16.1

1756. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p6.1

1757. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p14.1

1758. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p23.3

1759. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p35.1

1760. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p35.1

1761. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p28.1

1762. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p18.1

1763. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.8

1764. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p5.3

1765. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p9.3

1766. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p7.2

1767. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p40.5

1768. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p42.4

1769. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p55.2

1770. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p16.2

1771. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.4

1772. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p7.1

1773. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p3.1

1774. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.16

1775. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p10.2

1776. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p43.5

1777. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p9.2

1778. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p10.1

1779. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p13.1

1780. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p8.1

1781. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p20.1

1782. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p8.3

1783. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-p13.1

1784. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.8

1785. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p36.1

1786. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.6

1787. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p28.2

1788. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p52.5

1789. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p15.1

1790. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p17.2

1791. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p5.2

1792. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p66.4

1793. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.12

1794. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p4.2

1795. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p47.3

1796. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p19.3

1797. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.3

1798. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p22.3

1799. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p3.3

1800. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p25.1

1801. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p44.1

1802. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p28.4

1803. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p7.7

1804. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.9

1805. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p7.3

1806. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.2

1807. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.6

1808. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p52.3

1809. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.6

1810. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p3.3

1811. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p37.4

1812. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p17.3

1813. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p31.1

1814. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p79.3

1815. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p4.1

1816. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.8

1817. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p5.1

1818. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p46.3

1819. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p4.6

1820. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p34.2

1821. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p9.8

1822. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.8

1823. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p29.4

1824. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.5

1825. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.4

1826. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.12

1827. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p5.1

1828. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p6.4

1829. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p6.6

1830. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p21.6

1831. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p79.5

1832. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p26.2

1833. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p30.4

1834. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p7.5

1835. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-p3.5

1836. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p114.1

1837. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p16.1

1838. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.8

1839. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p8.1

1840. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.8

1841. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p21.7

1842. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p18.6

1843. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p35.3

1844. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p22.1

1845. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p3.1

1846. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p15.1

1847. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p3.3

1848. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p3.1

1849. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p7.1

1850. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p48.1

1851. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p27.2

1852. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p50.2

1853. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p29.2

1854. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p35.1

1855. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p18.6

1856. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p26.1

1857. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p4.3

1858. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p5.2

1859. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p22.6

1860. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p42.6

1861. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.8

1862. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p3.4

1863. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.8

1864. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p27.5

1865. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-p11.1

1866. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p4.4

1867. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.9

1868. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p11.3

1869. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p12.1

1870. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p19.3

1871. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p20.4

1872. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p5.1

1873. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.10

1874. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.14

1875. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p15.2

1876. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.26

1877. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p19.1

1878. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p43.1

1879. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p6.4

1880. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p4.2

1881. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p6.3

1882. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p53.3

1883. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p3.1

1884. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p25.2

1885. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p7.2

1886. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p35.4

1887. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p6.3

1888. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p5.1

1889. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p3.1

1890. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.13

1891. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p51.2

1892. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p3.2

1893. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p27.4

1894. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p75.1

1895. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.9

1896. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p26.5

1897. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p26.3

1898. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.25

1899. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p28.16

1900. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p15.5

1901. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p42.2

1902. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p47.2

1903. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p14.3

1904. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p11.3

1905. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p18.1

1906. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.11

1907. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p17.4

1908. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.4

1909. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p12.3

1910. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p3.3

1911. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p10.1

1912. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p11.1

1913. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.12

1914. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p12.2

1915. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p4.6

1916. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p3.2

1917. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p31.3

1918. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.7

1919. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p18.3

1920. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p15.3

1921. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.1

1922. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p7.6

1923. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p8.2

1924. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.10

1925. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p3.2

1926. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p37.2

1927. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p44.4

1928. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.6

1929. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p12.1

1930. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p21.4

1931. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p66.1

1932. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p26.4

1933. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.2

1934. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p125.1

1935. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p54.1

1936. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p4.1

1937. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p26.4

1938. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p3.1

1939. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.5

1940. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p55.2

1941. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p3.2

1942. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p18.3

1943. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p10.1

1944. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p19.1

1945. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p20.6

1946. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p21.3

1947. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p20.1

1948. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p8.4

1949. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p18.1

1950. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p51.5

1951. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p4.1

1952. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p21.4

1953. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p8.7

1954. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p18.5

1955. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p51.3

1956. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p41.2

1957. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p19.2

1958. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p49.3

1959. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p19.1

1960. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p14.2

1961. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p36.1

1962. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p9.2

1963. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.5

1964. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.1

1965. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p48.1

1966. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.8

1967. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p35.2

1968. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p14.1

1969. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p50.1

1970. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p20.1

1971. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p15.3

1972. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p20.7

1973. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p25.1

1974. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p7.2

1975. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p25.3

1976. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p6.8

1977. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p24.2

1978. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p13.2

1979. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p56.2

1980. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p3.2

1981. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.8

1982. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p6.1

1983. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p26.1

1984. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p42.1

1985. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p27.6

1986. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p27.8

1987. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p6.1

1988. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.8

1989. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p10.8

1990. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p75.3

1991. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p27.6

1992. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p10.1

1993. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.6

1994. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p26.2

1995. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p8.2

1996. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p27.3

1997. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p51.3

1998. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p36.3

1999. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p53.7

2000. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p6.1

2001. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p35.4

2002. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p3.2

2003. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p5.3

2004. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p8.5

2005. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p15.2

2006. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.1

2007. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p11.1

2008. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p9.11

2009. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p27.1

2010. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p25.5

2011. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.1

2012. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p40.5

2013. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.9

2014. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p21.1

2015. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p56.4

2016. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p3.3

2017. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p46.5

2018. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.8

2019. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p13.3

2020. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p9.5

2021. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p20.4

2022. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p35.5

2023. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p24.1

2024. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p23.6

2025. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p5.1

2026. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p50.1

2027. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p44.1

2028. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p18.1

2029. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p47.3

2030. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p22.1

2031. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.16

2032. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p48.4

2033. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p21.1

2034. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.22

2035. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p3.4

2036. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.3

2037. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p14.4

2038. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p6.4

2039. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.3

2040. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p12.1

2041. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p36.1

2042. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.3

2043. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.4

2044. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.5

2045. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.7

2046. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p27.1

2047. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p7.8

2048. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p50.1

2049. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p48.2

2050. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p29.2

2051. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.9

2052. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.2

2053. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.6

2054. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p17.1

2055. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.7

2056. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p47.1

2057. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p6.7

2058. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p6.2

2059. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p11.8

2060. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p33.1

2061. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p44.7

2062. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p22.4

2063. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p83.2

2064. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.4

2065. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p8.1

2066. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p17.2

2067. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p44.2

2068. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p14.1

2069. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p7.3

2070. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p38.1

2071. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p41.1

2072. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p40.1

2073. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p14.8

2074. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p43.1

2075. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p58.3

2076. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p7.6

2077. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-p3.3

2078. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p36.1

2079. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p39.1

2080. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p44.3

2081. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p35.1

2082. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p12.1

2083. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p30.4

2084. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p6.1

2085. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p37.1

2086. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p42.1

2087. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.2

2088. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p16.1

2089. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p13.1

2090. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p10.2

2091. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p10.1

2092. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p14.3

2093. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p14.2

2094. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p17.1

2095. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p14.7

2096. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p11.1

2097. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-p9.1

2098. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.4

2099. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p7.1

2100. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p9.1

2101. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p15.1

2102. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p8.2

2103. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p53.6

2104. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p14.1

2105. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p24.1

2106. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p12.5

2107. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-p4.1

2108. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p30.1

2109. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p3.1

2110. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.5

2111. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p10.2

2112. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.1

2113. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p10.2

2114. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.2

2115. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p9.13

2116. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p47.6

2117. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p8.1

2118. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.5

2119. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p7.2

2120. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p22.5

2121. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.3

2122. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p30.7

2123. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p20.3

2124. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p7.2

2125. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p15.4

2126. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p5.2

2127. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p8.5

2128. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p14.2

2129. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p2.2

2130. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p46.1

2131. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p35.1

2132. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p16.1

2133. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p114.2

2134. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p136.5

2135. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p13.4

2136. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p28.6

2137. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p28.3

2138. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p2.1

2139. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-p9.3

2140. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p34.1

2141. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p44.5

2142. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p6.7

2143. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p4.1

2144. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p34.4

2145. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p47.1

2146. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p87.3

2147. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p93.1

2148. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p42.3

2149. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p42.2

2150. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-p17.4

2151. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p80.2

2152. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p22.7

2153. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p22.1

2154. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p19.2

2155. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p9.3

2156. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p9.2

2157. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p3.1

2158. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p4.4

2159. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.2

2160. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p4.1

2161. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p17.15

2162. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p22.4

2163. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p47.8

2164. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p30.1

2165. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p31.2

2166. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.8

2167. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p41.2

2168. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p6.1

2169. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p13.4

2170. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.3

2171. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p47.10

2172. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p45.2

2173. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p3.1

2174. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p32.2

2175. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.4

2176. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.3

2177. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p19.1

2178. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p53.4

2179. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.19

2180. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.15

2181. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p50.2

2182. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p57.1

2183. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p22.1

2184. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.1

2185. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p5.1

2186. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-p5.2

2187. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p35.6

2188. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p20.1

2189. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p40.2

2190. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p35.3

2191. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p5.2

2192. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p16.1

2193. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p59.1

2194. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p34.1

2195. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p29.2

2196. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p12.6

2197. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p20.5

2198. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p18.5

2199. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p17.5

2200. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-p3.2

2201. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p13.1

2202. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.1

2203. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p47.2

2204. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p35.7

2205. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p56.6

2206. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p41.2

2207. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.2

2208. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p26.2

2209. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-p4.1

2210. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p64.1

2211. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.10

2212. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p51.2

2213. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p3.5

2214. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p23.1

2215. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p9.3

2216. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p9.1

2217. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p8.1

2218. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p62.1

2219. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.11

2220. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-p4.2

2221. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p3.3

2222. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.1

2223. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p6.11

2224. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-p2.1

2225. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p5.1

2226. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.9

2227. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p9.4

2228. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p6.4

2229. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p28.5

2230. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p10.1

2231. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p10.2

2232. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p53.1

2233. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p27.2

2234. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.18

2235. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p13.1

2236. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.10

2237. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p25.9

2238. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p51.1

2239. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p17.2

2240. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p41.2

2241. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p10.3

2242. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p16.2

2243. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-p22.1

2244. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p16.1

2245. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p59.1

2246. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p29.3

2247. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p61.3

2248. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p15.1

2249. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p14.1

2250. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p9.1

2251. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p12.4

2252. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.4

2253. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-p7.1

2254. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p75.2

2255. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-p5.1

2256. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.9

2257. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.6

2258. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p15.6

2259. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p23.1

2260. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p40.1

2261. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-p19.2

2262. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.10

2263. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p95.2

2264. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p9.3

2265. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p8.1

2266. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p17.2

2267. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p44.4

2268. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-p8.1

2269. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p23.2

2270. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p49.4

2271. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.3

2272. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p17.3

2273. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p17.4

2274. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.2

2275. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p78.10

2276. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p29.1

2277. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p10.3

2278. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p52.1

2279. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p37.1

2280. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p26.7

2281. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.7

2282. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p16.3

2283. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p5.1

2284. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.30

2285. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.28

2286. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.29

2287. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.27

2288. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p27.1

2289. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p7.1

2290. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p5.1

2291. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p10.3

2292. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p49.3

2293. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p4.1

2294. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p4.4

2295. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p29.3

2296. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.7

2297. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.8

2298. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p37.1

2299. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p27.4

2300. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p3.6

2301. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p19.3

2302. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.6

2303. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p20.5

2304. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p20.2

2305. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p23.5

2306. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.1

2307. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p28.1

2308. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p4.2

2309. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p14.1

2310. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p31.1

2311. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p7.5

2312. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p27.2

2313. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.3

2314. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-p27.1

2315. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p7.4

2316. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p7.3

2317. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.1

2318. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p13.1

2319. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-p48.1

2320. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p26.1

2321. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p9.1

2322. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-p15.9

2323. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p13.2

2324. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p14.1

2325. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p15.1

2326. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-p11.1

2327. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p18.3

2328. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p18.2

2329. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p40.1

2330. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p33.1

2331. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p7.11

2332. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-p15.2

2333. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.6

2334. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p15.1

2335. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p4.5

2336. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p41.1

2337. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p21.3

2338. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p28.8

2339. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p32.1

2340. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p20.4

2341. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p12.5

2342. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-p8.2

2343. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.2

2344. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.11

2345. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p79.2

2346. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p27.1

2347. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p29.1

2348. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p27.3

2349. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p13.2

2350. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.10

2351. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p20.1

2352. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-p8.8

2353. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p44.3

2354. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p10.4

2355. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-p20.3

2356. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.12

2357. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.4

2358. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p23.10

2359. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p20.6

2360. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p10.1

2361. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p4.2

2362. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-p11.24

2363. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p53.4

2364. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-p3.5

2365. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-p2.2

2366. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.7

2367. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.3

2368. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p9.1

2369. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p15.8

2370. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-p19.2

2371. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p22.6

2372. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p21.2

2373. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.12

2374. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p3.1

2375. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p19.1

2376. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p135.11

2377. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-p3.4

2378. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-p2.3

2379. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.5

2380. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p27.5

2381. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p38.1

2382. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p15.1

2383. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.15

2384. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p4.3

2385. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p16.2

2386. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p37.6

2387. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-p8.4

2388. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-p5.1

2389. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p49.1

2390. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-p20.2

2391. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p18.2

2392. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p32.7

2393. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p23.3

2394. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-p13.1

2395. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p36.2

2396. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p19.2

2397. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-p4.4

2398. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p57.2

2399. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p10.5

2400. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p20.1

2401. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p32.2

2402. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-p29.1

2403. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p5.1

2404. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.18

2405. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p32.1

2406. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p27.1

2407. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p108.2

2408. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p108.1

2409. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p7.1

2410. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p48.3

2411. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p10.8

2412. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p10.2

2413. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p7.2

2414. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p44.2

2415. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.3

2416. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p9.4

2417. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p22.3

2418. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p16.12

2419. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p23.2

2420. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-p4.1

2421. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p29.1

2422. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p3.4

2423. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p4.4

2424. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p91.2

2425. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-p6.27

2426. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p7.3

2427. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-p33.4

2428. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-p9.1

2429. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.12

2430. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.7

2431. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.15

2432. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-p2.16

2433. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.16

2434. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p21.3

2435. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p21.2

2436. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-p21.1

2437. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p14.4

2438. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-p4.8

2439. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p9.5

2440. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.8

2441. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-p22.6

2442. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p23.3

2443. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p38.12

2444. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p16.6

2445. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-p33.2

2446. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p7.1

2447. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.13

2448. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-p18.1

2449. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.11

2450. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p57.2

2451. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-p9.2

2452. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p23.1

2453. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p13.1

2454. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p2.14

2455. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-p11.3

2456. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-p6.1

2457. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.12

2458. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-p15.2

2459. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.12

2460. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p16.1

2461. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.9

2462. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-p5.1

2463. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p23.1

2464. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.9

2465. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-p18.16

2466. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-p6.2

2467. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-p115.1

2468. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p20.2

2469. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-p21.1

2470. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p22.2

2471. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-p16.4

2472. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-p5.12

2473. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p39.4

2474. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p28.9

2475. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p60.2

2476. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-p60.3

2477. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-p20.2

2478. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-p40.2

2479. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p2.2

2480. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-p12.15

2481. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-p28.1

2482. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-p50.1

2483. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p25.3

2484. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-p50.1

2485. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-p21.2

2486. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-p7.1

2487. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#i-Page_i

2488. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#i-Page_ii

2489. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#i-Page_iii

2490. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_iv

2491. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_v

2492. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_vi

2493. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_vii

2494. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_viii

2495. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#ii-Page_3

2496. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-Page_4

2497. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.i-Page_5

2498. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_6

2499. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_7

2500. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_8

2501. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_9

2502. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_10

2503. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_11

2504. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_12

2505. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_13

2506. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_14

2507. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_15

2508. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_16

2509. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_17

2510. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_18

2511. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_19

2512. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_20

2513. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_21

2514. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_22

2515. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_23

2516. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_26

2517. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_25

2518. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_26_1

2519. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_27

2520. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_28

2521. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.ii-Page_29

2522. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_30

2523. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_31

2524. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_32

2525. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_33

2526. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_34

2527. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_35

2528. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iii-Page_36

2529. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-Page_38

2530. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-Page_39

2531. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-Page_40

2532. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.i.iv-Page_41

2533. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.i-Page_42

2534. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_43

2535. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_44

2536. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_45

2537. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_46

2538. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_47

2539. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_48

2540. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_49

2541. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_50

2542. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_51

2543. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_52

2544. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_53

2545. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_54

2546. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_55

2547. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_56

2548. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_57

2549. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_58

2550. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_59

2551. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_60

2552. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_61

2553. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_62

2554. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_63

2555. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_64

2556. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_65

2557. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_66

2558. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.ii-Page_67

2559. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_68

2560. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_69

2561. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_70

2562. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_71

2563. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_72

2564. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_73

2565. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_74

2566. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iii-Page_75

2567. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_76

2568. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_77

2569. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_78

2570. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_79

2571. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_80

2572. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_81

2573. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_82

2574. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_83

2575. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_84

2576. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_85

2577. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_86

2578. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_87

2579. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.iv-Page_88

2580. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-Page_89

2581. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-Page_90

2582. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-Page_91

2583. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-Page_92

2584. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.v-Page_93

2585. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-Page_94

2586. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vi-Page_95

2587. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_96

2588. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_97

2589. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_98

2590. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_99

2591. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_100

2592. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_101

2593. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_102

2594. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_103

2595. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.vii-Page_104

2596. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_105

2597. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_106

2598. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_107

2599. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_108

2600. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_109

2601. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_110

2602. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_111

2603. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_112

2604. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_113

2605. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.ii.viii-Page_114

2606. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-Page_115

2607. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-Page_116

2608. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-Page_117

2609. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.i-Page_118

2610. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_119

2611. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_120

2612. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_121

2613. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_122

2614. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_123

2615. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_124

2616. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_125

2617. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_126

2618. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_127

2619. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_128

2620. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_129

2621. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_130

2622. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_131

2623. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_132

2624. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_133

2625. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ii-Page_134

2626. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_135

2627. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_135_1

2628. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_137

2629. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_138

2630. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_139

2631. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_140

2632. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iii-Page_141

2633. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-Page_142

2634. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-Page_143

2635. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.iv-Page_144

2636. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_145

2637. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_146

2638. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_147

2639. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_148

2640. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_149

2641. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.v-Page_150

2642. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_151

2643. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_152

2644. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_153

2645. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_154

2646. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_155

2647. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_156

2648. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_157

2649. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_158

2650. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_159

2651. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_160

2652. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vi-Page_161

2653. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-Page_162

2654. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-Page_163

2655. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-Page_164

2656. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.vii-Page_165

2657. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_166

2658. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_167

2659. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_168

2660. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_169

2661. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_170

2662. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.viii-Page_171

2663. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_172

2664. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_173

2665. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_174

2666. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_175

2667. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_176

2668. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_177

2669. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_178

2670. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.ix-Page_179

2671. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_180

2672. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_181

2673. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_182

2674. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_183

2675. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_184

2676. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_185

2677. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_186

2678. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_187

2679. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_188

2680. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_189

2681. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_190

2682. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_191

2683. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_192

2684. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_193

2685. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_194

2686. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.x-Page_195

2687. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_196

2688. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_197

2689. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_198

2690. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_199

2691. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_200

2692. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_201

2693. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_202

2694. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_203

2695. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_204

2696. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_205

2697. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_206

2698. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_207

2699. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_208

2700. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_209

2701. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_210

2702. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_211

2703. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_212

2704. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iii.xi-Page_213

2705. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_214

2706. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_215

2707. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_216

2708. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_217

2709. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_218

2710. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_219

2711. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.i-Page_220

2712. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-Page_221

2713. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-Page_223

2714. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-Page_224

2715. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-Page_225

2716. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.ii-Page_226

2717. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-Page_227

2718. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-Page_228

2719. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-Page_229

2720. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-Page_230

2721. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iii-Page_231

2722. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_232

2723. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_233

2724. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_234

2725. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_235

2726. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_236

2727. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_237

2728. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.iv-Page_238

2729. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-Page_239

2730. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-Page_240

2731. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.v-Page_241

2732. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-Page_242

2733. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-Page_243

2734. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-Page_244

2735. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vi-Page_245

2736. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-Page_246

2737. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-Page_247

2738. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-Page_248

2739. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-Page_249

2740. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.vii-Page_250

2741. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_251

2742. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_252

2743. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_253

2744. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_264

2745. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_255

2746. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_256

2747. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_257

2748. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_258

2749. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.iv.viii-Page_259

2750. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_260

2751. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_261

2752. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_262

2753. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_263

2754. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_264

2755. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_265

2756. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_266

2757. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_267

2758. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_268

2759. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_269

2760. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_270

2761. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_271

2762. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.i-Page_272

2763. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-Page_273

2764. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-Page_274

2765. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ii-Page_275

2766. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-Page_276

2767. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iii-Page_277

2768. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-Page_278

2769. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-Page_279

2770. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-Page_280

2771. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.iv-Page_281

2772. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_282

2773. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_283

2774. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_284

2775. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_285

2776. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_286

2777. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_287

2778. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_288

2779. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_289

2780. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.v-Page_290

2781. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_291

2782. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_292

2783. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_293

2784. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_295

2785. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_296

2786. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_297

2787. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_298

2788. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_299

2789. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_300

2790. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_301

2791. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_302

2792. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_303

2793. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_304

2794. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vi-Page_305

2795. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_306

2796. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_307

2797. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_308

2798. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_309

2799. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_310

2800. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_311

2801. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_312

2802. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_313

2803. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_314

2804. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_315

2805. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_316

2806. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_317

2807. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_318

2808. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_319

2809. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_320

2810. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.vii-Page_321

2811. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_322

2812. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_323

2813. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_324

2814. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_325

2815. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_326

2816. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_327

2817. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_328

2818. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_329

2819. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_330

2820. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_331

2821. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_332

2822. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_333

2823. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_334

2824. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_335

2825. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_336

2826. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_337

2827. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_338

2828. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_339

2829. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_340

2830. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_341

2831. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_342

2832. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_343

2833. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_344

2834. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_345

2835. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_346

2836. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_347

2837. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.viii-Page_348

2838. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_349

2839. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_350

2840. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_351

2841. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_352

2842. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_353

2843. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_354

2844. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_355

2845. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_356

2846. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_357

2847. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_358

2848. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_359

2849. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_360

2850. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_361

2851. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.ix-Page_362

2852. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_363

2853. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_364

2854. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_365

2855. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_366

2856. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_367

2857. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.x-Page_368

2858. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_369

2859. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_370

2860. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_371

2861. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_372

2862. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_373

2863. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_374

2864. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_375

2865. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_376

2866. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_377

2867. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_378

2868. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_379

2869. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_380

2870. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_381

2871. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_382

2872. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_383

2873. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_384

2874. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_385

2875. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_386

2876. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_387

2877. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_388

2878. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_389

2879. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_390

2880. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_391

2881. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_392

2882. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_393

2883. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_394

2884. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_395

2885. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_396

2886. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_397

2887. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_398

2888. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_399

2889. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_400

2890. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_401

2891. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_402

2892. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_403

2893. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_404

2894. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_405

2895. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_406

2896. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_407

2897. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_408

2898. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_409

2899. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_410

2900. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_411

2901. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_412

2902. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_413

2903. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_414

2904. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_415

2905. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_416

2906. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_417

2907. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_418

2908. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_419

2909. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_420

2910. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xi-Page_421

2911. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_422

2912. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_423

2913. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_424

2914. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_425

2915. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_426

2916. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_427

2917. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_428

2918. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_429

2919. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_430

2920. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_431

2921. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_432

2922. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_433

2923. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_434

2924. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_435

2925. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_436

2926. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xii-Page_437

2927. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_438

2928. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_439

2929. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_440

2930. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_441

2931. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_442

2932. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_443

2933. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_444

2934. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_445

2935. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_446

2936. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_447

2937. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_448

2938. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_449

2939. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_450

2940. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_451

2941. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_452

2942. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_453

2943. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_454

2944. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_455

2945. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_456

2946. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_457

2947. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_458

2948. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_459

2949. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_460

2950. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_461

2951. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_462

2952. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiii-Page_463

2953. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-Page_464

2954. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-Page_465

2955. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.v.xiv-Page_466

2956. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_467

2957. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_468

2958. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_469

2959. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_470

2960. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_471

2961. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_472

2962. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_473

2963. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_474

2964. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_475

2965. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_476

2966. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_477

2967. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_478

2968. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_479

2969. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_480

2970. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_481

2971. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_482

2972. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_483

2973. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_484

2974. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.i-Page_485

2975. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_486

2976. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_487

2977. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_488

2978. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_489

2979. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_490

2980. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_491

2981. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ii-Page_492

2982. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_493

2983. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_494

2984. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_495

2985. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_496

2986. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_497

2987. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iii-Page_498

2988. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_499

2989. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_500

2990. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_501

2991. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_502

2992. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_503

2993. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_504

2994. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_505

2995. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_506

2996. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_507

2997. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_508

2998. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_509

2999. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_510

3000. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_511

3001. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_512

3002. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_513

3003. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_514

3004. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_515

3005. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.iv-Page_516

3006. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_517

3007. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_518

3008. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_519

3009. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_520

3010. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_521

3011. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_522

3012. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.v-Page_523

3013. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vi-Page_524

3014. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vi-Page_525

3015. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vi-Page_526

3016. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_527

3017. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_528

3018. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_529

3019. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_530

3020. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_531

3021. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_532

3022. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_533

3023. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_534

3024. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_535

3025. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_536

3026. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_537

3027. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_538

3028. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.vii-Page_539

3029. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.viii-Page_540

3030. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_541

3031. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_542

3032. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_543

3033. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_544

3034. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_545

3035. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.ix-Page_546

3036. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_547

3037. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_548

3038. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_549

3039. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_550

3040. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_551

3041. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_552

3042. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_553

3043. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_554

3044. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_555

3045. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_556

3046. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_557

3047. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.x-Page_558

3048. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_559

3049. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_560

3050. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_561

3051. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_562

3052. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_563

3053. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_564

3054. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_565

3055. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_566

3056. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_567

3057. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_568

3058. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_569

3059. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_570

3060. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_571

3061. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_572

3062. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_573

3063. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_574

3064. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_575

3065. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_576

3066. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_577

3067. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_578

3068. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xi-Page_579

3069. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_580

3070. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_581

3071. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_582

3072. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_583

3073. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_584

3074. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_585

3075. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_586

3076. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_587

3077. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_588

3078. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_589

3079. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_590

3080. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_591

3081. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_592

3082. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_593

3083. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_594

3084. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_595

3085. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_596

3086. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_597

3087. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_598

3088. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_599

3089. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_600

3090. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_601

3091. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_602

3092. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_603

3093. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xii-Page_604

3094. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-Page_605

3095. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-Page_606

3096. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-Page_607

3097. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-Page_608

3098. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiii-Page_609

3099. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-Page_610

3100. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xiv-Page_611

3101. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_612

3102. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_613

3103. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_614

3104. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_615

3105. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_616

3106. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_617

3107. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_618

3108. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_619

3109. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_620

3110. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_621

3111. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_622

3112. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_623

3113. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_624

3114. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_625

3115. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xv-Page_626

3116. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_627

3117. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_628

3118. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_629

3119. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_630

3120. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_631

3121. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_632

3122. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_633

3123. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_634

3124. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_635

3125. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_636

3126. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_637

3127. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_638

3128. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_639

3129. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_640

3130. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_641

3131. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_642

3132. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_643

3133. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_644

3134. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_645

3135. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_646

3136. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_647

3137. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_648

3138. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_649

3139. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvi-Page_650

3140. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_651

3141. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_652

3142. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_653

3143. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_654

3144. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_655

3145. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_656

3146. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_657

3147. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_658

3148. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_659

3149. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_660

3150. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xvii-Page_661

3151. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_662

3152. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_663

3153. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_664

3154. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_665

3155. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_666

3156. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_667

3157. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_668

3158. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_669

3159. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_670

3160. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_671

3161. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_672

3162. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_673

3163. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_674

3164. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_675

3165. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_676

3166. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xviii-Page_677

3167. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_678

3168. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_679

3169. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_680

3170. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_681

3171. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_682

3172. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_683

3173. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_684

3174. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_685

3175. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_686

3176. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_687

3177. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_688

3178. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_689

3179. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_690

3180. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_691

3181. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xix-Page_692

3182. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_693

3183. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_694

3184. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_695

3185. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_696

3186. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_697

3187. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_698

3188. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_699

3189. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_700

3190. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_701

3191. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_702

3192. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_703

3193. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_704

3194. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_705

3195. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_706

3196. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_707

3197. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_708

3198. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_709

3199. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_710

3200. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iii.vi.xx-Page_711

3201. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv-Page_712

3202. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv-Page_713

3203. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_714

3204. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_715

3205. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_716

3206. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_717

3207. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_718

3208. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_719

3209. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_720

3210. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_721

3211. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_722

3212. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_723

3213. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_724

3214. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_725

3215. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_726

3216. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_727

3217. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_728

3218. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_729

3219. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.i-Page_730

3220. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.ii-Page_731

3221. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.ii-Page_732

3222. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.ii-Page_733

3223. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_734

3224. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_735

3225. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_736

3226. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_737

3227. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_738

3228. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_739

3229. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_740

3230. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_741

3231. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_742

3232. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iii-Page_743

3233. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_744

3234. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_745

3235. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_746

3236. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_747

3237. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_748

3238. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_749

3239. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_750

3240. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_751

3241. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_752

3242. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_753

3243. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_754

3244. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_755

3245. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_756

3246. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_757

3247. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_758

3248. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_759

3249. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_760

3250. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_761

3251. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_762

3252. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_763

3253. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_764

3254. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_765

3255. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_766

3256. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_767

3257. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_768

3258. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_769

3259. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_770

3260. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.i.iv-Page_771

3261. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_772

3262. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_773

3263. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_774

3264. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_775

3265. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_776

3266. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_777

3267. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_778

3268. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_779

3269. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_780

3270. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_781

3271. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_782

3272. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_783

3273. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_784

3274. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.i-Page_785

3275. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.ii-Page_786

3276. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.ii-Page_787

3277. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.ii-Page_788

3278. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.ii-Page_789

3279. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.ii.ii-Page_771

3280. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.i-Page_791

3281. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.i-Page_792

3282. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_793

3283. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_794

3284. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_795

3285. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_796

3286. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_797

3287. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_798

3288. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_799

3289. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iii-Page_800

3290. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-Page_801

3291. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-Page_802

3292. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-Page_803

3293. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-Page_804

3294. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.iv-Page_805

3295. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_806

3296. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_807

3297. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_808

3298. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_809

3299. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_810

3300. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_811

3301. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.v-Page_812

3302. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_813

3303. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_814

3304. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_815

3305. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_816

3306. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_817

3307. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_818

3308. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_819

3309. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_820

3310. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_821

3311. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_822

3312. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_823

3313. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_824

3314. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_825

3315. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_826

3316. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_827

3317. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_828

3318. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_829

3319. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_830

3320. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_831

3321. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_832

3322. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_833

3323. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_834

3324. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_835

3325. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_836

3326. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iii.vi-Page_837

3327. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_838

3328. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_839

3329. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_840

3330. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_841

3331. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_642

3332. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_843

3333. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.i-Page_844

3334. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_845

3335. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_846

3336. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_847

3337. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_848

3338. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_849

3339. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_850

3340. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.ii-Page_851

3341. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-Page_862

3342. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-Page_853

3343. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-Page_854

3344. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iii-Page_855

3345. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_856

3346. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_857

3347. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_858

3348. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_859

3349. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_860

3350. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.iv-Page_861

3351. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_862

3352. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_863

3353. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_864

3354. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_865

3355. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_866

3356. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_867

3357. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.v-Page_868

3358. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_869

3359. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_870

3360. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_871

3361. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_872

3362. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_873

3363. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_874

3364. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_875

3365. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_876

3366. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_877

3367. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_878

3368. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_879

3369. file:///ccel/h/hodge/theology3/cache/theology3.html3#iv.iv.vi-Page_880

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