CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY BY HENRY ORTON WILEY (3 VOLUMES)

by Henry Orton Wiley

A three-volume systematic theology prepared for the Church of the Nazarene's course of study for licensed ministers. Wiley provides a comprehensive treatment of Christian doctrine from an Arminian-Wesleyan holiness perspective.

39 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00.4. Preface
2. 00.5. Introduction
3. 00.6. Chapter 1 - THE IDEA AND RELATIONS OF THEOLOGY
4. 01. Chapter 2 - THE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY
5. 02. Chapter 3 - SYSTEMS AND METHODS
6. 03. Chapter 4 - THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH
7. 04. Chapter 5 - THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION
8. 05. Chapter 6 - THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION
9. 06. Chapter 7 - THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE
10. 07. Chapter 8 - THE CANON
11. 08. Chapter 9 - THE EXISTENCE AND NATURE OF GOD
12. 09. Chapter 10 - THE DIVINE NAMES AND PREDICATES
13. 10. Chapter 11 - GOD AS ABSOLUTE REALITY
14. 11. Chapter 12 - GOD AS INFINITE EFFICIENCY
15. 12. Chapter 13 - GOD AS PERFECT PERSONALITY
16. 13. Chapter 14 - THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD
17. 14. Chapter 15 - THE TRINITY
18. 15. Chapter 16 – COSMOLOGY
19. 16. Chapter 17 – ANTHROPOLOGY
20. 17. Chapter 18 – HAMARTIOLOGY
21. 18. Chapter 19 - ORIGINAL SIN OR INHERITED DEPRAVITY
22. 19. Chapter 20 – CHRISTOLOGY
23. 20. Chapter 21 - THE PERSON OF CHRIST
24. 21. Chapter 22 - THE ESTATES AND OFFICES OF CHRIST
25. 22. Chapter 23 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS BIBLICAL BASIS AND HISTORY
26. 23. Chapter 24 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS NATURE AND EXTENT
27. 24. Chapter 25 - THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
28. 25. Chapter 26 - THE PRELIMINARY STATES OF GRACE
29. 26. Chapter 27 - CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS
30. 27. Chapter 28 - CHRISTIAN SONSHIP
31. 28. Chapter 29 - CHRISTIAN PERFECTION OR ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION
32. 29. Chapter 30 - CHRISTIAN ETHICS OR THE LIFE OF HOLINESS
33. 30. Chapter 31 - THE CHURCH: ITS ORGANIZATION AND MINISTRY
34. 31. Chapter 32 - THE CHURCH: ITS WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS
35. 32. Chapter 33 - ESCHATOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF LAST THINGS
36. 33. Chapter 34 - THE SECOND ADVENT
37. 34. Chapter 35 - THE RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT
38. 35. Chapter 36 - THE FINAL CONSUMMATION
39. 36. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

00.4. Preface

Preface

Nearly twenty years ago I was asked by the Department of Education of the Church of the Nazarene, of which Dr. J. B. Chapman was then chairman, to prepare a work on Systematic Theology for use in the Course of Study for Licensed Ministers. I immediately set myself to the task but my range of vision was too narrow. I was constantly discovering new truth and each new discovery demanded a place in the plan of the work. Now after nearly twenty years of constant study and teaching, I am presenting to the church the result of these efforts in a work entitled Christian Theology. It is offered with a prayer that it may find at least some small place in the preparation of young men and women who look forward to the work of the ministry. I have no thought of attempting any new contribution to modern theological science. My purpose and aim has been to review the field of theology in as simple a manner as possible for the use of those who, entering the ministry, desire to be informed concerning the great doctrines of the church

I wish to acknowledge my obligation to the Rev. Paul Hill. of Lynbrook, New York, who has collaborated with me in the preparation of this work and who has made many helpful suggestions and criticisms. To the General Superintendents of the church, Dr. John W. Goodwin, Dr. R. T. Williams and Dr. James B. Chapman; I owe a special debt of gratitude for their constant help and inspiration during the heavy years of preparation. To Dr. Chapman especially I am indebted for the Introduction to this work. Dr. Olive M. Winchester has reviewed the references to the Hebrew and Greek texts, and Dr. L. A. Reed has furnished the parallel between the Genesis Account of Creation and Modern Science. To all the above I express my sincere appreciation for the help given to me The various publishers have extended me the privilege of making certain quotations from their books, and for this I am deeply grateful. I acknowledge my debt to the following: to Funk and Wagnalls for permission to use a quotationfrom The Institutes of the Christian Religionby Gerhart; to the Pilgrim Press for a selection from their book,Christ and the Eternal Orderby my former honored professor, John Wright Buckham; to the Cokesbury Press for permission to quote from their work onSystematic Theologyby Dr. Summers; to the Methodist Book Concern for selections fromSystematic Theologyby Dr. Miley,System of Christian Doctrineby Dr. Sheldon,and Foundations of the Christian Faithby Dr. Rishell; to Scribners for references toPresent Day Theologyby Dr. Stearns, andAn Outline of Theologyby Dr. William Newton Clarke; to Longmans for a reference to their work entitledA Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articlesby Dr. Bicknell, and to any others not mentioned above whose works have furnished me inspiration and help in the preparation of this work

It is to the Nazarene Publishing House that I am specially indebted for the publication of this work now presented to the church. The Manager, Mr. M. Lunn, and the Assistant Manager, Rev.p. H. Lunn, have given the writer every encouragement and been patient with his many shortcomings. Both the writer and the church are indebted to the publishers for the splendid form in which the book is presented

I would indeed be ungrateful if in this, the publication of my first work, I did not pay rich tribute to her who for the entire period has had an unflagging interest in the preparation of this work, and has ever been a constant stimulus and blessing, my wife, Alice M. Wiley

H. ORTON WILEY, Pasadena, California

Chapter 2

00.5. Introduction

Introduction As far back as 1919 those of us who were serving on the General Department of Education in the Church of the Nazarene felt keenly the need of a work on systematic theology of sufficient scope and thoroughness that it might serve as a standard of doctrine in connection with the development of the literature of our church and movement, and we asked Dr. H. Orton Wiley to undertake to produce such a work. Pressed by many duties as college president, and for a time as editor of theHerald of Holiness, Dr. Wiley was unable to give the thought and attention to this subject that was necessary for its speedy completion. Sometimes we felt that he did not make sufficient progress with the task to furnish ground for hope that he would live to complete it. But this delay was useful, for during all this time Dr. Wiley has been gathering material, rearranging his own thought and growing in courage for the stupendous task set before him. And now within recent months he has found it possible to devote more time and thought to the direct task, and he has been able to do better work than otherwise would have been possible. So we are the gainers for waiting

I am glad to be counted among those who have encouraged Dr. Wiley from the beginning. I have never missed an opportunity to urge him to pursue his task of writing the standard theology for our church, even though he must do it at the expense of neglecting other duties. For I have felt that he would through this channel make the greatest and most lasting contribution of his life. And just now as he is ready to hand over the first volume to the publishers, having myself made a careful examination of it, I am more convinced than ever that he has done a work that few men of this generation are prepared to do, and that he has given us a theology so fundamental and so dependable for scholarship that it will stand as standard with us for many years to come

Dr. Wiley is a scholar, but he is more than a scholar. He is an unctuous preacher, and an administrator. He has been compelled to try out his theories in the school of life and to test his claims in the furnace of trial and affliction. He is not a speculator nor an inventor. He is at most a discoverer and a judge of sound words. For the space of an average generation he has been before us as a Christian and a leader, and he has everywhere and all the time deserved and received the full commendation of his contemporaries and intimate coadjutors. He is a man of good report among all who know him intimately or distantly. It is a joy to commend him because it is certain none will arise to contradict

It is not expected that one writing a foreword should enter into an analysis of a book. Especially is this the case when the book is one demanding so much of study and thought as this monumental work which you now have in hand. But you will find the scope adequate, the theses orthodox, the arguments convincing, and the conclusions clear and unequivocal. I really do not see how more could be done with the subject of systematic theology than Dr. Wiley has done This work will find its place as a textbook in our schools and in the course of study for ministers. This will probably be its two largest fields. But its style brings it within the scope of the Sunday school worker and layman of the church, and many who are not in the official callings of the church will find pleasure

and profit in the study of the great doctrines which lie at the base of our holy religion. I believe the demand for such material is sufficiently great that Dr. Wiley's theology will find a wide field among spontaneous students, as well as among those who must take it in connection with technical preparation for given tasks

Without the slightest reservation, and with the fullest satisfaction, I commend Dr. Wiley and his work on Systematic Theology to all men everywhere to whom such commendation from me can carry meaning. And my prayer is that God may continue to bless the author and publishers, and that the leaves of this book may serve for healing, even as leaves from the tree of life JAMES B. CHAPMAN, General Superintendent, Church of the Nazarene.Kansas City, Missouri, April 6, 1940

00.6. Chapter 1 - THE IDEA AND RELATIONS OF THEOLOGY

Chapter 1 - THE IDEA AND RELATIONS OF THEOLOGY The term "Introduction," when used in a technical sense, is one of extensive application. Every branch of scientific knowledge must be preceded by a preliminary survey, in order to properly determine its boundaries and contents in relation to other fields of investigation. There must be a "recognition of the organic whole of the sciences," says Schelling, and this "must precede the definite pursuit of a specialty. The scholar who devotes himself to a particular study must become acquainted with the position it occupies with respect to this whole, and the particular spirit which pervades it, as well as the mode of development by which it enters into the harmonious union of the whole. Hence the importance of the method by which he is himself to estimate his science, in order that he may not regard it in a slavish spirit, but independently and in the spirit of the whole." The term "Introduction" has in modern times largely superseded the terms "Prolegomena" and "Propaedeutic" formerly used in philosophy and theology. The terms "Encyclopedia" and "Methodology" which were frequently used in the sense of a distinct science, must still be considered an important part of the general curriculum. A true "Introduction," however, must embrace (1) formal or systematic Encyc1opedia - or a presentation of the information necessary to a study of the several departments of theology; (2) Methodology - or directions as to the best methods of theological study; and to these must be added (3) a History of Theology as systematized in the church. The present chapter (I) will deal with the Idea and Relations of Theology, while the three following chapters will be devoted to (II) Sources and Limitations; (III) Systems and Methods; and (IV) Theology in the Church THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THEOLOGY

Christian Theology, or Dogmatics as the term is often used technically, is that branch of theological science which aims to set forth in a systematic manner the doctrines of the Christian faith. The term theology is derived from the Greek wordstheos(qeoV) andlogos(logoV), and originally signified a discourse about God. The word was in use before the advent of Christ and the development of the Christian Church. Aristotle in hisOrganonapplied the term theology to his highest or first philosophy. The Greeks were accustomed to applying the termtheologoito their honored poets and teachers, such as Homer, Hesiod and Orpheus, "who with poetic inspiration sang of the gods and divine things." In its most general sense, therefore, the term theology may be applied to the scientific investigation of real or supposed sacred persons, things or relations. However crude the content of these treatises may be, usage allows it to be called theology if the subject matter is concerned with that which is regarded as sacred. The term is therefore elastic and somewhat vague, and must be made more definite and specific by the use of qualifying terms as Christian or Ethnic theology

Definitions of Christian Theology. Christian theology has been defined in various ways by the masters of this science. Perhaps none of these definitions, however, exceeds in adequacy or comprehensiveness that of William Burton Pope who defines it as "the science of God and divine things, based upon the revelation made to mankind in Jesus Christ, and variously systematized within the Christian Church." Others define it as follows: "Christian Theology, or Dogmatics, as it is

technically called, is that branch of theological science which aims to give systematic expression to the doctrines of the Christian faith."-WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN. "Dogmatic Theology treats of the doctrines of the Christian faith held by a community of believers, in other words, by the church."-BISHOP MARTENSEN. "Theology is the exhibition of the facts of Scripture in their proper order and relation with the principles or general truths involved in the facts themselves, and which pervade and harmonize the whole."-DR. CHARLES HODGE. "Theology is the science of God and the relations between God and the universe. "-DR. AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG. "Systematic Theology is that part of the entire system of theology which has to solve the problem presented by the Christian faith itself-the exhibition of Christianity as truth."-DR. J. A. DORNER. "Christian Theology is the intellectual treatment of the Christian religion." WILLIAM NEWTON CLARKE. "Theology is a discourse about God as related to moral beings and His created universe. "-DR. A. M. HILLS. "Theology may be defined as the systematic exposition and rational justification of the intellectual content of religion."-DEAN ALBERT C. KNUDSEN. "Dogmatics deals with the doctrinal teachings of the Christian religion. It is the systematic and scientific presentation of the doctrine of Christianity in harmony with the Scriptures and in consonance with the confessions of the church."-DR. JOSEPH STUMP. "Systematic Theology is the scientific and connected presentation of Christian doctrine in its relation to both faith and morals."-GEORGE R. CROOKS and JOHN F. HURST

Dr. Wakefield, who edited "Watson’s Institutes" and added some valuable material of his own, defines theology as "that science which treats of the existence, the character, and the attributes of God; His laws and government; the doctrines which we are to believe, the moral change which we must experience, and the duties which we are required to perform." Closely related to this and to the definition of Dr. Pope, is that of Dr. Alvah Hovey, the great Baptist theologian. "By Christian theology," he says, "is meant the science of the Christian religion, or the science which ascertains, justifies, and systematizes all attainable truth concerning God and His relation, through Jesus Christ, to the universe and especially to mankind."

We may gather up therefore the various phases of truth as set forth in the above definitions and summarize them in a brief but we think equally adequate definition as follows: "Christian Theology is the systematic presentation of the doctrines of the Christian Faith." The Scope of Theology. The study of Christian Theology must be expanded to comprehend a wide range of investigation, and then systematized according to principles regarded as dominant in the history of Christian thought. If the definition of Dr. Pope be carefully analyzed, and likewise that of Wakefield and Hovey, it will be found that the following subjects are given consideration:First,God as the source, subject, and end of all theology. "This gives it its unity, dignity and sanctity. It is theA Deo, De Deo, In Deum: from God in its origin, concerning God in its substance, and it leads to God in all its issues."Second,Religion as furnishing the basic consciousness in man, without which there could be no capacity in human nature to receive the spiritual revelations of divine truth.Third,Revelation as the source of the facts out of which systematic theology is constructed.Fourth,the relation of these facts to Jesus Christ, the Personal and Eternal Word in the revelation of God.Fifth,the development and systematization of theology in the Church as the expression of its Christian life, under the immediate supervision and control of the Holy Spirit.Sixth,Christian Theology must be considered in its relation to contemporaneous thought THE RELATIONS OF THEOLOGY

"There is a sense," says Dr. Pope, "in which universal theology is concerned simply with the relation of all things to God: if we carefully guard our meaning we may make this proposition include the converse, the relation of God to all things. Relation, of course, must be mutual: but it is hard in this matter to detach from the notion of relation that of dependence. The Eternal One is the Unconditioned Being. When we study Hisnature and perfections and works we must always remember that He is His Perfect Self independent of every created object and independent of every thought concerning Him. But there is not a doctrine, nor is there a branch or development of any doctrine, which is not purely the expression of some relation of His creatures to the Supreme First Cause. Hence every branch of this science is sacred. It is a temple which is filled with the presence of God. From its hidden sanctuary, into which no high priest taken from among men can enter, issues a light which leaves no part dark save where it is dark with excess of glory. Therefore all fit students are worshipers as well as students" (Pope,CCT, I, pp. 4-5). But aside from the divine Source of theology, there are three outstanding and vital relations which it sustains:First,to religion;Second,to revelation andThird,to the church

Theology and Religion. Since theology in a preliminary and general sense is the science of religion, it is therefore necessary to come immediately to a discussion of the nature of religion. It may be said that religion furnishes the basic consciousness in man without which there could be no capacity in human nature to receive the revelation of God. It has its roots, therefore, in the very nature of man. It is the consciousness that he is made for higher things, and that he has kinship to the unseen Power upon which he feels himself dependent. Added to this is a sense of need which expresses itself negatively in a consciousness of sin, and positively in a desire for communion with a higher spiritual power. It is the province of theology to gather up and systematize these needs and desires, for religion is not merely an individual but also a social phenomenon. Those who are brought into communion with God feel that they must impart this knowledge to others, and thus arise the various religious societies. These crystallize into fixed institutions with a body of tradition designed to hand down to posterity the religious insights of the past. Theology and religion are related, therefore, "as effects in different spheres, of the same cause. As theology isan effect produced in the sphere of systematic thought by the facts respecting God and the universe, so religion is an effect which these same facts produce in the sphere of individual and collective life" (Strong,Syst. Th., I, p. 19)

Theology and Revelation. Theology bears relation not only to religious experience in a general way, but also to that higher type of revealed truth which is found in Christ and known as the Christian Revelation. Since the time of Schleiermacher, feeling or the sense of dependence has been given a large place in theological thought. There are those who fear too great subjectivity if theology is to be grounded in Christian experience, but it should ever be borne in mind that the Christian faith is not something which is self-created. It has its source in objective revelation. The universe is an external revelation of God. It declares Hiseternal powerand Godhead(Romans 1:20). Over against the position of James Martineau who unwarrantably isolates the witness of God to the individual soul, Dr. Strong insists that in many cases where truth has been originally communicated as an internal revelation, the same Spirit who communicated it has brought about an external record of it, so that the internal revelation might be handed down to others than those who first received it. Both the internal revelations as recorded, and the external revelations as interpreted, furnish objective facts which may serve as proper material for science.

The whole creation reveals the Word. In nature God shows His power; in incarnation His grace and truth. Scripture testifies of these, but Scripture is not the essential Word. The Scripture is truly apprehended and appropriated when in it and through it we see the living and present Christ It does not bind men to itself alone, but it points them to the Christ of whom it testifies. Christ is the authority. In the Scriptures He points us to Himself and demands our faith in Him. This faith once begotten, leads us to a new appropriation of Scripture, but also to a new criticism of Scripture. We find Christ more and more in Scripture, and yet we judge Scripture more and more by the standard which we find in Christ. -DORNER,Hist. Prot. Theology1: 231-264.

Theology and the Church. It is to the Church that God has committed the Scriptures and these have become its Rule of Faith and Practice. As the early oracle had its ark, so the Christian Church has become the receptacle of the faith which was "once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). With the coming of the incarnate Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the foundations of the Church were laid; and with the enlargement of its mission to include mankind universally, it was necessary, also, that the divine oracles be likewise increased. Becoming the repository of a new dispensational truth, the Church was under obligation from the beginning, both as a teacher and a defender of the faith, to create a theology, by means of which it could systematically present its teachings. This didactic divinity, Dr. Pope insists, was the necessary expansion of what in Scripture is termedthe Apostles' doctrine. "Its first and simplest form as seen in the writings of the earliest Fathers, wasExpositoryor practical, aiming at the edification of the flock; then followed theCatechetical, for the preliminary instruction of converts or Catechumens in order to baptism, conducted by pastors as Catechists, and formulated in the permanent Catechism; and thus were laid the foundations of all subsequent biblical theology proper. Defensive assertion of truth was rendered necessary by heresies arising within the community, and by the duty of vindicating the Faith against those without. The latter obligation gave rise toApologeticsin all its branches, called in modern timesEvidences: Apology having reference rather to the position of the Christian society as challenged by the world, Evidences belonging rather to its aggressive missionary character. The former introducedDogmatic Theology, taught first in the Creeds - the Apostles', the Nicene-Constantinopolitan, and the Athanasian; afterward in specific expositions of those creeds, and their individual articles; this as distinguished from Apologetic, is controversial divinity orPolemics. In later times, all these branches have been incorporated into the unity of what is called Systematic divinity, or the orderly arrangement of the doctrines of revelation, as they are Dogmas fixed in the decisions of the Church, defended against external assaults, and unfolded in the ethics of human duty. This is the normal developmentof the science within Christendom and common to all its branches. Every Christian community presents in its own literature more or less systematically all these various forms of fundamental teaching" (Pope,CCT, I, pp. 15-16). We have given only in brief outline the manner in which theology was developed in the Church DIVISIONSOFTHEOLOGY The whole field of theology may be broadly divided into (I) Christian Theology, and (II) Ethnic Theology. By Ethnic Theology is meant the teachings embraced in the non-Christian religions as opposed to the revelation of God in Christ. Non-Christian people, whether crude or cultured, have their doctrines of God or of the gods, and of things which they regard as sacred. These must be classified as theologies. To Christians, the value of this ethnic theology is chiefly illustrative, setting forth as it does the outstanding and fundamental differences between Christianity and paganism. By this contrast, Christianity is seen to be, not merely a religion which has attained to a higher scale in natural development, but one

which is unique in that it is a revelation from God to man, rather than an origination of man in his state of barbarism. It does, however, have this exegetical value, for the great doctrines of Christianity will be seen in a clearer light when placed side by side with the deformities of heathenism

Another division, more popular with the older theologians than at the present time, is that of (I) Natural Theology, and (II) Revealed Theology. Natural Theology draws its sources from the facts of nature including the exercise of reason and the illumination of conscience. Revealed Theology finds its sources in the Holy Scriptures as the authoritative revelation of God to man. Christian Theology does not regard Revealed Theology as in opposition to Natural Theology but supplementary to it. It regards it as gathering up the primary revelation of God through nature and the constitution of man, into the higher and perfect personal revelation of God in Christ

Christian Theology as a didactic or positive science is usually made to conform to the four main divisions of Biblical (or Exegetical), Historical, Systematic and Practical Theology. This fourfold division was generally followed by the earlier encyclopaedists, Neosselt, Thym, Staudlin, Schmidt, and Planck. Rabiger and Hagenbach followed the fourfold outline of Schaff-perhaps the arrangement now most commonly employed. Among the more modern theologians, Miley, Pope, Strong, Brown and Clarke follow the fourfold division. There are some of the more prominent theologians, however, who prefer different arrangements. Schleiermacher arranged his material in three divisions, (I) Philosophical; (II) Historical; and (III) Practical-"the root, the trunk, and the crown." Another has a fivefold division, (I) Exegetical; (II) Historical; (III) Apologetic; (IV) Systematic; and (V) Practical. Cave in hisIntroduction to Theology

The arrangement of subjects under the fourfold division which is most commonly followed is that proposed by Schaff in his Theological Propaedeutic. (I) Exegetical Theology, including (1) Biblical Philology; (2) Biblical Archaeology; (3) Biblical Isagogic, or Historico-Critical introduction which includes both the lower or textual criticism and the higher or historical criticism; (4) Biblical Hermeneutics. (II) Historical Theology, including Biblical and Ecclesiastical history in the widest sense. (III) Systematic Theology including (1) Apologetics; (2) Biblical Theology; (3) Dogmatic Theology; (4) Symbolics, Polemics, and Irenics; (5) Ethics, Ecclesiastical Geography and Statistics. (IV) Practical Theology including (1) Theory of the Christian Ministry; (2) Church Law and Church Polity; (3) Liturgics; (4) Homiletics; (5) Catechetics; (6) Poimenics; and (7) Evangelistics

Crooks and Hurst in theirTheological Encyclopedia and Methodologyhave the following arrangement of subjects: (I) Exegetical Theology, including Archaeology, Philology, Isagogics, Canonics, Criticism, Hermeneutics and interpretation; (II) Historical Theology, including History of Dogma, Church History, Patristics, Symbolics, and Statistics; (III) Systematic Theology, including Doctrine, Dogmatics, Apologetics, Polemics, Irenics, Theology (in the narrower sense of the term), Anthropology, Christology, Soteriology, Eschatology and Ethics; (IV) Practical Theology, including Catechetics, Liturgics, Homiletics, and Pastoral Theology.

historical studies during the middle and latter part of the nineteenth century, an attempt was made to place Historical Theology in advance of the Biblical or Exegetical Theology as formerly accepted. Kienlen and Pelt adapted a threefold division into (I) Historical Theology, including exegetical; (II) Systematic Theology and (III) Practical Theology. Against this, two main objections

may be urged:First,since Christian Theology draws its sources largely from the Scriptures as revealed truth, its beginnings should coincide with that fact, and therefore be found in a thorough and systematic study of the documents in which this revelation is recorded. This is Exegetical Theology. Protestant Theology which is based so emphatically upon the Bible as the Word of God, cannot but establish Exegetical Theology as a separate and distinct division, assigning to the Scriptures a sufficient and unrestricted position in the realm of theological thought. Without this, theology may become philosophical and barren, never biblical and vital.Second,we must bear in mind that there is one law of development which is peculiar to the Scriptures - the law of progressive revelation, and closely allied to it another law which governs the systematization of the truths revealed. Exegetical Theology must take into account this historical progression, and the recorded events of sacred history, therefore, become the basis for the interpretation of all history. The logical arrangement of the revealed truths set forth in sacred history gives us Biblical Theology. Thus there is given us by

The arrangement of the fourfold division indicated above may be also justified in the following manner: "The assertion is warranted that all knowledge is based either on personal (physical or mental) observation, or on report and tradition, and is, therefore, either theoretical (philosophical) or historical in its nature. Historical knowledge however, must be obtained by investigation, and for the latter acquaintance with languages and philological criticism is necessary; while theoretical knowledge leads to its practical application. In like manner Christianity is, in its positive character, both a history and a doctrine; but its history is based on the Bible, which must, first of all, be exegetically examined; and its doctrine is not pure knowledge but practical. The truth of revelation is to be applied in the Church and the various departments of Church activity, to which practical theology has regard. The two departments of learning are thus confined between two fields of applied art, the exegetical at the beginning, and the practical at the end. - CROOKS AND HURST,Encyclopedia and Methodology, p. 139.

this process a clear idea of the connection which, beginning in Exegetical Theology, traces the progress of historical development down to our own times by means of Historical Theology, combines the truths thus given into a mental picture of orderly arrangement as found in Systematic Theology, and from this makes the necessary deductions which Practical Theology offers for converting theory into practice. Christian Theology, therefore, becomes an Organism of Truth. In our further discussion of the forms of theology we shall observe this fourfold division as indicated. The arrangement of subjects is set forth more fully in the accompanying diagram. (See page 24.)
EXEGETICALTHEOLOGY

Exegetical Theology, or as it is frequently called, Biblical Theology, is a study of the contents of Scripture, exegetically ascertained and classified according to doctrines. Among the Greeks, the term "exegete" referred to one whose office it was to lead out or interpret the oracles to laymen with a view to producing sympathetic understanding. Exegetical Theology covers an extensive field of interpretation, dealing with both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures, and is commonly arranged in two main divisions, (I) Biblical Introduction, and (II) Biblical Exegesis or Interpretation

1.Biblical Introduction. This department includes all the preliminary studies which are introductory to the actual work of exegesis. The older term used to designate this department was Isagogics,

and included four branches of study, (a) Biblical Archaeology, an auxiliary study of the manners and customs of ancient people; (b) Biblical Canonics, or a discussion of the canon of Scripture as understood by the ancient Jews, the early Christians, the Roman and the Protestant churches; (c) Biblical Criticism, including the lower or textual criticism, with a view to ascertaining the correct reading of the text; and the higher criticism, too often confused with destructive criticism, which deals with the authorship, date and authenticity of the books of the Bible, the circumstances under which they were written, their occasion and design; and (d) Biblical Hermeneutics, or the science of the laws and principles underlying correct interpretation THEOLOGICALCHART

THEOLOGY IN

GENERAL

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

I. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

Introduction

Exegesis

Archaeology

Philology

Isagogics

Canonics

Hermeneutics

II. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Sacred

Ecclesiatical

Biblical History Biblical Dogmatics

Church History

Patristics

Symbolics

III. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Apologetics

Dogmatics

Irenics

Polemics

Ethics

Theology

Cosmology

Anthropology

Hamartiology

Christology

Soteriology

Eschatology

Ecclesiology Moral Philosophy

Moral Theology

Casuistry

Ascetics

IV. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

Catechetics

Liturgics

Canonics

Homiletics

Evangelistics Pastoral Theology

ETHNIC THEOLOGY

History of Religions Comparative Religions

Brahmanism

Buddhism

Confucianism

Taoism

Shintoism

Zoroastrianism

Mohammedanism Barbarian Religions Extinct Religions

2.Biblical Exegesis. Under this division is included, interpretation, exposition and application of the Scriptures. Two things are essential: (a) a knowledge of interpretation as found in sacred and cognate philology, and a proper understanding of oriental archaeology. The Bible was originally written in Hebrew, Chaldee [Aramaic] and Hellenistic Greek, and a knowledge of these languages

is essential to authoritative exegesis. Then there is the Arabic, Assyrian, and Aramaic of the Targums-all related in several ways to the Hebrew language. Oriental archaeology is essential as furnishing a knowledge of the social, religious and political life of the peoples associated with the Hebrews at different periods of their national life. (b) The method of exegesis is likewise important. At different periods in church history such methods of interpretation as the Allegorical, the Catenistic, the Dogmatic, the Pietistic, the Rationalistic and the Spiritualistic have all held sway. These will be given a brief description in the History of Exegesis

3.History of Exegesis. Exegetical studies have a history which must be viewed according to the several analyses or plans of interpretation. Prominent among these are: (a) Jewish exegesis, which in its rabbinical form is represented by the Targums, and in its Alexandrian form by the writings of the Hellenistic Jews, particularly Philo of Alexandria. (b) Early Christian exegesis, which made much of quotations from the Old and New Testaments. The allegorical method borrowed from Philo, is found in the writings of pseudo-Barnabas and others. (c) Patristic exegesis, which took three main forms, the literal and realistic interpretations of Tertullian and Cyprian; the historico-grammatical school represented by Jerome and Chrysostom, and the allegorical method which was more or less prevalent in all the forms. (d) Mediaeval exegesis, represented by the compilations of the Catenists, consists in expositions selected from various authors, as the termcatena, which signifies a chain, would indicate. Along with this was the mystic and scholastic exegesis of many of the schoolmen. (e) Reformation exegesis, which followed the revival of learning, is found in three prevailing forms, that of the German or Lutheran school, that of the Swiss or Reformed school, and that of the Dutch or Arminian school. The work in exegesis done by British and American scholars is abundant and valuable but does not fall into any one distinctive group HISTORICALTHEOLOGY

Historical Theology is sometimes enlarged to include the whole range of ecclesiastical history, but in the strictest sense refers only to the historical development of Christian doctrine and its influence upon the life of the Church. It includes two sections: (1) Biblical, which is limited to the historical portions of the sacred Scriptures; and (2) Ecclesiastical, which traces the development of doctrine in the Church from the time of the apostles to the present

1.Biblical History. This subject comprises a study of the historical sections of the Old and New Testaments, and such contemporaneous history as may serve to throw light on the biblical accounts. In the narrower sense of the term, Biblical History has to do primarily with the facts and events related in the Bible in so far as they bear upon the divine plan of human redemption. Biblical Dogmatics, on the other hand, embraces a study of the doctrinal contents of the Scriptures presented in the order of their historical unfolding; for the Bible must ever be viewed as revelation in progress and therefore not complete until the close of the canon. In order to understand the content of Biblical History there must be a proper orientation on the part of the student - such an orientation as enables him to see the point of view of the people to which the Scriptures were addressed, rather than the significance they hold for those of a later day. Once clearly understand this, and it answers many of the objections offered against the customs and practices of the people under the earlier and less perfect periods of revelation. Christ came not to abrogate the teachings of the Old Testament, but to fulfill them - that is, to bring them to the highest forms of experience and life. There can be no antagonism between the teachings of the Old and New Testaments as such, but the one must be regarded as primary, the other perfect and complete

2.Ecclesiastical History. Here the subject matter is regarded as Church History when dealing with the external events in the Church’s struggle with the world, the development of its institutions and its spiritual accomplishments. It is regarded as the History of Doctrine when it takes into account the shaping of the Christian faith into doctrinal statements. Included in this division, also, is the study of the writings of the Fathers commonly known asPatristics; and the study of creeds or symbols of the Church generally treated under the head ofSymbolics SYSTEMATICTHEOLOGY

Systematic Theology arranges in logical order, the materials furnished by Exegetical and Historical Theology; and it does this in order to promote fuller study and practical application. It may, therefore, be defined as "the scientific and connected presentation of Christian doctrine in its relation to both faith and morals."

Biblical Theology is the offspring of Protestantism, and in no other than the free and fertile soil of Protestantism can it ever flourish. The history of its origin and rise to a distinct and recognized branch of theological science, is not the least interesting chapter in the internal history of the modern church. But while Protestant freedom and activity have given to the world this and many other phases of biblical and theological study, it would be well for Protestants themselves to hold ever vividly in mind that liberty is not license ... It would be a sad day for the Church, and hence for the world, if Protestantism, in its bounding freedom and eagerness to unveil truth, should swing loose from all historical landmarks, and the word traditional should become only a term of reproach, and we should have no more respect for gray hairs of the once mighty past. The middle way is the safest, and if Protestant biblical study, whether in its narrower or more comprehensive sense, would achieve its best results for the Church and the world, in this way it must walk.

"Systematic Theology," says William Adams Brown, "occupies the center of the theological curriculum, midway between the Exegetical and Historical, and the practical disciplines. From the former it receives its materials; to the latter it furnishes their principles. In this it is like philosophy in the curriculum of the university, which stands midway between the sciences and the arts. We may describe it as the philosophy of the Christian life." Systematic Theology, however, is concerned not only with faith but with practice. It insists upon repentance as well as faith. It must therefore include both Dogmatics and Ethics. Lange sums up the relation existing between dogmatics and ethics as follows: "Dogmatics represents life in its transcendent relations to God, the eternal basis of its being; ethics according to its immanent relation to the world of man. Dogmatics regards it in its specifically ecclesiastical character, ethics in its general human character. Dogmatics describes the organ, ethics indicates the tasks that await its energy. Dogmatics teaches how man derives his Christian life from God, ethics how he is to give proof of it in the world of men, by human methods and in that exercise of incarnated power which we call virtue" (LANGE,Chr. Dogm., pp. 46, 47). There appears to be no general agreement as to the divisions of Systematic Theology, but for our purpose we shall treat the subject under the threefold division of (I) Dogmatics; (II) Ethics; and (III) Apologetics

1.Dogmatics. Christian Dogmatics as defined by Martensen, is that branch of theology which "treats of the doctrines of the Christian faith held by a community of believers, in other words, by the Church." It is therefore, "the science which presents and proves the Christian doctrines, regarded as forming a connected system" (MARTENSEN,Christian Dogmatics, p. 1). Strong points out the distinction which formerly obtained between Dogmatics and Systematic Theology,

insisting that Dogmatic Theology in strict usage, is "the systematizing of the doctrines as expressed in the symbols of the Church, together with the grounding of these in the Scriptures, and the exhibition, so far as may be, of their rational necessity." Systematic Theology begins, on the other hand, not with the symbols, but with the Scriptures. It asksFirst,not what the church has believed, but what is the truth of God's revealed word" (STRONG,S. T., I, p. 41) . But since Christian Dogmatics forms the central point of all theology, it has come to be identified in present day thought with Systematic Theology itself. This too was the earlier conception for Augusti remarks "that the old and generally adopted usage, which conceives dogmatics and theology as being synonyms, is evidence of the high importance which has always been attached to this first of all the departments of theology" (AUGUSTI,Syst. der Christl Dogmatik, p. 1). The term, however, still connotes a relation to the symbols or dogmatical writings of the Church, in which the particular tenets of a school or denomination are reflected. It is in the words of Lange "in a specific sense the theology of the Church," for dogmatics should bear a direct relation to the Church to which it owes its existence. It is proper, therefore, in this sense, to speak of the dogmatics of Roman Catholicism or of Protestantism, of Lutheran, Reformed or Arminian. Christian Dogmatics must be viewed, not as a philosophy of religion, or a history of doctrine, but as a science including both historical and philosophical elements. It is the science which presents to our notice the material obtained by exegesis and history in an organized and systematic form, representing the sum of the truth of the Christian faith in organic connection

The Reformation seemed to spring primarily from moral, not directly from doctrinal causes. But a change of relations soon took place, which resulted in the attaching of greater weight to the definition of doctrinal points. It might be said that attention was, with entire propriety, directed chiefly to the settling of the truth belonging to the faith, since works spring from faith. But the faulty principles consisted in this fact, that the faith was too little apprehended from the dynamical, and too greatly from the merely theoretical side the apprehending of the faith being confounded with tendencies of belief and the understanding of the faith with its power. In this way Christian ethics long failed to receive just treatment. It is not strange, therefore, that Calixtus should fall upon the idea of emancipating ethics from dogmatics, and assigning it to a separate field. The Reformed theologian, Danaeus, attempted this even earlier than Calixtus. CROOKS AND HURST,Encyc. and Meth., pp. 396, 397.

with the facts of religious consciousness. It therefore demands preparatory training in exegesis and history, as well as in philosophy" (CROOKS and HURST, Encyl. and Meth., p. 399)

2.Ethics. The second main branch of Systematic Theology is Christian Ethics, formerly known as Moral Philosophy. The term Ethics is from hqoV or eqoV and has relation to the home, the seat, posture, habit or internal character of the soul. Morals, on the other hand, comes from the root wordmoswhich means custom, and refers more especially to the outward manifestation than to the internal character. The term ethics therefore has largely superseded that of moral philosophy in its application to the Christian life. Christian Ethics may be properly defined as the science of the Christian life. In the evangelical scheme, Dogmatics and Ethics are closely connected. It may be said that Ethics is the crown of Dogmatics, for the manifold truths of revelation find their highest expression in the restoration of man to the divine image. Christian Ethics differs from philosophical ethics in at least three fundamental positions.First,philosophical ethics has to do with determining man toward morality considered as a whole and impersonal; while Christian Ethics is purely

personal, representing the divinely human life in the person of Christ as constituting the ideal of morality, and therefore requires of every individual that he become like Christ.Second,philosophical ethics starts from the moral self-determination of man, while Christian Ethics regards the Spirit of God as the determining power through which the law of God is written within the

Dogmatics is not only a science of faith, but also a knowledge grounded in and drawn from faith. It is not a mere historical exhibition of what has been, or now is, true for others, without being true for the author; nor is it a philosophical knowledge of Christian truth, obtained from a standpoint outside of faith and the Church. For even supposing -what yet we by no means concede that a scientific insight into Christian truth is possible, without Christian faith, yet such philosophizing about Christianity, even though its conclusions were ever so favorable to the Church could not be called dogmatics. Theology stands within the pale of Christianity; and only that dogmatic theologian can be esteemed the organ of his science, who is also the organ of his Church-which is not the case with the mere philosopher, whose only aim is to promote the cause of pure science. -MARTENSEN,Christian Dogmatics, pp. 1, 2.

hearts of men.Third,philosophical ethics treats of the relations which man sustains to the world, while Christian Ethics deals primarily with the relations which he sustains to the kingdom of God. Christian Ethics must not, therefore, be regarded as a catalogue of duties and virtues imposed upon the individual from without; for the positive element does not consist in the authoritative letter of the law, but in a course of life introduced into human conditions, and actualized in Christ. This new life is through the Spirit, continued in the community of believers, and therefore determines its ethical standards

3.Apologetics. It is the task of Christian Apologetics to justify the truth of the Christian religion at the bar of human reason. It has a further task of proving that the Christian religion is the only true and perfect manifestation of God to man in the Person of Jesus Christ. While sometimes regarded as a separate branch of theology, the subject of apologetics is frequently treated in connection with dogmatics. Closely related to apologetics are two similar branches of theology: (1) Polemics or the study of doctrinal differences; and (2) Irenics or the study of doctrinal harmonies with a view to the promotion of Christian unity. Sack in hisPolemikdistinguishes these terms in the following manner: "Dogmatics is Christian doctrine as adapted to Christian thinkers, implying friendliness on their part; apologetics is Christian doctrine in a form adapted to heathen thinkers, and presumes hostility on their part; and polemics adapts the doctrine to the state of heretical Christian thinkers, proceeding on the supposition of dissatisfaction on their part."

PRACTICALTHEOLOGY

Practical Theology is concerned with the application of the truths discovered in the preceding branches of theological study, and with their practical values in the renewing and sanctifying of men. Vinet defines it as "an art which supposes science, or science resolving itself into art. It is the art of applying usefully in the ministry, the knowledge acquired in the three other departments of theology which are purely scientific." Ebrard maintains that Practical Theology "when examined in the light, is not a knowledge but an ability; not a science but an art, in which theological knowledge acquired becomes practical." It embraces churchly activities and functions, whether exercised by the Church as a whole, or by individual members acting in a representative capacity. The

arrangement of subjects as classified in this division vary greatly, but the following are generally included: (1) Homiletics treats of the composition and delivery of sermons; (2) Pastoral Theology is concerned with the qualifications of the minister in charge of a church or mission; (3) Catechetics has to do with the instruction of the young, whether in age or Christian experience, as a preparation for church membership; (4) Liturgics deals with the conduct of regular or special services in the church; (5) Evangelistics is a term applied to Home and Foreign Missions, and those forms of local or general work which have to do with the direct spread of the gospel and the salvation of men; and (6) Ecclesiology, more commonly known as Canonics or Church Polity, is a study of the various forms of church organization, including canon law A knowledge of the several divisions of theology is of utmost importance - specially to those whom God has called into the ministry. Exegetical Theology furnishes the authoritative sources; Historical Theology gives perspective and balance; Systematic Theology provides the doctrinal standards of the church; and Practical Theology seeks to make effective the knowledge gained in the previous departments. Without this full range of theological science there can be no true perspective, no balanced knowledge, no authoritative standards, and hence no supremely effective ministry

01. Chapter 2 - THE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY

Chapter 2 - THE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY The question concerning the sources of theology meets the theologian at the very threshold of his science. It will be profitable, therefore, to give this subject due consideration before entering the temple of truth to survey its inner wealth and magnificence. It is here that we meet the most widely divergent views-the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Evangelical, the Mystical, and the Rationalistic-each of which demands some attention. Not infrequently, also, reason and revelation are regarded as the sources of theology. For our purposes, however, we shall use another classification, arranging the sources in two main divisions: (I) Authoritative Sources; and (II) Subsidiary Sources AUTHORITATIVESOURCES

Christian Theology as the science of the one true and perfect religion is based upon the documentary records of God’s revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. The Bible, therefore, is the Divine Rule of faith and practice, and the only authoritative source of theology. But this statement needs explication if not qualification. In a stricter and deeper sense, Jesus Christ himself as the Personal and Eternal Word is the only true and adequate revelation of the Father.No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. His testimony is the last word in objective revelation and this testimony is perfected in the Christian Scriptures. "The Oracle and the oracles are one." The Scriptures, therefore, become the perfect disclosure and finished revelation of the will of God in Christ Jesus In general, therefore, it may be said that the source of divine knowledge as exemplified in Christian theologyis a unity, but a unity which exists in a twofold form with both objective and subjective aspects. Objectively, it is the self-revelation of God in Christ as recorded and presented in Holy Scripture, which "as the archetypal work of the Spirit of inspiration," says Martensen, "the Scriptures include within themselves a world of germs for a continuous development. While every dogmatic system grows old, the Bible remains eternally young" (MARTENSEN,Chr. Dogm.,p. 52). Subjectively, the same revealed truth lives in the Christian consciousness of the Church, being begotten and nourished by faith in Jesus Christ. This dual principle has developed through similar processes but with widely divergent results in the two great branches of the Church-the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Evangelical The Roman Catholic Church, previous to the Vatican Council, A.D. 1870, held that there were two valid and authoritative sources of theological knowledge - the Bible and tradition. By tradition as here used, is meant religious opinion on matters of faith and practice, which the Church believed to be handed down from apostolic times to succeeding generations by the Holy Spirit. Tradition, therefore, represents the crystallization of the subjective element in Christian consciousness. Lacking the deeper principle of fundamental unity, the relation &nb

The Roman Catholic position concerning the Bible differs from the Protestant in two important particulars. (1) It has since the time of Augustine included the Apocrypha among the canonical books of the Old Testament and regards them as of inspired and infallible authority. These were declared canonical by the Councils of Hippo (A.D. 393) and Carthage (A.D. 397). Later this action was confirmed by the Council of Trent (1542-1564) with the exception of the two books of Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh. The Douay version of the Old Testament (1609) contained forty-six

books. (2) It differs from the Protestant position in the matter of inspiration. Protestantism regards only the original Hebrew and Greek texts as inspired, while the Roman Catholic Church by a papal bull holds that the version known as the Latin vulgate was also inspired. There is also a wide difference in the matter of tradition, the Roman Catholic Church maintaining that tradition was another stream flowing from the same source of Christ who is the fountain of all truth. Thus later there came to be not only a canon of scripture but a canon of tradition, the Council of Trent affirming that the traditions are to be "received with equal piety and veneration with the Scriptures." The Protestant churches rejected tradition entirely as forming an authoritative source of theology.

of Scripture and tradition became very early a matter of serious concern. With the increasing authority of the Roman see, the dogmas and customs there received became in effect the criteria for the interpretation of the Scriptures themselves. This current ecclesiastical opinion was made the official position of the Church of Rome, at the Vatican Council in July, 1870, when it adopted the transmontane or Italian theory commonly known as papal infallibility. This was, in effect, a triumph of tradition over the supreme objective authority of the Bible. The Vatican decree had the further effect of changing the principle, originally held by both Eastern and Western Churches, as to the dual source of theological knowledge. Neither the written word nor ecclesiastical tradition is now the authoritative source. Both occupy a subordinate position and find their unity in the supreme authority of the Church. The pope when speaking ex cathedra becomes the mouthpiece of the Church, and thereby the source and arbiter of religious knowledge. The Church is thus placed in an abnormal relation to Jesus Christ, its Divine Head, and its decrees and interpretations have superseded the direct and immediate authority of the Holy Scriptures. Whatever honor may be accorded them, they are no longer, for Roman Catholicism, the sole and authoritative source of Christian Dogmatics In the Protestant Evangelical Church a similar process took place, though with directly opposite results. The development in Protestantism was perhaps not so conspicuous as that in the Church of Rome, because of the many and varied communions which are embraced in this one general term. It nevertheless had its ill effects in a distorted conception of the nature of the sacred Scriptures, their place in the Church, and their proper relation to Christ the Living Word. The Protestant Evangelical Church, especially during the sixteenth and a portion of the seventeenth centuries, found the dual source of theology, not in the scriptures and tradition, but in the Scriptures and the spiritual illumination of the Church, this latter being known technicallyas thetestimonium Spiritus Sancti. These two principles, when rightly construed, find their deeper unity in the glorified Christ, by whom the Holy Spirit is given to the Church. The Spirit then, becomes at once the inspiring source of the Holy Scriptures, and the illuminating, regenerating and sanctifying Presence through whom believers are enabled to perceive and understand the truth as presented in the written Word. This evangelical conception corresponds to the twin principles of the Reformation which found expression in the formula, "Scripture alone, and faith alone." As the unifying principle grew dim, the dual sources betrayed the same tendency toward severance as was displayed in the case of the Bible and Tradition. There was, however, this important difference. In Roman Catholicism, the material principle of tradition superseded the formal principle of sacred Scripture; while in Protestantism, the formal principle of Holy Scripture superseded the material principle of spiritual consciousness. In the Roman communion, therefore, the Church became the supreme authority and an apostolic succession a necessity; while in the Evangelical communion, the supreme authority was vested in the Scriptures, which being given to the Church by the apostles and prophets became thereby the only true and logical succession.

Furthermore, as by undue emphasis upon the material principle, Rome placed the Church in a false sacramental position with respect to her Living Head, and made of it a communion with a priesthood; so also by undue emphasis upon the formal principle, Protestantism placed the Scriptures in a distorted relation to Christ, the Personal Word. The distinction, therefore, so delicately drawn by St Paul between the letter which kills and the spirit which gives life, soon lost its significance in Christian consciousness. Revelation and the written Word came to be regarded as identical. Intellectual adherence to certain received doctrines was accepted as the standard of orthodoxy. The concept of the Church as at base a spiritual fellowship was not duly emphasized. Legalism supersededspirituality. Further still, thetestimonii Spiritus Sanctiwhich had been interpreted as a spiritual experience, gradually came to mean nothing more than human reason. Thus there arose a conflict between reason and revelation which finally issued in the rationalistic movement of the nineteenth century. In reaction to this unwarranted emphasis upon reason, there arose various forms of mysticism which attributed no authority to either tradition or reason

There is but one safe course to follow, in a consideration of the authoritative sources of theology-the Scriptures must be our only rule of faith and practice. Whatever is not contained therein, or may be proved thereby, cannot be enjoined as an article of faith. The Scriptures as we now have them are but a condensation of the teachings of Christ, brought into unity and expanded into their full meaning by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. No future source,- therefore, can rise higher than the source of all truth-the fountainhead opened in Himself. For us, therefore, "the Bible means all revelation, and all revelation means the Bible."

SUBSIDIARYSOURCES

While Protestantism recognizes the Holy Scriptures as under Christ the primary and final authority in the Church, it does take into consideration the fact that there are proximate or subsidiary sources of great value in determining a Christian Dogmatic. Among these secondary and subsidiary sources may be mentioned,first,Experience, which is commonly known as the vital source of theology in that it conditions a right apprehension of its truths;second,Confessions or Articles of Faith, which are the crystallization of the beliefs of particular periods or groups, generally termed the traditional source;third,Philosophy, which is the formal or shaping source of theology; andfourth,Nature, as a fundamental and conditioning source

1.Experience. We need to make clear at the outset, that in our use of the term experience, we do not meanthereby merely human experience of the unregenerate; but Christian experience, in the sense of an impartation of spiritual life through the truth as vitalized by the Holy Spirit. In our previous discussions, we pointed out the sense in which the written Word becomes a true source of theological knowledge, and the subordinate position which it must ever hold in respect to Christ, the Personal and Eternal Word. It now remains for us to show that the formal principle of the Word may through the Personal Word, so coincide with the material principle of faith as to become theengrafted wordwhich is able to save the soul. Truth in its ultimate nature is personal. Our Lord made this clear when He said,I am the truth. He knocks at the door of men’s hearts-not as a proposition to be apprehended, but as a Person to be received and loved. To those who receive Him, He gives the right to become the sons of God. Granting that all personal knowledge must have its root in ethical sympathy, or a likeness in character between the knower and the known, then the knowledge of God involves a filial relationship between the Incarnate Son and the souls of

men, a relationship begotten and nourished by the Holy Spirit. This filial relationship is spiritual knowledge, inasmuch as it is an awakening into consciousness of a fellowship with God in Christ. Nor does the New Testament allow that spiritual knowledge of divine things is possible except on the basis of personal contact with God through the Spirit Our Lord further emphasized this great truth when He said,If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself(John 7:17). Here Christ asserts that the knowledge of God does not come through scientific investigation or philosophical speculation, but through right ethical and spiritual relationships. Personal knowledge comes not by logical processes but through spiritual contacts. Our Lord further indicates that the pivot of personal knowledge is an obedient will, and that the deepening bond of sympathy makes possible a more intimate communion and an enrichment of personalknowledge. This ethical knowledge growing out of the obedience of faith is, we maintain, a rudimentary but true knowledge of God, and therefore a subsidiary source of Christian theology. We believe with Gerhart, that from it valid conceptions of God may be intellectually constructed, and systematic knowledge may be developed. Then the whole man, personality in all its functions, attains to the possession of divine truth (GERHART,Institutes,p. 30)

2.Confessions and Creeds.The word "creed," derived from the Latin wordcredo, I believe, signifies a confession of faith or articles of belief. Confessions may be either individual or collective. As collective formulations of a common faith, they are public testimonies concerning the manner in which the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures are understood and taught by the Church. Creeds are not forced upon the Church from without, they grow up from within. Usually they begin as individual convictions, and come gradually to official recognition. Being the outgrowth of experience, such confessions represent a collective or corporate experience, corrected and tested by a wider group of believers. While not authoritative in the sense of a norm of doctrine, they are an outgrowth of the religious life which owes its origin to Jesus Christ through the Spirit, and must therefore be regarded in a subsidiary sense as true sources of theology. They are the conclusions to which the Church has come in its interpretation of the Word of God and its defense against errors. "It is because the great creeds of the Church represent genuine convictions," says William Adams Brown, "and for this reason alone they have a rightful place among the sources of theology." It is true, also, that in the development of the creeds, any lack of balance between the formal and material principles comes clearly to light. When the formal principle dominates and Christian experience is obscured, the creed ceases to be a genuine confession and becomes, instead, a symbol or a rule of faith. This drift from vital spiritual experience to formal statement is always by slow and imperceptible degrees, and in thetransition the creed loses much of its earlier freedom and spontaneity, and becomes increasingly elaborate in character

According to Henry B. Smith, creeds and confessions have four objects:first,to give living testimony to the truth;second,to testify against error;third,to furnish a bond of union among those of the same belief; andfourth,to provide means of continuing the succession of those uniting in the belief, and instructing them and their children. The relation of the creeds to the scriptures is that the former are designed to express scriptural truth in relation to the errors, wants and questions of the times The three Ecumenical Creeds may be said to preserve for us the substance of the faith of the undivided Church. These are (a) The Apostles’ Creed; (b) The Nicene Creed; and (c) The Athanasian Creed

(a)The Apostles' Creed. Viewed from the standpoint of systematic arrangement, the Apostles' Creed is an expansion of the baptismal formula, its threefold division being that of the names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is, however, to be regarded as a summary of facts rather than a theological interpretation, and was not written by the apostles, but so named because it represents a summary of their teachings. It appears that in the early Church some form of belief must be confessed in order to admission into the society of believers. The Church had been enjoined by the apostles to hold fast the form of sound words, and to guard "the deposit." There were two types of these formulas, (1) theKerygma, which was a condensed record of the life of Christ; and (2) aTrinitarianform-these being condensed and combined in our present statement of the creed. In its final form, the Apostles' Creed is the Western baptismal creed. It is variously dated from 100-150 A.D., and in practically the same form as at present. Irenaeus and Tertullian state that it had always been the same (Cf. SCHAFF,Creeds, II,p. 52ff). It is certain that from the year A.D. 390 it existed in substantially the same form as now. This is shown by Rufinius'commentary. Few additions were made, and Pirminius of Frankland gave us thetextus receptusin about the eighth century. Since that time it has been cherished by the Church for more than a thousand years with the exception of one change, that ofad inferosbeing substituted

The following analysis of the creed will serve to show more definitely the various ages when the different clauses were added, and also in general, the meaning which has always attached to the various statements of the creed CREDO IN DEUM PATREM OMNIPOTENTEM. Ancient

(CREATOREM COELI ET TERRAE.) This is found generally in the Eastern creeds from the earliest times and especially in the writings of Irenaeus. It appears first in the Western creed about A.D. 375. It was copied from the East without animus and is probably the last article to be generally adopted. ET IN JESUS CHRISTUM FILIUM EIUS UNICUM DOMINUM NOSTRUM. Ancient. As here used, the word "Jesus" means Saviour and is the name of the Man, while "Christ" means anointed and is the representative of God. He is the full representative in that He is the unique Son, and as "Our Lord" is the object of our religion QUI (CONCEPTUS) EST SPIRITU SANCTO, NATUS EX MARIA VIRGINE. Ancient (PASSUS) SUB PONTIO PILATO, CRUCIFIXUS, (MORTUUS) ET SEPULTUS. Ancient

(DESCENDIT AD INFERNOS.) Late fourth century, but without any controversial animus. It is generally understood to connote that our Lord went into the place of the dead, preached to them, and led away into Paradise those who would follow Him. This was often mentioned as "the harrowing of hell." Certainly the word "hell" in this article does not mean the place of torment, but that of departed spirits. It signifies the realm of the departed TERTIA DIE RESURREXIT A MORTIUS. Ancient

ASCENDIT (AD) COELOS SEDIT AS DEXTERAM (DEl) PATRIS (OMNIPOTENTIS). Ancient 'It signifies that the humanity of Christ lives now with God in glory

(INDE) VENTURUS EST JUDICARE VIVOS ET MORTUOS. Ancient. The doctrine of the coming of Christ in glory for judgment is older than that of His coming "in great humility."

(CREDO) IN SPIRITUM SANCTUM. Ancient. To correspond with the earlier baptismal formula, the Spirit is correlated with the Father and the Son as a Divine Person

SANCTAM ECCLESIAM (CATHOLICAM).Catholicamis late fourth or fifth century, the rest ancient "Catholic" at first meant universal as opposed to local, but from the third century it meant also and usually, in harmony with the universal Church as opposed to the heretical and schismatic

(SANCTOREM COMMUNIONEM.) This is about contemporary withCatholicam. There is some doubt about its earlier creedal use. When put into the creed it meant the unity of life of all the Church, living and departed REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM. Ancient

CARNIS RESURRECTUIONEM. Ancient. The body will be raised - the same body by personal continuity, but in a very different condition - a spiritual body

(ET VITAM AETERNAM.) Late fourth century. "Eternity" here means superior to mere successiveness in time. Von Hugel defines it as ''simultaneity.''

forad inferna. It has been well said that this creed should be treasured in the hearts and minds of all believers and be often upon their lips. The creed is as follows:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; And in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen

(b)The Nicene Creed. An interesting history attaches to this creed, adopted at the First Ecumenical Council, held at Nicaea in Bithynia during the summer of A.D. 325. The Council was summoned by the Emperor Constantine, who at that time was not a baptized Christian, but who hoped by this measure to restore peace to the Church which was greatly distracted by the Arian controversy. The Council was attended by a great number of bishops from Egypt and Asia Minor, and some from the provinces beyond the Bosphorus. Other countries were ably represented also, and there were in addition a number of missionary bishops present from outside the Roman Empire. The lists of names extant specifies only about two hundred and twenty, but Eusebius, the historian, who was present, speaks of more than two hundred and fifty. Constantine and Athanasius declared that there were over three hundred present. Dr. Dickie suggests that the foundation for the belief in the three hundred was symbolical rather than historical. Since the Greek symbol for three hundred and eighteen is TIH, as early as the Epistle of Barnabas this number, which is that of Abraham’s household in the fight with the kings (Genesis 14:1-24), came to be regarded as the ideal number in the championship of truth against error, T standing for the cross, and IH being the first two letters in IHSOUS. At the time of the Nicene Council, however, none of the participants seem to have had any realization of its great importance for the whole future history of Christianity (Cf. DICKIE,Organism of Christian Truth,p. 208). Even during the life time of Athanasius, it became a settled belief that there were three hundred and eighteen present at the Council, and for this reason it is called "the Council of the three hundred and eighteen holy fathers." The text of the original creed differs in a few points from that which came to be used universally in the Church. We give the text of the latter:

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God; begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of light, Very God of very God, begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under

The text of the original Nicene Creed as adopted in 325 is as follows: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father-that is of the substance of the Father; God of God; Light of light; very God of very God; begotten, not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both the things in heaven and the things in earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, descended and was incarnate, and was made man, suffered and rose again the third day; he ascended into heaven; and cometh to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit. But the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church anathemizes those who say there was a time when the Son was not, or that he was not before he was begotten, or that he was made of things not existing, or who say that the Son of God was of any other substance or essence, or created, or liable to change or conversion." The text of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of A.D. 381, is essentially as given in the body of the text above, with the exception that it begins with "We" instead of "I." The clause on Baptism seems to have been directed against the Novatians, who rebaptized. The Eastern or Orthodox Church recognized heretical baptism as valid.

Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried; and the third day He arose again according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven; and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified; Who spake by the prophets; and I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church; I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead; and the life of the world to come. Amen

It will be noted that this creed is but an expansion of the threefold division of the Apostles' Creed, which in turn was an expansion of the baptismal formula. The trinitarian conception seems to have been one of the earliest principles of systematization. The creed itself was a growth, having passed through several recensions. In its earlier form, as adopted by the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D., it was directed against Arianism and other forms of error. It was found with the Eusebian

The following notes on the technical terms of the creed drawn from various sources may prove illuminating and helpful GOD OF GOD. Christ is viewed as God derived from God LIGHT OF LIGHT. This was a favorite metaphor in the fourth century BEGOT'TEN NOT MADE. This is directed against the Arian teaching that Christ was a creature BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER. The divinity of Christ is here regarded as being the same as that of the Father, because there is but one divinity BY WHOM ALL THINGS WERE MADE. This refers to the Son, as in the pre-Nicene forms. The Logos is the agent of God in creation. The word through whom is better than that of by whom. The word is expressive of the meaning of God in nature, and then in man CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN. Metaphorical or mystical in form THE HOLY GHOST,

THE LORD AND GIVER OF LIFE. The Greek words for Lord and Life-Maker, are in the neuter, purely grammatical gender to agree with the word Spirit TOGETHER IS WORSHIPED AND GLORIFIED. More literally, is co-worshiped and co-glorified

ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH. The wordholyas in the Apostles' Creed and the earlier text of the Nicene Creed is here omitted. It belongs, however, before the word Catholic, foreisis found beforemian, andhagianis predicated of the church as well as catholic.

Confession in a letter of Eusebius to his diocese at Caesaraea, and the closing paragraph contained the anathema. In A.D. 381, at the Council of Constantinople, the creed was revised, some additions and changes made, and the anathema omitted. A paragraph, substantially as now used, was added in order to combat the error concerning the Holy Ghost which Macedonius and his followers had advanced, denying the essential deity of the Spirit. The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed is essentially the same as the present creed with the exception that it contained the word holy before the words Catholic and Apostolic Church; and omitted the words "and from the Son" (filioque) as it concerns the procession of the Spirit. The unique feature of the creed is the insertion of the wordfilioque, which indicates the belief in the procession of the Spirit from the Son as from the Father, but this will be treated more fully under the head of Christology

(c)The Athanasian Creed. The Athanasian Creed is a Latin document of uncertain date. It is frequently assigned to Vincent of Lerins in the fifth century; others assign it to Hilary, Bishop of Arles (A.D. 449), or Vigilius, Bishop of Tapsus in Africa; while Gieseler thinks that it originated in Spain some time during the seventh century. It is a further expansion of the Apostles' Creed, and is far more explicit in its teachings concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation than those which precede it. Dr. Summers characterizes it as "very subtile, metaphysical and minute." It was never adopted by any general council, but was received in the seventh century as one of the ecumenical symbols. The Lutherans placed the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed in theLiber Concordiae; while the Eighth Article of the Anglican Thirty-nine Articles states that "the three creeds - the Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed - ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." As to the comparative excellency of the three creeds, it is generally allowed thatthe Apostles' Creed excels in traditional antiquity the Nicene in formal dogmatic status, and the Athanasian in fullness of explicit statement. The creed is too long for common use and has been omitted from the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. The following text is from the recension of the creed as inserted in the Anglican Liturgy

QUICUNQUEVULT 1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith 2. Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly 3. And the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity 4. Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance 5. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost 6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal 7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost 8. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate 9. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible 10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal,

and the Holy Ghost eternal 11. And yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal 12. And also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated, but one uncreated and one incomprehensible 13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty 14. And yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty 15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God 16. And yet there are not three Gods, but one God 17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord 18. And yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord 19. For like as we are compelled by Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord 20. So we are forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say there be three Gods, or three Lords 21. The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten 22. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten 23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding 24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts 25. And in this Trinity none is afore or after another; none is greater or less than another 26. But the whole three Persons are coeternal together and coequal 27. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshiped 28. He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity

29. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ 30. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man

31. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the world;

32. Perfect God, and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;

33. Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his Manhood 34. Who although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ;

35. One; not by Conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God;

36. One altogether; not by Confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person 37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ 38. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead

39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead 40. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their works 41. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire 42. This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved This creed is sometimes called theQuicunque Vultfrom the first Latin word which meansWhosoever. Dr. Summers says that "the creed itself is a venerable and valuable symbol, and we do not think, with some that its positive and negative propositions are contradictory and puzzling to the understanding. It is not designed for unlearned persons, but as a dialectic development of the dogmas of Christianity, as settled by the most acute and learned theologians of the age in which it was written" (SUMMERS, Systematic Theology,

Philosophy should be the constant companion of theology, but each is to retain, without interchange or confusion, its own peculiar field. Its work does not consist in the merely logical. process of connecting thoughts together (arrangement), nor in the exercise of occasional criticism (reasoning); but rather in combining the great variety of matter into a higher unity for the consciousness. This can be done only after the material has been furnished from without, by experience and history. Philosophy can neither invent the needed material in the exercise of its own authority, nor destroy or make it other than it is through a pretended transformation or idealizing process. - CROOK AND HURST,Ency. and Meth.,p. 74.

3.Philosophy. Philosophy is the formal or shaping source of theology. Its claim as a subsidiary source of theology lies solely in the fact that it has the power of systematizing and rationalizing truth, so that it may be presented to the mind in proper form for assimilation. Perhaps the relation of philosophy to theology has never been better stated than by Auberlin in hisDivine Revelation. "This is the task of all philosophico-theological labors," he says, "to see the actual as it were transparent, as illuminated by the divine idea, the positive as ideal, the real - that which is truly real, that is effected by God - as rational, so that it may lose that external character in which it might seem foreign to our minds."

Christianity was introduced into a world characterized, not only by ancient forms of religion, but also by ancient systems of philosophy. It came into conflict simultaneously with heathen religion and pagan philosophy. As early as the time of St. Paul warnings were offered against the dangers ofphilosophy and vain deceit(Colossians 2:8) andscience, falsely so-called(1 Timothy 6:20) This conflict of theology and philosophy has come down through all Christian history, and so close have been their relations, that the history of one cannot be written without the other. We may classify in a general way, the periods and forms of this conflict in four main divisions: (I) the ancient Greek and Roman philosophy; (II) Scholasticism as a revival of the Greek and Roman philosophy; (III) the period of Rationalism during the 17th and 18th centuries; and (IV) the Absolute or Pantheistic systems of the 19th century

Christianity came as a system of revealed truth for which it claimed absolute authority as coming from the true God. This revelation is placed over against the pretensions of human reason and was thereby brought into immediate conflict with the philosophy of that time. The conflict reached its heights in the Gnostic and Manichaean controversy of the second and third centuries, and in the Neo-Platonic controversy which extended into the fourth century. Two modes of defensewere found in the Church,first,that represented by Tertullian who claimed that all philosophy is fiction, and that it is necessary to cling to faith alone; andsecond,the School of Alexandria which maintained that there was a true Christian philosophy, and that on this basis alone the false pagan philosophies must be defeated. Due to this conflict with pagan philosophy and religion, Christian Theology took the form of Apologetics and frequently that of Polemics. In the scholastic philosophy of the mediaeval period we find perhaps the greatest attempt in the history of the Church to reconcile Christianity with traditional philosophy. Scotus Erigena had derived from Platonism a form of theosophic pantheism, which brought on a conflict with those Church Fathers who had adopted the Aristotelian philosophy. Thus was revived the ancient controversy which took the form of Nominalism and Realism. The logic of Aristotle, however, made possible a comprehensive scheme of classification, and of this the Fathers took advantage, using it as a basis for the systematic arrangement of the dogmas of the Church. Thus philosophy shaped the theology of

this period into Systematic, or more properly Dogmatic Theology In the third,or Rationalistic Period, philosophy is again brought into conflict with theology. Like Hagar, philosophy rendered great service to her mistress, but exalting herself, she was cast out. The Reformation period freed the mind as well as the Church, and made possible the logic of induction which was promptly applied to all spheres of investigation. Philosophy, losing sight of its true mission, attempted to furnish the materials of investigation instead of confining itself to the systematization of the truth derived from nature and revelation. Three tendencies are to be noted,first,that of Descartes and the Cartesian School, which appealed to self-consciousness as the ultimate fact;second,the appeal to nature, as opposed to revelation. This gave rise to English Deism and German Rationalism; andthird,a theosophic or mystical tendency which sought truth in pure spiritual vision. As a consequence theology in thisperiod took the twofold form of (I) Natural Theology, and (II) Revealed Theology-the former being largely apologetic. As a consequence also of the false emphasis upon human reason, there arose a number of rationalistic theological systems, all having at base some form of philosophical speculation In the fourth period, which covered the nineteenth and the earlier portion of the twentieth century, the rationalistic tendencies of the previous period found expression in Materialism and reactionary Pantheism. The philosophical systems of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and especially Hegel gave color to much of the theology of the period. The search for the Absolute in philosophy found its counterpart in the theological discussions concerning the Being and Nature of God; while the Synthetic Philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and the investigations of Huxley and Darwin, furnished the impetus for the various forms of theistic evolution which have characterized recent treatises on theology

4.Nature as a Fundamental Source of Theology. The Scriptures recognize the fact that nature reveals God, not only by frequent references to the work of nature but also by direct assertion.The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world(Psalms 19:1-4). The meaning here, according to Dr. Alexander, is that "the idea of perpetual testimony is conveyed by the figures of one day and one night following another as witnesses in unbroken succession .... The absence of articulate language, far from weakening the testimony, makes it stronger. Even without speech or words, the heavens testify of God to all men." The Apostle Paul in his address at Lystra (Acts 14:15-17), and also in his Athenian address (Acts 17:22-34), makes it clear that nature reveals God sufficiently to lead men to seek after Him and worship Him. Butit is in the introduction of his Epistle to the Romans that he gives us his clearest statement on natural revelation, and also defines its limitations.That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse, because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful(Romans 1:19-21). From this it cannot be doubted that God sufficiently reveals Himself through His works, as to lay in nature a sure foundation for Theology. But He limits this revelation in its scope to a knowledge of "His power and Godhead" that is, to His existence and personality. Men may be led to seek after God by nature, to feel for Him in conscience, but only through the added revelation of His Word can men find Him in the knowledge of salvation. Rationalists may assert that the light of nature is sufficient for salvation, but every branch of the historical Church denies it. No man can tell what is necessary for

salvation, or even that salvation is possible apart from a supernatural revelation

02. Chapter 3 - SYSTEMS AND METHODS

Chapter 3 - SYSTEMS AND METHODS The various systems of theology are scarcely less important as subsidiary sources, than the creeds and confessions. Representing as they do, the various groupings of the great doctrines of Christianity, they are arranged according to some principle of organization which in the mind of the author is regarded as central and comprehensive. Frequently these systems are attempts to relate theology to the philosophy of the times, and so to justify its claims at the bar of reason. Dr. W. B. Pope has given us a paragraph, which sets forth perhaps more clearly than any other, the value of system in theology. "It is of great importance," he says, "that the mind should be imbued at the outset with a sense of the possibility and advantage of a well-articulated system. In the organic unity of Christian truth, every doctrine has its place, while all the lesser systems revolve around their common center, and it is one of the fruits of theological study to enable students to locate every topic at once. But not only so, there are rich and profound harmonies among these truths; and every doctrine having its proper place, has also its relation to almost every other; the quick discernment of these relations is another fruit of devout and earnest inquiry. Putting the two together, the high aim of the proficient in this study should be to discover all the affinities and connections of the truths of the Christian system. Theology, the city of God, is built as it were upon seven hills, which are the great doctrines that may be discerned as fundamental. These several hills of the Lord are not sharply separated from each other, but throw out their spurs in all directions, making it hard to show where one department of truth ends and another begins. To maintain the distinctions without marking them too mechanically is the aim of sound theological science" (POPE,CCT, I, p. 26) The question is sometimes asked by the naive and uninformed, "Why not take the truths of the Bible as God has revealed them, without any attempt to systematize them?" Dr. Charles Hodge answers this question in an argument for systematization which has become classic in theology. "Such, evidently," he says, "is the will of God. He does not teach men astronomy nor chemistry, but gives them facts out of which these sciences are constructed. Neither does he teach us systematic theology, but He gives us in the Bible the truth which, properly understood and arranged, constitute the science of theology. As the facts of nature are all related and determined by physical laws, so the facts of the Bible are all related and determined by the nature of God and His creatures, and as He wills that men should study His works and discover their wonderful Organic relation and harmonious combination, so it is His will that we should study His Word, and learn that, like the stars, its truths are not isolated points, but systems, cycles, and epicycles, in unending harmony and grandeur. Besides all this, although the Scriptures do not contain a system of theology as a whole, we have in the Epistles of the New Testament, portions of the system wrought out to our hands. These are our authority and guide." We may say further, that three general arguments are urged in support of the necessity for systematization.First,the constitution of the human mind, the nature of which is such that, having gathered factual knowledge, it must of necessity reflect upon these truths and unify them into a harmonious system of knowledge. The mind can never rest satisfied in possession of facts unless these are arranged in an orderly and coherent manner. This is as true in the study of the Scriptures as in any other field of investigation.Second,the development of Christian character.

Only as truth is thoroughly assimilated does it become conducive to the development of' the Christian life. The uniform testimony of the Church is, that the strongest Christians in every age are those who have had a firm grasp upon the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. This is true, not only because of the power of truth itself, but also because of the strength of purpose which leads to patient research, in order that a reason may be given for the hope that is within them.Third,the presentation of the truth. Closely related to the fact that the very constitution of the mind demands an orderly system, is the same fact viewed from a different angle. Truth must be presented in an orderly manner if it is to be comprehended by other minds. "If we would discharge our duty as teachers and defendants of the faith," continues Dr. Charles Hodge, "we must endeavor to bring all the facts of revelation into systematic order and mutual relation." According to Dr. A. H. Strong, the object of the Christian teacher must be to replace obscure and erroneous conceptions among his hearers, by those which are correct and vivid. He cannot do this without knowing the facts with regard to their relations-knowing them in short, as parts of a system. With this truth he is put in trust. To mutilate it or misrepresent it, is not only a sin against the Revealer of it, it may prove to be the ruin of men's souls. The best safeguard against such mutilations or misrepresentations, is the diligent study of the several doctrines of the faith in their relation to one another, and especially to the central theme of theology, the Person and work of Jesus Christ (Cf. STRONG,Syst. Th., p. 17) METHODSOFSYSTEMATIZATION The various methods of systematization which have been adopted by theologians of the Church, are here presented in brief review as illustrations of systems built upon a central truth, which by its author is regarded as sufficiently comprehensive to express the full range of Christian doctrine The Trinitarian Method. We have already indicated in our study of the three ecumenical creeds, that the trinitarian method of systematization seems to have been the earliest method adopted by the Church. This form of systematization has continued even to the present day. Bishop Martensen has worked out his monumental contribution to Christian Dogmatics in a very interesting manner on the three rubrics - the Doctrines of the Father, the Doctrines of the Son, and the Doctrines of the Holy Spirit. Dr. John Dickie, the learned theologian of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, follows the same plan inhis Organism of Christian Truth; and still later, Dr. Joseph Stump, or the Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary has adopted the same order. One of the earliest representatives of this system in modern theology is Leydecker (1642-1721) an ardent exponent of the doctrines of the Reformed Church The Analytic Method. This was the method of Calixtus (1586-1656) a theologian of the Lutheran Church in Germany, who began with the assumed end of all things as blessedness, and from this works out the means by which blessedness is secured The Federal Method. This method grew out of the political science of the sixteenth century, in which federal headship had become the popular theory. As carried over into theology, the method starts with the idea of two covenants, that of works and that of grace, the latter forming the basis for the unfolding of the doctrines of salvation. It was first used by Cocceius (1603-1669), a Dutch theologian from Holland. It was later used by Witsius (1636-1708), another Dutch theologian, and Thomas Boston (1676-1732) a Scottish writer The Anthropological Method. Here the central principle of systematization is the idea of man-his sinful condition and his need of redemption. Chalmers (1780-1847) begins with the disease of man and proceeds to set forth the remedy. Rothe (1799-1867) arranges his theology in two main divisions: (a) The Consciousness of sin, and (b) the Consciousness of redemption The Christological or Christocentric Method. The central idea here is the incarnation. It is evident to all Bible students that early Christianity was strictly Christ

centered. With St. Paul, To live is Christ and to die is gain. "Jesus" and the "Resurrection were the central and dominating themes of early apostolic preaching and teaching. With the rise of the Western Church and the emphasis placed upon divine sovereignty by Augustine, the centrality of Christ was made subservient to the doctrine of the Church. "It almost seems," says Dr. A. V. G. Allen in hisContinuity of Christian Thought, "as though, if Christ were left out altogether, the scheme of Augustine would still maintain its consistency as a whole and retain its value as a working system." The new movement toward a Christ-centered theology is to be attributed to Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), a German theologian known as the "father of modern theology." With his background of Moravian mysticism, he reacted against the emptiness and formality of the rationalistic theology of his time, and became the "great revivifier of spiritual theology"; and in the field of dogmatic theology wrought a work comparable to that which John Wesley, his great contemporary, accomplished in revitalizing the formal religion of his day. "His it was to make Christ and His redemption the center of one of the most skillfully developed systems of theology which the Christian Church has known," writes Henry B. Smith, who himself was to become the apostle of the movement in this country. Others who have adopted this method are Hase (1800-1890), Thomasius (1802-1875), Andrew Fuller (1754-1815), Gerhart (1817-1904), while his outline would seem to indicate otherwise, his theology is essentially Christocentric, especially as it concerns the knowledge of God; and Dr. Olin A. Curtis is by some writers also placed in this class. Dr. A. H. Strong, and William Newton Clarke are generally classified otherwise, but give large attention to the Person and Work of Christ in their theological treatises. To Principal Fairbairn of England is usually attributed the most constructive and far-reaching contribution to the Christocentric school The Confessional Method. This plan is simply the exposition of certain creeds and confessions in regular order. As instances of this method may be cited, Pearson (1613-1686),Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles; Charles Hodge (1797-1878),Commentary on the Westminster Confession; Thos. 0. Summers (1812-1882), in hisSystematic Theology,edited by John J. Tigert, follows the order of the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism. Dr. Summers was widely known for his "conservatism, broad theological scholarship, and particularly, for careful, conscientious, and patient study of all the elements of the Arminian system of theology. His work is at once a complete system of Wesleyan Arminian divinity and an exhaustive commentary onthe Twenty-five Articles of Religionwhich embody the doctrinal views of American Methodism" (Cf. TIGERT,Preface, p. 3). One of the latest representatives of this confessional method is E. J. Bicknell, who published in 1919 hisTheological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles, the last impression of the book being made in 1936 The Allegorical Method. This method was prominent in the early church, especially among the followers of Origen, but fell into decline with the rise of rationalism. The best modern representative of this method is Dannhauer (1603-1666), a professor of theology in Strassburg and the minister of the cathedral church in the same city. He describes "man as a wanderer, life as a road, the Holy Spirit as a light, the Church as a candlestick, God as the end, and heaven as the home." The Synthetic Method. This is the method adopted by Dr. A. H. Strong in hisSystematic Theology, and which he asserts is the most common and the most logical method of arranging the topics of theology. Dr. Gamertsfelder, who characterizes his own system of theology as "Evangelical Arminianism" follows this method also in his Systematic Theology, declaring that while the method has been in vogue many years it has lost none of its freshness and attractiveness. Hagenbach describes the method as one which "starts from the highest principle, God, and. proceeds to man, Christ,

redemption, and finally to the end of all things." The basic principle of organization is its logical order of cause and effect. This is the method of Pope in hisCompendium of Christian Theology, Miley in hisSystematic Theology, Hills in hisFundamental Christian Theology, Fairchild in hisElements of Theology, Ralston in hisElements of Divinityand Wakefield in his revision ofWatson’s Institutes, known asChristian Theology. It is likewise the method of Charles G. Finney, Henry C. Sheldon, Enoch Pond and numerous other writers

Miscellaneous Methods. Among these may be noted: (a) The Decretal Method which begins with the idea of the divine decrees; (b) The Patricentric Method which arranges its material around the central idea of the Divine Fatherhood, and (c) The Historical Method, followed by Ursinus (1534-1583) and later adopted by Jonathan Edwards in hisHistory of Redemption, which, says Strong, was in reality a system of theology in historical form. It was "to begin and end with eternity, all great events and epochs in time being viewedsub specie eternitatis. The three worlds - heaven, earth and hell were to be the scenes of this grand drama. It was to include the topics of theology as living factors, each in its own place," and all forming a complete and harmonious -whole (Cf. STRONG,ST, I, p. 50). Dr. I. A. Dorner in his System of Christianity, makes Christian faith, the central organizing principle, while Dr. Julius Kaftan (b. 1858) in his Dogmatics makes the grace of God the central idea. In recent times, such works as William Adams Brown,Christian Theology in Outlineand William Newton Clarke,Outline of Christian Theology, have made the conception of the Christian religion the determining factor

There are several important results to be gained from the study of the various systems of theology. Among these may be mentioned,First,and most important perhaps, they give us a knowledge of what their authors regarded as central in their faith. Underlying every system is one principal truth about which all others are organized. What the dogmatic theologians of the Church in any age regard as central gives rise to the various types of Systematic Theology. Care should be exercised, however, in judging the methods of systematization in one age by those employed in another. If Anselm’sCur Deus Home, or Origen’sDe Principusor St. Thomas’Summa Theologicado not appear to be scientific according to our standards, they doubtless were according to their standards, and these very differences prove illuminating to the earnest student of theology.Second,these various systems furnish us with a knowledge of the materials which the writers had at their disposal, their mental characteristics, and the methods employed to adapt their teaching to the need of the times. Dr. Dickie regards Dogmatics as a Christian religious conviction endeavoring to think itself out, and to relate itself to all other knowledge and opinion. The situation is complicated, he says, by the fact that our varying mental elements have different sources in our experience. Part of our mental content we owe to our general environment, part to our special training, and part to our individual experience. One must take into account this whole mental complex of knowledge and opinion which, whether imperfectly or altogether unsystematized, is never alike in any two minds. It is evident then that attention to the method of systematization reveals much of the author’s mental characteristics, and this personal equation will be taken into account, both in the materials selected and the methods by which they are adapted, to their proposed ends.Third,they are important as furnishing a foundation for the study of historical theology, enabling the theologian to trace in unbroken continuity the development of truth from age to age. Since the Church in all ages is one, no age can come to its fullest expression without a knowledge of the past THEOLOGYASCIENCE

Having defined theology and treated it from the standpoint of its sources and methods, we have now an objection which must be answered. It is objected that theology is not a science, in that its subject matter is not drawn from knowledge but from faith, and therefore lacks certitude. Closely related to this is the attack of Sir William Hamilton who, after defining faith as the organ by which we apprehend what is beyond our knowledge, argues that since science is knowledge, what is beyond our knowledge cannot be matter for science. He maintains, therefore, that science in its highest achievement can only build an altar to "the Unknown God." On the false assumption that faith and knowledge are antithetical, either that faith does not reach the requirements of certitude, or that it operates in a realm beyond scientific knowledge, two basic truths have been overlooked.First,science itself must be based upon faith, which in the scientific realm is known and treated as the assumptions of science. Physical science rests upon faith in our own existence, in an orderly world whose facts may be systematized, and in the power of the mind to logically arrange the facts presented to it. It assumes such metaphysical truths as space and time, substance and attributes, cause and effect, and also assumes the trustworthiness of the mind in its investigations. If these assumptions do not invalidate physical science, most certainly they should not be regarded as invalidating that science which deals with assumptions, admittedly without proof from the science which objects to it. "If theology is to be overthrown because it starts from some primary terms and propositions, then all other sciences are overthrown with it." Mozley defines faith as unverified reason (Cf. DOVE,Logic of the Christian Faith, p. l4)

Second, We must therefore take the position that Christian Dogmatics "is not only a science of faith but also a knowledge grounded in and drawn from faith" (MARTENSEN,Christian Dogmatics, p.1). This has been the position of all leading theologians. Richard Rothe (1799-1867), who is generally regarded as belonging to the right wing of the Hegelian school, gave to theological science a clear statement of the basic elements of knowledge which has been widely used in modern theology. "Now in the devout or religious man," he says, "according to the measure in which his devoutness is living and healthy, there is immediately contained in his thought as pure thought, the notion of being determined by God. The religious man’s feeling of self is at the same time a feeling of God, and he cannot come to a distinct and clear thought of self without coming to the thought of God. Thus there is provided for the devout subject a twofold point of departure for his speculative thinking, and the possibility of a twofold method of speculative inquiry. Thinking can proceed either from the consciousness of self as ana priorifact, or from the consciousness of God. Theological speculation is in essence nothing more than the attempt to express, in conceptual form, the immediate and certain content of the devout consciousness, the content of the feeling of the divine." Julius Kaftan, a younger contemporary of Rothe (1799-1867), takes a similar position, though admitting that the idea of faith, in Christian Theology, underwent a change in passing from the medieval to the modern period. In the scholastic period, faith rested on authority, and was developed largely by strengthening external evidence. Now we have returned to the biblical idea of faith as a fact of human consciousness, and as a form of knowledge which strikes its roots deep into the inner practical relations sustained to its objects

03. Chapter 4 - THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH

Chapter 4 - THEOLOGY IN THE CHURCH

Having dealt with the materials and methods of theology, it is our task now to trace the development of Systematic Theology in the Church. Doctrinal discussions arise not only from original and elaborate sources, but from the simplest writings of the early church fathers. The History of Dogmatics, however, is concerned primarily with the attempts at framing an orderly and systematic representation of Christian truth as a whole, and can give attention only in a secondary manner to the discussions which have furthered or hindered the development of a Systematic Theology

Hagenbach finds five tendencies in the development of Christian Doctrine. (I) The Age of Apologetics, when it was the main endeavor of the theological mind to defend Christianity against infidelity from without the Church. It extends from the Apostolic Age to the death of Origen (A.D. 70-254). (II) The Age of Polemics or Controversies, when it was the main endeavor of the theological mind to maintain Christianity against heresy from within the Church. It extends from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254-730). (III) The Age of Systematizing Past Results or of Scholasticism, in the widest significance of the word. It extends from John of Damascus to the Reformation (A.D. 730-1517). (IV) The Age of Creed Controversy. It extends from the reformation to the Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy (A.D. 1517-1720). (V) The Age of Philosophizing upon Christianity. This period is characterized by criticism and speculation, the reconciliation of faith with science, and reason with revelation (A.D. 1720 to about the close of the nineteenth century) For our purpose in reviewing the development of theology in the Church, we shall use the following outline: (I)The Earlier Period.from the Apostolic Age to the time of John of Damascus (A.D. 70-730). (II) TheMediaeval or Scholastic Period,from John of Damascus to the Reformation (A.D. 730-1517). (III) The Reformation Period,covering the remaining portion of the sixteenth century (A.D. 1517 to 100: 1600). (IV)The Confession Period,covering the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (AD. 1600 to 100: 1800). (V)The Modern Periodfrom the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present time (A.D. 1800 to the present) THEEARLIERPERIOD The Earlier Period may be subdivided into (I) The Apologetic Period, from the Apostolic Age to the death of Origen (A.D. 7-254); and (II) The Age of Polemics, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254-730). The Earlier Period is peculiarly that of the Church Fathers, who through defenses of Christianity against paganism from without, and controversies against heresy from within, wrought out through patient endurance and often at the price of martyrdom, the materials which the doctors of later periods systematized by various methods into Christian Dogmatics

Great Leaders of the Earlier Period.The earlier Church Fathers are generally classified in two main divisions: (I) the Ante-Nicene Fathers and (II) the Post-Nicene Fathers. For our purpose, however, we shall mention only the Apostolic Fathers and the Earlier Apologists. The Apostolic Fathers were those of the first and second centuries who were known to have been personally associated

with the apostles, or to have been directly influenced by them, so that their writings breathe the same spirit as attaches to the later epistles of the New Testament. Among these may be named Clement of Rome (1st century) the first bishop of Rome whose extant work known asThe Epistle of

Among the striking and quotable sentences, McGiffert gives the following: "It is better to keep silence and to be than to talk and not be." "It is meet that we not only be called Christians but also be Christians." "Where there is more toil there is much gain." "A Christian has no authority over himself but giveth his time to God." "Christianity is a thing of power whenever it is hated by the world." "I am God’s wheat and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread."-McGIFFERT, History of Chr. Thought, I, p. 37.

I Clement, is an elaborate and treatiselike writing similar in form to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The next in order is Ignatius of Antioch, born about the middle of the first century. He was an immediate disciple of St. John with whom he was contemporary for about twenty years. There are seven letters extant, written like some from the pen of St. Paul, while he was on his way to Rome where he suffered martyrdom. His letters have been characterized as "fiery, incisive, vigorous and eloquent beyond any other writings of the post-apostolic period." His striking personality and the depth of his thought characterize him as the outstanding figure of this period. The dominant tone of his life was that of devotional love. The third in regular succession is Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who wrote an Epistle to the Philippians about A.D. 120. He was a disciple of Ignatius and is generally considered to have been personally acquainted with St. John. He left a noble testimony preceding his martyrdom, an account of which was sent by the Church at Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium some thirty years later, and is usually included with his epistle. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, who likewise may have been a disciple of St. John, wrote five books, but of these only fragments remain of hisExposition of the Oracles of the Lord

In his Epistle to the Roman Church, Irenaeus advises the Christians there of his coming and begs them not to do anything to secure his release and prevent him from martyrdom, for he regarded it as "the greatest privilege and the highest honor to die for the name of Christ." "Bear with me," he writes. "I know what is expedient for me. Now I am beginning to be a disciple. May nought of the things visible and things invisible envy me, that I may attain unto Jesus Christ. Come fire and cross and grapplings with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushing of my whole body! Come cruel tortures of the devil to assail me! Only be it mine to attain unto Jesus Christ." "The pangs of a new birth are upon me. Bear with me, brethren. Do not hinder me from living; do not desire my death. Bestow not upon the world one who desireth to be God’s, neither allure him with material things. Suffer me to receive the pure light. When I am come thither, then I shall be a man. Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God."-IRENAEUS,Epistle to the Romans, pp. 5, 6

Polycarp’s noble testimony has been quoted perhaps more than any other of the words of the Fathers. "Eighty and six years have I served Him, my Lord and my King, and He has never done me wrong. How can I deny Him?"

was a disciple of Polycarp, and thus there is established a direct relationship from St. John to Irenaeus, the last of the Apostolic Fathers

There were also a number of anonymous writings that are of sufficient importance to demand attention. TheDidacheor Teachings of the Twelve is believed to have been published about A.D. 80-90, and if so is perhaps the oldest uninspired manuscript of the Christian Era. TheEpistle of Barnabasis sometimes attributed to Barnabas the companion of Paul, but the weight of evidence is in favor of anonymous authorship.The Epistle to Diognetusclaims discipleship with the apostles, but probably this is meant in the broad sense of conformity to apostolic teachings. TheShepherd of Hermasis strictly speaking, of sub-apostolic authorship, but is generally classified with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Some claim authorship of this epistle for Hermes mentioned by St. Paul in Romans 16:14, but the evidence appears stronger for Hermas, the brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome 100: 139-154. There is also the epistle known as II Clement which is sub-apostolic in date, but which like I Clement is classified with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Its author is unknown, but in all probability it is a homily written about A.D. 120-140, and therefore perhaps the earliest extant sermon preached before a Christian congregation

During the next or Apologetic Period proper, the great names among the earlier apologists are those of Justin Martyr (died 100: 165), who wrote the First and Second Apologies and theDialogue with Trypho; Clement of Alexandria (100: 160-220), a voluminous writer but whose best known work is probably theStromateisor Miscellanies treating of various biblical and theological subjects - other works being theProtrepticuswritten with an evangelistic purpose to make converts, andPaedagogus, an elementary manual intended as a handbook for the instruction of new converts; Tertullian (155-222), whoseDe Testimonio Animaeis but one of his numerous works; and Cyprian (200-258), an Africanbishop whose greatest contribution is found in his teachings concerning the Church

Then there was Origen (185-254), perhaps the greatest scholar and writer of this period,whose De Principiiswill be given further attention; Arius (d. 336), a popular and influential preacher and a scholar of no little ability. who, adopting the rationalistic positions of Lucian (d. 311 at Antioch), came into conflict with his bishop, Alexander, and thus brought about the great Arian Controversy; Athanasius (100: 296-373), the opponent of Arius, and known as the "father of orthodoxy" because of his championship of the deity of Christ; the greatest name of the period, Augustine (354-430), to whose writings both the Roman Catholic and many Protestants turn for authority; and lastly, John of Damascus (700-760), the great theologian of the Eastern Church

Besides these there are many names of lesser importance, but of intense interest to the student of Apologetics, Aristides who addressed an apology to Emperor Antonius Pius about A.D. 150, Tatian known especially for hisDiatesseron, Athenagoras (wrote 100: 176-178) who addressed an appeal to Marcus Aurelius; a defense of Christianity written by Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 190; the three great Cappadocians, Gregory Nazianzen (100: 329-389), Gregory Nyssa (Bp. in 372) and Basil (100: 330-379) noted for their work in the solution of the trinitarian problem; Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), Theodoret of Cyprus (died 457), Theodore of Mopsuesta (100: 350-428 or 429) all of whom contributed interpretations of Scripture, or devotional and apologetic tracts. Cyril’s answer to Julian has been notorious in apologetic literature The Great Councils of the Earlier Period. No summary, however brief, can do justice to the Earlier Period without enumerating the great councils. These gave to the Church the clear and concise statements of doctrine out of which the theology of the Church was constructed. "In the lead of these controversies," says Philip Schaff, "stood church teachers of imposing talents and energetic

piety; not mere bookmen, but venerable theological characters, men of a piece, as great in acting as in suffering. To them theology was a sacred business of heart and life." We give the following summary of the Ecumenical Councils. The East and West recognize seven Ecumenical Councils, but the Roman Catholic Church holds to a greater number. By "ecumenical" is meant one which, whether representative in membership or not, is accepted by the entire Church as rightly representing it in its definitions of faith. These councils with one exception were all held during the Polemic Period

(1) The Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) was called by the Emperor Constantine to consider, and if possible to settle, the Arian heresy. It gave the Church the first great ecumenical creed. (2) The First Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) was called by Emperor Theodosius the Great in order to correct the errors of Apollinarianism and Macedonianism. Apollinaris (d. 392) held that Christ assumed only a human body, and that the Logos took the place of human mind or spirit. Macedonius (100: 341), Bishop of Constantinople, taught that the Holy Spirit was not a Person but a divine energy through the universe. (3) The Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) was presided over by Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, and was called on occasion of the Nestorian controversy which seemed to teach a Christological dualism. (4) The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) was presided over by three bishops and two presbyters, who were the representatives of Leo of Rome. Six hundred and thirty bishops were present. This council condemned the Eutychian heresy which confused the two natures of Christ. It gave to the Church the creedal statement on Christology which has stood the test of the centuries. (5) The Second Council of Constantinople (A.D. 553) was called by Emperor Justinian, and presided over by the patriarch Eutychus. The council condemned the writings of Theodore of Mopsuesta, Theodoret of Cyprus and the Epistle of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa-all these being thought to favor Nestorianism. (6) The Third Council of Constantinople (A.D. 680) called by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, was directed against Monothelitism, or the teaching that the divine will supplanted the human will in Christ. (7) The Second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787) falls across the line into the next period but is mentioned here as being one of the great councils. It had to do with the Iconoclasts and Iconduli The Development of Systematic Theology. While much preliminary work was done by the writers of this period, probably the first formal attempt at Systematic Theology was Origen’sDe Principus, or "First Principles," written about A.D. 218. It is arranged in four books, the first treating of God; the second of Creation and the facts of human history; the third of man’s moral and spiritual endowments; and the fourth of the Holy Scriptures as the basis of the Christian system. No adequate place is given to either Christology or Soteriology, and the doctrine of the Church is omitted entirely. Westcott points out the value of the fourth division which "he examines with reverence, an insight, a humility, a grandeur of feeling never surpassed, the question of the inspiration and interpretation of the Bible" (Cf. SMITH,Dictionary of Chr. Biography, 4: p. 121). In view of the four Christological heresies, the Arian, the Apollinarian, the Nestorian and the Eutychian, the writings of Athanasius are of exceptional value but cannot be said to take the form of Systematic Theology The second formal attempt at Systematic Theology was theEnchiridionof Augustine (353-430), the great dogmatic and polemic writer of the fifth century whose influence is yet strong in theological thought. As a polemical writer he opposed the Manichaeans, the Donatists, the Pelagians and the Semi-Pelagians. The doctrines of Augustine when focused upon Pelagianism, show a controversial position at every point, the controversy itself being not so much between Augustine and Pelagius, as a conflict between the East and the West focused in these

eminent theologians. We shall have occasion to notice these contrasts in the following sections on Theology, the Trinity, Christology, and Soteriology. TheEnchiridionis an exposition of the Creed, and in the West became as authoritative as the creeds themselves, going far beyond them in the doctrines of sin and salvation. The work was organized on the threefold Pauline principle of faith (de fide), hope (spe), and love (caritate). Of Augustine's other writings theDe TrinitateandDe Doctrina Christianaare regarded as important contributions to theology. HisDe CivitateorCity of Godwas epoch making. The Church is regarded as the kingdom of God on earth and its government and worship as royal institutions. However, it started a trend of thought which finally resulted in the identification of God's spiritual kingdom with the visible organization of the Church, and thus gave impetus to the Roman Catholic position against which later Protestantism objected and still objects

Another work of this period is sometimes classified as theology, theCommonitoriumof Vincent of Lerins (d. 100: 450) which supports the doctrines of the Church by reference to the Church Fathers. It is not, however, strictly dogmatic but rather a systematic exposition of Church tradition The third and last attempt at Systematic Theology during this period was a contribution from the East by John of Damascus (100: 700-760, date uncertain), and marks the close of the Earlier Period. The title of this work isDe Fide Orthodoxaor the Summary of the Orthodox Faith, and by many is considered the first work worthy to be known as a Systematic Theology. It is the third section of a larger work entitledFons Scientiaor Fountain of Knowledge something on the order of a modern religious encyclopedia. The first two sections ofCapita Philosophicawhich contain a brief treatise on the Categories of Aristotle, and a Compendium of Heresies, numbering one hundred and three, are relatively unimportant. The third section is sometimes known also as "An Accurate Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," and was a textbook at once philosophical and ecclesiastical. John of Damascus was to the East what Thomas Aquinas was to the West, and by Briggs is thought to hold even a higher position as a doctor of the universal Church. On account of his general positions being those of the School of Constantinople, he is the normal theologian of the Greek Church. Theophanes states that he was called Chrysorrhoas, "Stream of Gold" - literally pouring forth gold-"because of that grace of the spirit which shines like gold both in his doctrine and in his life."

THEMEDIEVALPERIOD The Mediaeval Period covers nearly seven hundred years, and extends from the death of John of Damascus to the beginning of the Reformation (A.D. 754-1517). It is pre-eminently the period of the doctors or schoolmen, and is frequently called the Scholastic Period. Turner in his History of Philosophy, and Kurtz in his Church History subdivide this period into four main divisions. "From the tenth century, almost completely destitute of any scientific movement, the so-calledSaeculum Obscurum, there sprang forth the first buds of scholarship without, however, any distinct impress upon them of scholasticism. In the eleventh century scholasticism began to show itself, and that in the form of dialectic, both skeptical and dogmatic. In the twelfth century mysticism assumed an independent place alongside of dialectic, carried on a war of extermination against skeptical dialectic, and finally appeared in a more peaceful aspect, contributing material to the positive dogmatic dialectic. In the thirteenth century dialectic scholasticism gained the complete ascendancy, and reached its highest glory in the form of dogmatism in league with mysticism., and never, in the persons of its greatest representatives, in opposition to it" (KURTZ,Church Hist., II, p. 81) The earlier part of this period, to the beginning of

the eleventh century, while aSaeculumObscurum, as to outstanding scholarship, was not so as to the events of church history. It was marked by constant strife in both church and state. In the Eastern Church there was the controversy over images, in which the Iconduli as image worshipers triumphed over the Iconoclasts or image-breakers. It was during this period also, that the great controversy arose over the insertion of the wordfilioquein the Western Creed, a controversy which finally resulted in the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches. From this one word, filioque, by which is meant the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, two great systems of theology arose, widely different in both material and type. The Eastern theology was contemplative and mystical, and sought to teach by symbol rather than creed; the theology of the West was more analytical and progressive, and taught more by the logical presentation of truth as found in the creeds and confessions. The principal theologians of this period were Alcuin (735-804), a great teacher whose writings mostly concerned the doctrine of the Trinity. He was a tutor of Rabanus Maurus (776-856) known as the greatest teacher in Germany. Alcuin was himself an assistant of Charlemagne in his attempt at the revival of learning, and under his care the monastery of Tours became a great center of theological learning. Another great theologian of this period was John Scotus Erigena (100: 815-875), known as "the father of scholastic theology." In addition to hisDe Divisione Naturae, a system of natural and speculative theology, for which he claimed a common source in the Divine Wisdom, he also wrote a treatise,De Divina Praedestinatione, directed against Gottschalk and his high Augustinian position on predestination. Other and

"The pupils of Rabanus," says Briggs, "teaching in various monasteries in Northern and Western Europe, greatly enhanced theological education." Of Alcuin it was said that he distributed "the honey of the sacred writings," "the wine of ancient learning," and "the apples of grammatical subtlety."

Rabanus has this interesting paragraph: "If anyone would master the Scriptures, he must first of all diligently find out the amount of history, allegory, anagoge and trope there may be in the part under consideration, for there are four senses to the Scriptures, the historical, the allegorical, the tropological and the analogical, which we call the daughters of Wisdom. Through these Wisdom feeds her children. To those who are young and beginning to learn, she gives the milk of history; to those advancing in the faith the bread of al1egory; those who are truly and constantly doing good so that they abound therein, she satisfies with the savory meat of tropology; while finally, those who despise earthly things and ardently desire the heavenly, she fills to the full with the wine of anagoge. - SCHAFF,Hist. Chr. Ch.,IV, p. 719.

lesser writers of this period were Strabo (809-849) who was the originator of theGlossa Ordinaris, or brief commentaries on the Scripture. He is known also for hisVision of Wettinwhich Sandys calls "an early precursor of Dante’sDivine Comedy." Servetus Lupus (805-862), a pupil of Rabanus, wrote a treatise on predestination. The works of Rabanus were more exegetical than theological and included commentaries on both the Bible and the Apocrypha. To him is attributed also the great hymn of Pentecost,Veni Creator Spiritus(Cf. further, BRIGGS,Hist. Th., II, pp. 4-7) The latter part of this period, beginning with the eleventh century and extending to the sixteenth, is known as the Scholastic Period, in both philosophy and theology. The rise of Mohammedanism in the East did much to bring about the transfer of theology from the churches to the schools in the West. Of this period, the first two centuries - the eleventh and the twelfth - were preparatory, and are

characterized by the subordination of philosophy to theology. The schools accepted the theological doctrines as they were delivered to them by the Church, and assuming their truth sought to adjust them to human reason and deduce from them whatever corollaries were possible. Yet it is this period which marks the beginning of Systematic Theology. Following John of Damascus, who represented the theology of the East, were Anselm, Abelard, and Peter Lombard who marked the beginning of systematic treatises in the West. Anselm (1033-1109) was the first to attempt a rational theory of the atonement, and hisCur Deus Homo, as well as hisMonologiumandProslogium, was an influential contribution to the literature of theology. Abelard (1079-1142) is known especially for his conceptualism in philosophy, a mediating position between the realism of Anselm and the nominalism of Roscelinus (1050-1100). His two principal theological works areDe unitate et Trinitate Divina, which was condemned at Soissons under the title,Theologia Christiana, andIntroductio ad Theologam. Peter Lombard (1100-1164) representedone of the earliest attempts toward a systematization of doctrine in the West The thirteenth century represents the period of perfection in scholasticism. Philosophy is here characterized by a friendly alliance with theology, rather than as subordinate to it. The revival of Aristotelian philosophy gave to the theologians a new principle of co-ordination and systematization. The theology of this period is therefore, the doctrines of the fathers systematized according to Aristotle. While in the former period, Systematic Theology took the form ofSententiaeor sentences from the Fathers, arranged in systematic order under certain rubrics, in this period it took the character ofSumma Theologiae, which in reality were independent systems of theology. Duns Scotus (1276-1308), was born shortly after the death of Thomas Aquinas, and though he lived only about thirty-three years, began a movement in philosophy and theology, which finally resulted in the downfall of scholasticism, and the ushering in of the period of theReformation The Development of Theology in the Scholastic Period.The first great systematic work of the Scholastic Period was Peter Lombard’sLibri Sententiarum Quattuor, or Four Books of Sentences. These were an arrangement of excerpts in systematic order from the writings of Augustine and other Church Fathers. The first book treats of God, theSecond,of creatures; theThird,of redemption; and theFourth,of the sacraments and last things. It was adopted as a textbook by the Lateran Council (1215) and used as a text in theology for more than five hundred years. Peter Lombard, known as theMagister Sententiarumwas a pupil of Abelard. Previous to this there were other books of sentences such as Hugo of St. Victor,Summa Sententiarum, and Robert Pulleyn,Sententiarum, but these were not as extensive as that of Peter Lombard The second great treatise on theology during the Scholastic Period, was theSumma Theologicaof Thomas Aquinas, a work of great value and a source book even in modern times THEREFORMATIONPERIOD The preceding age was characterized by a systematizing of the results of the Polemic Period, but the Reformation becomes again a period of controversies and creed formulations, thus marking the transition from the medieval to the modern world. The Reformation as such was the outgrowth of the Renaissance. It was in fact, a continuation of the Renaissance as it affected matters of religion, especially in Germany and England. Reuchlin and Erasmus have been called the two eyes of Germany, the one on account of his knowledge of Hebrew language and literature; the other because of his Greek learning and labors. A recent writer traces the development of thought through the four Johns - John Duns Scotus, John Tauler, John Huss and John Wesley, and then adds a fifth and a sixth-John Wessel and John Reuchlin The most important event of this period, and that which gave rise to the development of two radically different types of theology, was the

separation of the Church into two main divisions, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Since that time each type has developed into a large body of divinity. While there are fundamental unities, the differences are manifest at almost every essential point in theology. The Roman Catholic positions were expressed in the Tridentine Decrees, formulated by the Council of Trent (1545-1563). They were in effect a complete system of Roman Catholic theology, and were wrought out by the indefatigable labors of the schoolmen in the universities of the Church. The positions of the Protestant Reformation were expressed in the Formula of the Concord (1580) and later in the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1618-1619). Protestantism accepted the teachings of the creeds of Nicaea, Constantinople and Chalcedon, and also in the main the Augustinian doctrines of sin and grace. It rejected the absolute authority of ecclesiastical tradition and the findings of the Church Councils. It maintained the supreme authority of the Scriptures in faith and morals, the universalpriesthood of believers, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone The Theology of the Reformation Period.The theology of the Reformation Period falls into two broad divisions - the Lutheran and the Reformed. The Lutheran may in general be characterized as more deeply sacramentarian, while the Reformed is more intellectualistic and doctrinal. Luther and Melanchthon are the representatives of the former, and Zwingli and Calvin of the latter. Luther and Zwingli were primarily the reformers, and Melanchthon and Calvin the theologians of early Protestantism. In a discussion of the Lutheran theologians, however, it would not do to pass by Martin Luther himself (1483-1546), whose chief workDe Servo Arbitnowritten in 1525 has been compared to a doctrinal manifesto. But the first systematic theologian of the Reformation period was Melanchthon (1497-1560), who published hisLoci Communesin 1521. This work ran through eighty editions during the lifetime of the author, and gave its name to countless successors. It is characteristic of the practical spirit of the Reformation that the Loci of Melanchthon grew out of his lectures on the Epistle to the Romans and he treated the various topics in the order in which they occurred in that epistle. While Zwingli (1484-1531) is not generally regarded as a theologian, he published in 1525his Commentarius de Vera et Falsa Religione, a dogmatic work which begins with a discussion of religion, and follows with the usual order of theology. The work stresses the sovereignty of God and absolute predestination. The epoch making work of Reformed theology was Calvin'sInstitutio Christianae Religionis

Among the earlier followers of Melanchthon were Strigel (1514-1569),Loci Theologici; Chemnitz (1522-1586),Loci Theologici; and Selneccer (1530-1592), Institutio Relig. Christ. In connection with Calvin, two other Swiss divines are worthy of mention, Ursinus (1534-1583) and Olevianus (1536-1587) authors of theHeidelberg Catechism.

idea like that of Zwingli is the sovereignty of God, and the arrangement is essentially Trinitarian The Controversies of the Reformation Period. The controversial periods in Church History are usually regarded as barren and uninteresting. It is true that they are never accompanied by either the systematic development of theology or the spiritual force of evangelism, but only in this way it seems, could the materials of truth be prepared for later systematization and thence become the ground for great periods of spiritual revival. No earnest student of theology can afford to overlook the importance of these controversies, nor once he gives them his attention can he fail to admire the intellectual acuteness and moral heroism of these defenders of the faith. We can but enumerate them here as a suggestion for further study, and give them in historical order

1.The First Eucharistic Controversy(1524-1529). This controversy was between Luther and Carlstadt (1481-1541) and also between Zwingli and those who upheld the Mass. Zwingli's positions were independent of Luther who could have tolerated them had he not thought them associated with the teachings of Carlstadt. As early as 1524 Luther wrote that "Carlstadt's poison is spreading in Switzerland."

2.The Anabaptist Controversy(1525) was concerned with the subjects and modes of baptism

3.The Antinomian Controversy(1527-1566) grew out of the extreme statements of John Agricola, who insisted upon justification by faith in such a manner as to minify allegiance to the law

4.The Adiaphoristic Controversy(1548) concerned certain questions of faith and morals. In its earlier form it was concerned with the question as to whether or not there was any doctrine which was purely neutral as to right or wrong. Melanchthon and Bugenhagen asserted that there were such neutral doctrines, while Placeus and Westphal held to the negative. Thomas Aquinas attempted to make a distinction between right and wrongper se,and right and wrong in the concrete. In the seventeenth century it broke out again; Spener and the pietists denying any neutral positions while the opposers of the pietists affirmed that there were such

5.The Synergistic Controversy(1543-1580) concerned the relation of the human and divine elements in salvation. The followers of Melanchthon affirmed that there was co-operation between the divine and the human, the Flacians denied that the sinner could be other than purely passive. The Formula of Concord rather favored the latter position. Calvinism in the main is monogeristic, while Arminianism is strictly synergistic

6.The Osiandric Controversy(1549-1552) had to do with the nature of justification, Osiander (1498-1552) maintaining that it consists in the infusion of essential righteousness, or the divine nature. His position exhibits the confusion of justification with sanctification found in Roman Catholic theology, though Osiander himself was a staunch Protestant. This view of justification has never found acceptance in Protestant theology

7.The Second Eucharistic Controversy(1552) was between Luther and Zwingli, and served to develop and clarify the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Zwingli denied (a) that the body of Christ corporeally eaten does or can confirm the faith; (b) that the body of Christ corporeally or naturally eaten can or does forgive sin; (c) that the body of Christ is corporeally present in the Eucharist as soon as the words, "This is my body," are spoken over the elements. This Luther never taught: (d) that the body of Christ can be corporeally present in the elements. Luther on the other hand, asserted (a) that in the Eucharist Christ is present only to faith; (b) that whoever accepts the miracle of the incarnation has no ground for doubting the presence of Christ in and with the elements; (c) that Christ is not shut up in heaven. This Zwingli never taught: (d) that it is necessary for Christ's body and blood to be present in the Eucharist to assure the believer of the forgiveness of sins

8.The Majoristic Controversy(1559) concerned the nature of good works. Major declared that good works were essential to salvation, while Amsdorf, who led the opposition, declared them to be detrimental. The dispute was settled by the Formula of Concord which took the middle ground and laid the foundations for the generally accepted Protestant doctrine, which is, that good works are necessary as a consequence of faith, but not necessary as a condition of justification

9.The Arminian Controversy(1560-1619) dealt with the doctrine of grace. The Arminians, so-called from the type of theology represented, remonstrated against five points in the Calvinistic theology. On account of this they were called Remonstrants. The Arminians were excluded from the Reformed Church, and their teachings condemned by the Synod of Dort. The Arminian theology forms the basis of the Wesleyan teaching as held by the great body of Methodism. It is also the basis of the theology of the Church of England after the time of Bishop Cranmer. The importance of this controversy demands further attention, and will be more fully discussed under the doctrines of grace

10.The Deistic Controversy in England(1581- 1648) was a form of the rationalistic controversy which appeared at a later period

11.The Pietistic Controversy(1650). This controversy occurred a little later than the century in question but is placed here because of its connection with the earlier controversies. It was occasioned by a reaction against the dogmatic formalism of the times. The reformers had emphasized the efficacy of faith in Christ as the means of securing the forgiveness of sin, but the controversies which arose among them gradually gave a too exclusively doctrinal and polemical character to the sermons and writings of both the Lutheran and Calvinistic divines. The reaction took the form of a renewed emphasis upon feeling and good works. The direct originator of this movement was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705), who at meetings held in his home, repeated his sermons, expounded passages from the New Testament, and induced those present to join in conversation on religious subjects. From this they were given the name of Pietists. The purpose of Spener was to combine the Lutheran emphasis upon Bible doctrine, with the Reformed tendency to a vigorous life

12.The Placean Controversy(1633-1685). This controversy also falls outside the limits of the Reformation period. It was concerned with "mediate imputation."

Thus through struggle and debate, often with muchodium theologicumattached, ’and sometimes with practices that must be viewed with disapproval, were the doctrines of the Church wrought out and preserved. Great issues were at stake, and men of intellectual acuteness and moral heroism rushed to the defense of the faith. We must believe, also, that above all was a superintending Providence which overruled the failures and shortcomings of men, and that the Holy Spirit as a Guide into all truth, Himself shaped the destinies of the Church THE CONFESSIONAL PERIOD The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (100: 1600-1800) represent the Confessional Period in theological development. During this time the doctrinal statements of the larger communions were worked out in systematic form and given to the Church as varying types of Christian Dogmatics. The theologians of this period are frequently classified as Protestant Scholastics, due to the fact that they followed in the main the same principles of systematization as were observed by the older schoolmen. Two phases of this subject demand our attention: (I) the various confessional types, and (II) the different forms which theology assumed, due to the varying influences of external circumstances. These divisions will be treated from the genetic viewpoint

I The different types of theology are found within the New Testament itself, and mark the beginning of the developments found in later periods of dogmatic history. Peter represented the practical tendency; James a combination of the practical and philosophical, giving us the Wisdom Literature of the New Testament; Paul was a logician and systematizer, and gives us the Systematic

Theology of the New Testament; while John was primarily a seer, announcing dogmatically what he had seen by intuition. The differentiating features of these types of theology will best be set forth by the contrasts found in chronological order in the history of the Church: (1) Eastern and Western; (2) Roman Catholic and Protestant; (3) Lutheran and Reformed; and (4) Reformed and Arminian The Eastern and the Western Churches.The East and the West hold in common the three Ecumenical Creeds, and also the findings of the four Ecumenical Councils - Nicaea (325); Constantinople (381); Ephesus (431); and Chalcedon (451). They separated over the controversy which began with the insertion of the wordfilioquein the creed, but perhaps the separation was due more to political and ecclesiastical reasons than to the doctrinal point of a single or double procession of the Spirit. There were two rival pontiffs, one at Constantinople in the East and one at Rome in the West. The decline of the Eastern Empire greatly aided in the development of power at Rome. After their separation they developed two distinct types of theology. That of the East was more philosophical and speculative, that of the West more progressive and practical. To the former with its fondness for metaphysical subtleties, we are indebted for the doctrines of the Trinity and the Nature of the Godhead. To the West with its more practical trend, we are indebted for the doctrines of grace and the organization of the Church The Confessional Standards of the Eastern Church are the three creeds mentioned above, to which were added later, theConfessio Gennadii(1453), and theConfessio Orthodoxa(1643). The doctrinal differences between the Eastern and Western Churches are these - the East (1) rejects the doctrine of the papacy; (2) modifies the seven sacraments; (3) denies the immaculate conception of the virgin; (4) circulates the Bible in the vernacular; and' (5) asserts its own supremacy, viewing the Church of Rome as the eldest born among the schisms and heresies The Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches.As different types of theology developed in the Eastern and Western Churches, so in the West itself, the differentiating features of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were marked and distinct. The Roman Catholic Church is sacramentarian, the Protestant Church is evangelical. Evangelical Christianity holds that God saves men directly by entering into personal and spiritual relations with them. Roman Catholicism, on the contrary, teaches that the Church is the one divinely appointed instrument, through which spiritual blessings are communicated by means of the sacraments. Evangelical Christianity maintains that the true Church is composed of the whole number of those redeemed through Christ, and that its authority is conditioned by the immediate spiritual relation existing between its constituent members, and the one living Lord who is its Divine Head. While Roman Catholic theology technically admits that there is an invisible Church, practically it identifies it with the visible organization, which it maintains is commissioned to accomplish a certain work in the world. It further maintains that it derives its authority from this commission alone, apart from any personal relation existing spiritually between Christ and its members, or even the officials in whom the authority is vested. Thus in the West the two branches build up an extensive though widely divergent theology The Roman Catholic Standards are the three creeds, and as especially directed against Protestantism, theCanons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, (1545-1563);Professio Fidei Tridentina(1564), which is the creed of Pius IV; to which were added later the Vatican decisions on the Immaculate Conception (1854), and Papal Infallibility (1870)

Protestant Theology and Its Divergent Types. While the divergent views of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches center largely in the conception of the Church itself, these differences have been developed into two systems of theology which are opposed to each other at

almost every point.First,Protestantism maintains the universality of the priesthood of believers, as over against a special order of priesthood held by Roman Catholicism;second,it believes that grace is communicated through the truth received in faith, as over against that which vests it solely in the sacraments;third,it exalts the preaching of the Word above the sacramental ministry at the altar; andfourth,it insists that grace is received directly from Christ through the Spirit, and that this gives membership in the Church as Christ's spiritual body, as over against the teaching that a spiritual relation with Christ must be established through the Church. The evangelical view that the Church must be approached through Christ, rather than Christ through the Church, not only marks a distinction in theology, but gives rise also to widely different types of Christian experience In the discussion of Protestant theology we shall consider the four following types: (1) Lutheran Dogmatics; (2) Reformed Dogmatics; (3) Arminian Dogmatics; and (4) Socinian Dogmatics

1.The Lutheran Dogmatic. The Lutheran Standards are theAugsburg Confessionwith itsApology(1530); theSmalcald Articles(1537); Luther'sSmallerandLarger Catechisms(1529), andthe Formulas of Concord(1577). There have been three marked tendencies in Lutheranism,first,a movement toward the end of the sixteenth century and the earlier years of the seventeenth which manifested a renewed attachment to the positions of Luther as opposed to those of Melanchthon;second,a reaction against strict Lutheranism in favor of the earlier Ecumenical Creeds; andthird,the mediating positions. The Lutheran theologians will be grouped under this classification In the movement toward a return to Luther may be mentioned Leonard Hutter (1563-1616) who is commonly known as "Luther Redivivus." His chief work,Compendium Locorum Theologicorum, was published in 1610, and consisted of extracts from Lutheran standards A second edition was published by Twesten in 1855. Here also must be classed John Gerhard (1582-1637), who was regarded as the most learned theologian of his age. His great workLoci Communes Theologiciwas published in nine volumes (1610-1622), and far excels the work of Hutter in systematic arrangement. Chemnitz (1522-1586) in his earlier years followed Melanchthon but later turned to Lutheranism. He is described as "clear and accurate, the most learned of the disciples of Melanchthon." In opposition to strict Lutheranism, George Calixtus (1586-1656) started a reactionary movement by insisting on a return to the great Ecumenical Creeds. While he followed Melanchthon rather than Luther, he was known as the "syncretistic theologian" and endeavored to find the truth in both the Reformed and the Romanist positions. His chief work was theEpitome Theologiae, and represents a change from the analytical to the synthetic method of treatment. Aside from Danaeus, he is the first theologian to separate between Ethics and Dogmatics. The opponent of Calixtus was Calovius (1612-1686) who in defense of Lutheranism undertakes to confute the errors which arose after the time of Gerhard. His work is entitledSystema Locorum Theologicorumand was published in twelve volumes. It follows the scholastic style. Akin to this, but even more dialectical in style was theTheologic Didactico-polemica Theologieaof Quenstedt (1617-1688). Hollaz (1648-1713) whose work consists largely of extracts from Gerhard, Calovius and others, and shows the influence of mysticism, marks in some sense the transition from the severely scholastic theology of the seventeenth century to the pietistic type of the eighteenth century. The mediating theologians of the Jena school held a position midway between that of Calixtus and Hutter, the chief representatives being Musaeus (16131681) and Baier (1647-1695). The latter's work,Compendium Theologiae Positivae, became an important and popular textbook for the study of the old Lutheran Dogmatic

2.The Reformed Dogmatic. A movement similar to that noticed in Lutheranism is found in even a more marked manner in Reformed theology. Starting with the theology of Calvin, there was a movement in the direction of overstraining his position which led practically to "hyper-Calvinism." Against this was a reactionary movement which could not be called a return to Calvinism but to an avowed modification of it. This was represented by the Amyraldists and the Arminians, but the latter must be regarded not merely as a modification of Reformed theology but a distinct type of Dogmatics The Reformed theologians which immediately followed Zwingli and Calvin, were able representatives of the true Calvinistic positions. Among these may be mentioned Peter Martyr (1500-1562); Chamier (1565-1621); Wolleb (1536-1626) author ofCompendium Theologiae Christianae; and Wendelin (1584-1652) whose principal works areCompendium Christianae Theologiae(1634) andChristianae Theologia Systema Majus(1656) both of these being expositions of the strict Calvinism of that period. Theodore Beza (1519-1605) who produced no distinctly dogmatic work, began nevertheless, a powerful movement toward hyper-Calvinism which greatly influenced the theology of his time. Dr. William Twisse (1575-1646) wrote a book in 1648, the title of which translated is"The Riches of God’s Love unto the Vessels of Mercy Consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the Vessels of Wrath."McPherson says that this affords "perhaps the very best example of supralapsarianism developed by fearless application of logic, without necessary qualifications or reservations, to the doctrinal principles of Calvinism" (MacPHERSON,Christian Dogmatics, p. 63). Following him was Francis Turretin of Geneva (the father) (1623-1687) whoseInstitutio Theologiae Elencticaeshows the influence of the rising federal school of theology, and Jean Alphonso Turretin (the son) (1671-1737) who sought to modify the strict Calvinism of the father, and also to promote a union of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches. Turretin, the younger, and Benedict Pictet (1655-1725), his contemporary, may both be classed as federalists and were influenced by the Cartesian philosophy The reactionary movement in the Reformed Church of this period was begun by Cocceius (1603-1669) who renounced the scholastic method and accepted in its stead a purely biblical method. He distributed his materials according to the covenant idea and became in this sense a federalist. His principal work was entitledSumma Doctrinae de Foedere et TestamentisDeipublished in two volumes. Witsius (1636-1708) attempted to reconcile the Federalists and the Orthodox party but without success. The intermediate group was represented in England by John Owen (1616-1683), Richard Baxter (1616-1685); and Thomas Ridgeley (1666-1734). The School of Saumur in France was represented by two outstanding theologians, Amyraldus (1596-1664) who made an attempt to modify the positions of the Synod of Dort; and La Place, or Placaeus (1606-1655) as he is commonly known, who advanced the theory of mediate imputation of Adam’s sin. The Calvinism of the School of Saumur did not meet with approval on the part of the Reformed Churches of Geneva and was condemned by theFormula Consensusat the Synod of Charenton (1675). The Scotch Presbyterian theologians were Thomas Boston (1676-1732); John Dick (17641833) and Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847). Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758 and Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803) were the chief American theologians of the period

3.The Arminian Dogmatic. The Arminian or Remonstrant school arose in Holland at the opening of the seventeenth century, and came as a protest against the Calvinism of that day. James Arminius (1560-1609) was "a learned and able divine, of a meek Christian spirit." As a youth he was precocious and studied theology under Theodore Beza, a rigid Calvinist and the leading spirit in the development. of hyper-Calvinism. In later life, Arminius was drawn away from the earlier

positions of Reformed theology, and while a professor at Leyden, broke into a fierce conflict with Gomarius (1563-1641). Arminius did not live long after this, but his death witnessed no cessation of the controversy. Following James Arminius, from whom this type of theology took its name, may be mentioned Simon Episcopius (1583-1643), who after the death of Arminius became the leader of the movement and carried on the controversy before the Synod of Dort. HisInstitutiones Theologicae, published in 1643 is the clearest and most authoritative statement on earlier Arminianism. Episcopius was opposed at Dort by Gomarius, and by Maccovius (1588-1644). Voetius of Utrecht (1588-1676) was the bitterest and most violent of all the opposers of Arminianism, hisSelectae Disputationes Theologicaebeing directed against the Arminians, the Cartesians and the Cocceians. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) was perhaps the most outstanding theologian of the Dutch school. He is celebrated both for his "governmental theory of the atonement" and for his contribution to international law. Chief among his apologetical writings areDe Veritate Chr. Religionis,andDefensio Fidei Catholicae de Satisfactione Christi,this latter being directed against the Pelagians and Socinians but upholding the Arminian positions. Philipp van Limborch (1633-1702) not only by his life span linked the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but marks also the transition to rationalism. He was a professor of theology in Utrecht and a friend of John Locke, the English philosopher. His exegesis of the New Testament proved to be popular and enduring, andhis Institutes of Christian Theologyformed the most complete and best known exposition of the earlier Arminianism

Among the Puritans in England, the most noted representative of evangelical Arminianism was John Goodwin (1593-1665). HisRedemption Redeemedpublished in 1651 dealt with the questions of election, reprobation and perseverance, and hisImputatio Fideior a Treatise on Justification (1642) was greatly valued by John Wesley and Richard Watson. HisExposition of the Ninth Chapter of RomansandOn Being Filled withthe Spiritwere further contributions to the evangelical cause. John William Fletcher (1729-1785), Vicar of Madeley has been called the "Arminian of the Arminians." He was the apologist of early Methodism and hisChecks to Antinomianismis still the best treatise on this subject. He is perhaps best known for his saintly character and his spiritual ministry. John Wesley (1703-1791) was the Father of Methodism both as to the doctrine and the polity of the Church. The development of later Arminianism commonly known as Wesleyanism occurs in the following century

While not strictly of the Arminian type of theology, and yet thoroughly evangelical, we may mention here, George Fox (1624-1691) the founder of the Society of Friends or Quakers, and George Barclay (1648-1690) whose Apology represents the doctrinal standards of the society. The English Churchmen of this period were Richard Hooker (1553-1600); Gilbert Burnett (1643-1715)) and John Pearson (1613-1685) whose works on theCreed, theParablesand theMiraclesare still standard authorities

4.The Socinian Dogmatic. Frequently the Socinian theology is not regarded as a distinct type of dogmatics, but since the movement dates back to the Reformation period it is best treated here. Laelius Socinus (the uncle) (1525-1562) and Faustus Socinus (the nephew) (1539-1604) are the founders of what is known in modern times as Unitarianism. Socinianism takes its name from the former, and the latter is regarded as the founder of the sect. Their writings are collected in theBiblotheca Fratrum Polonorum. In the seventeenth century the doctrines were defended by Crell (1590-1631) who wrote a treatise against the Trinitarian conception of God, and Schlichting

(1592-1662) who wrote a confession of faith for Polish Christians. The father of English Unitarianism was John Biddle (1615-1662) who wrote a series of tracts onThe Faith of One God,who is only the Father; and of one Mediator between God and men, who is only the man Christ Jesus; and of one Holy Spirit, the gift of God: asserted and defended. The doctrinal standards are found in the Racovian Catechism. This appeared as the Rakow Catechism in the Polish language in 1605, immediately after the death of Socinus, and was completed on the basis of his writings by Statorius, Schmalz, Moscorovius, and Volkel. Latin translations appeared in 1665, 1680 and 1684

II

We have now to consider some of the forms which theology assumed due to the varying influences of external circumstances. We shall notice briefly (1) The Pietistic Movement; (2) The Rationalistic Movement; and (3) The Biblical Movement

1.The Pietistic Movement. A strong opposition grew up in the latter part of the seventeenth and the earlier part of the eighteenth centuries against the barrenness of scholasticism, which resulted in the Pietistic Movement in Germany. Andreae (1586-1654) and Spener (1635-1705) had waged war against a dead orthodoxy and proclaimed the need for atheologiaregenitorumor a regeneration of theology. Spener advocated the substitution of a prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures for the official theology of his time. His special work, however, was m Eschatology, where he attempted to fill in that which he considered lacking in the Dogmatics of Luther. His views of the millennium were later worked out systematically by two of his pupils, Johann Wilhelm Peterson (1694-1727), a Lutheran mystic who was expelled from Luneburg because of his millenarian views; and Johann Konrad Dippel (1673-1734) who was known as a religious enthusiast. The work of Spener was continued by Francke (1663-1727) who was the founder of the Francke Institute at Halle. Benedict Carpzon (1679-1767) was a decided adversary of the whole Pietistic movement and under his leadership the breach widened between Scholasticism and Pietism. There developed in the minds of the people a repugnance to Scholasticism which was typically displayed in the writings of Hollaz, who has been called "the last of the orthodox theologians."

2.The Rationalistic Movement. Here there begins to be felt the varying influence of the systems of philosophy upon dogmatics. There was a school of Descartes in Holland represented by Bekker (1634-1698). His book,Strong Food for the Perfect, aroused suspicions of Socinianism and later he was deposed from the ministry. There were also schools of Wolff (1659-1754) and Leibnitz (1646-1716) in Germany and these greatly influenced theological study. Among the theologians of the school of Wolff may be mentioned Stapfer (1708-1775) whoseTheological Instituteswere widely known; Baumgarten (1706-1757); Endemann (d. 1789); Bernsau (d. 1763) and Wyttenbach (d. 1779). These theologians of the earlier rationalistic period were not unorthodox and had as their motive the exact demonstration of dogma in such a clear manner that there could be no true opposition offered to it. However, their very attempts at accurate statement developed an intellectualism that later gave rise to the skeptical tendencies of rationalism. The separation between Natural Theology and Revealed Theology became widened, and Natural Theology was exalted at the expense of revelation. This issued in the Deism of England and the period of the "enlightenment" as it is generally termed, in philosophy. Here are the beginnings of the

Rationalistic Period of the early nineteenth century which set itself up in such strong opposition to the truth of Christianity. After the Reformation had freed theology in a large measure, from the bonds of scholasticism, other philosophies soon took its place. Semler built upon the philosophy of Wolff and Leibnitz, and consequently represented the Scriptures as having merely a local and temporary character. Michaelis (1716-1784) and Doederlein (1714-1789) followed Semler (1725-1791), both being aided by the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). The philosophy of Herder (1744-1803) and Jacobi (1743-1819) exemplified greater spirituality and prepared the way for the "Father of Modern Theology" Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834)

3.The Biblical Movement.Against the growing tendency toward rationalism there arose a Biblical Theistic tendency which served to preserve the truth against the attacks of the rationalists. Bengel (16871751) with a firm faith in the inspiration and absolute authority of the Bible was perplexed at the great number of variations in the text. He set himself to study, and after twenty years published hisApparatus Criticus, which became the starting point for modern textual criticism of the New Testament. In hisEssay on the Right Way of Handling Divine Subjectshe states that in brief it is to "put nothing into the Scriptures, but to draw everything from them, and suffer nothing to remain hidden that is really in them." Oetinger (1702-1782) followed Bengel in theology and Boehme in philosophy. He maintained that life is not only the fruit of do6trine but also its starting point and basis. Buddeus (1667-1729) was a man of genuine piety and learning, and by the conciliatory position he occupied, exerted a profound Christian influence. HisInstitutiones Theologiae Moralis(1711) removed the casuistical elements from the Protestant treatment of Christian morals. Ernesti (1707-1781) was noted for his proficiency in Classical Languages, Rhetoric and Theology. His principal work wasInstitutio Interpretis N.T. (1761) which opened a new epoch in the history of Hermeneutics. J. H. Michaelis (1668-1738) made valuable contributions to Old Testament criticism and exegesis. He lectured at Halle and was closely associated with Francke. J. D. Michaelis (1717-1791) was recognized as an indefatigable investigator, and a prolific writer. His exegetical works on both the Old and the New Testaments are numerous, his work on the Psalms being of special importance

THEMODERNPERIOD

Schleiermacher, the "Father of Modern Theology," may be said to have introduced into modern thought the vitality of the evangelical teaching, much as did his contemporary, John Wesley, in the field of religion. As over against the positions of the rationalists, he understood the Christian faith as something given, not merely in an external manner, but as having its seat in the consciousness. It was a consequence, therefore, not of rational thinking, but had its origin in the heart. Religion was a "feeling of dependence" and Christ and His redemption were made the center of his system of theology. As to the range of his influence Schleiermacher has been compared to Augustine and Calvin. So extensive does the history of Dogmatics become in the modern period, that it will be necessary for us to confine our thought to a mere classification of the greater theologians according to their particular schools. We shall consider the development of theology during this period under the following divisions. (1) The School of Schleiermacher; (2) The Rationalistic School; (3) The Mediating School; (4) Ritschl and His School; and (5) British and American Theology

1.The School of Schleiermacher.Schleiermacher and his successors are generally regarded as belonging to the transitional school, which marks the distinction between the thought of the medieval and that of the distinctly modern period. Here following Schieiermacher may be mentioned Alexander Schweitzer (1808-1888), who attempted to work out a system of theology based upon Christian consciousness, historical Christianity being the religion in which this ideal was realized. Schenkel (1813-1885) made conscience the distinct organ of religion. Lipsius (1830-1892) sought to develop a Christian Dogmatic purely from the standpoint of Christian consciousness, his threefold division being, (1) God-consciousness; (2) Self-consciousness; and (3) World-consciousness. Rothe (1799-1867) the pupil of Daub, occupied a position midway between rationalism and supernaturalism, and in this respect his theology is comparable to that of Schleiermacher

2.The Rationalistic School. This is sometimes known as the philosophical school, due to the fact that the theology of the period was largely influenced by philosophy-especially that of Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. Among the earlier followers of Hegel were Daub (1765-1836), Goschel (1784-1862), Hasse (1697-1783), Rosenkranz (1805-1879), Erdmann (1821-1905). and Marheineke (1780-1846). Daub was the teacher of Rothe, and shows the influence of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel in successive stages. Marheineke was a colleague of Schleiermacher and a thorough-going Hegelian. The outline of hisSystem of Christian Doctrineis derived from the Hegelian triad: (1) the pure notion of God himself, embracing His nature and attributes; (2) God distinguishing Himself from Himself, the God-man, at once substance and subject. This embraces the subject of Christology and Soteriology. (3) God returning out of this distinction into eternal unity with Himself, which embraces the doctrine of the Trinity, the Administration of Grace, and the Kingdom of God. Biedermann (1819-1885) in hisChristliche Dogmatikdevelops the principles of Hegelianism in a somewhat pantheistic manner. With the advent of Hegelianism in philosophy, it was asserted for a time that peace had been declared between belief and knowledge, and that theology presented the same truth in formal statement, that philosophy acknowledges in a higher conception. This self-deception, however, did not last long, and the school of Hegel split up into two parties, the first clinging to the orthodox faith, and the second making a sharp distinction between faith and knowledge as the highest wisdom. The left wing of Hegelianism was represented by Bauer (1792-1860) and the Tübingen School. Bauer applied Hegel’s method of dialectical development to church history and the New Testament, and thus founded the Tubing School which became a center of rationalism and destructive criticism. It was in Strauss (1808-1874) that the most extreme positions were reached, of whose teachings it was said, that they resembled "Christian theology as a cemetery resembles a town." Here also we should mention as having in some sense been influenced by Hegel, but more evangelical in their teaching, Otto Pfleiderer (1839-1908) and Lipsius (1830-1892). Pfleiderer’sPhilosophy ofReligion(1896) and hisEvolution and Theology(1900) were widely influential in American thought during the latter part of the nineteenth century

3.The Mediating School. This is represented by a group of outstanding theologians who sought to maintain evangelical principles and yet combine them with the best thought of modern times. As showing the marked influence of Schieiermacher there should be mentioned first of all, the incompleteDogmatikof Twesten (1789-1876), who was inclined toward ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and Nitzsch (1787-1868)whose System of Christian Faithwas a vigorous attempt to unite

Dogmatics and Ethics. As other outstanding members of this school we may mention Isaac A. Dorner (1809-1884) whose great work is entitleda System of Christian Doctrine. His rationalistic positions appear primarily in his doctrine of the Trinity and in his Christology. Bishop H. L. Martensen (1808-1884), a Danish writer and friend of Dorner, follows in general the teachings of Lutheranism, although in the later portion of his work entitledChristian Dogmaticshe swings more to the Reformed position. Written in an attractive style, his great contribution to theological thought exerted a wide influence in the later nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. This influence was due perhaps to his attractive style, and to his unusual blending of mysticism and philosophical speculation. Thomasius (18021875) is classed among the new Lutherans and is known especially for his treatment of theKenosis. Kahnis (18141888) inclined toward the Sabellian idea of the Trinity. Philippi (1809-1882) bases his dogmatic on the thought of fellowship, (1) Original fellowship with God; (2) the breach of fellowship; (3) objective restoration of fellowship through Christ; (4) subjective appropriation of fellowship with God; and (5) the future completion of the restored and appropriated fellowship. Martin Kahler of Halle (1835-1912) arranges his dogmatic in three divisions: (1) the confession of the need of salvation; (2) the confession of the possession of salvation; and (3) the confession of the hope of salvation. Ebrard presented the Reformed Dogmatic from a study of its sources in opposition to the principles of A. Schweitzer. J. P. Lange (1802-1884) in an elaborate work on dogmatics, starts with the Reformed principles and endeavors to harmonize these with later thought

More or less independent of any particular school may be mentioned Carl Hase of Jena, who though he accepted the rationalistic position in some measure, reached his conclusions in a manner independent of other thinkers. His chief theological work is theEvang. Dogmatik(1826). Here also may be mentioned Cramer (1723-1788), Baumgarten-Crusius (1788-1843), and especially thePhilosophische Dogmatikof C. H. Weisse (1801-1866) written in an attempt to harmonize the various philosophical positions. J. Müller (1851-1878) contributed to the field of theology a masterly treatise on theChristian Doctrine of Sin(tr. 1868). Among the apologists of this period may be mentioned C. Ullman (1796-1865) and A. Tholuck (1799-1877). Continuing the supranaturalistic position of the former period are the names of A. Hahn (1792-1863) and J. T. Beck (1804-1878) the latter endeavoring to open a new pathway in theology by using a special terminology. He was a student at Tübingen but reacted against the rationalism prevalent there. He is usually classified as a follower of Schleiermacher, but allied himself with the earlier biblical realism of Bengel. It was against his teaching that Strauss reacted so violently. The names of A. Vinet (1797-1847), Godet (1812-1900) and Poulain (1807-1868) stand high in Switzerland and France, the latter being one of the strongest apologists against modern Naturalism

4.Ritschl and His School.Albrecht Ritschl of Bonn (1822-1889) may be said more than any other of this period, to have founded a distinct school of theology. His chief work,Justification and Reconciliation, is the third volume of a larger work setting forth his own positions. Ritschl rejects the scholastic position, and in fact all philosophy, maintaining that philosophy and theology have no valid connection with each other. He was a firm adherent of the historical movement and therefore insists strongly upon the recognition of the historical Christ, and the acceptance of the Scriptures as a record of revelation. His theory of knowledge is empirical, and confusion arose from an attempted union of the idealistic and realistic elements of knowledge, borrowed from Kant on the one hand and Lotze on the other. The term "value judgments" belongs peculiarly to Ritschl

and his school. By these they are meant those judgments which are true and important only as they have value in producing emotional or other effects in the consciousness of the one who entertains them. This gave rise to certain phases of Higher Criticism in its destructive tendencies, such as the position that the miracles might not have been historical facts, and yet, since they produce the effect of omnipotent power, they have "value" for religion. Some of the more radical adherents of this position extended the value judgment to Christ himself, maintaining that the religious value could be dissociated from the historical background

Among the theologians classified as Ritschlians may be mentioned Gottschick (b. 1847), Hermann of Marburg (b. 1846), Hermann Schultz (b. 1836), and perhaps Adolf von Harnack (b. 1851). Julius Kaftan (b. 1848), the successor of Dorner at Berlin, modified Ritschl's position, abandoning the distinctions between scientific and religious knowledge; and Theodor Haering (b. 1848), more than any other of the Ritschlians returns closer to the Orthodox Church

5.British and American Theology.The earliest Methodist writings of a doctrinal character were John Wesley's Sermons, which together with hisNotesand theTwenty-five Articlesconstitute the doctrinal standards of Methodism. John Fletcher, while in some sense the apologist of Methodism, was a member of the Established Church and Vicar of Madeley. The earliest Methodist writer to formulate a complete system of doctrine was Richard Watson (1781-1823) who published hisTheological Institutesin 1823. This work was revised by Wakefield and with some additional material is found in Wakefield'sChristian Theology. William Burton Pope (1822-1903) in hisCompendium of Christian Theology, published in three volumes is the first British writer to compare favorably with Richard Watson. In America, Miner Raymond (1813-1897) publishedhis Systematic Theology, a monumental work in three volumes (1877-1879); Thomas Neely Ralston,his Elements of Divinity(1847) which was revised and enlarged by the addition of hisEvidences, Morals and Institutions of Christianity(1871). In its first form it was translated into Norwegian (1858) and in its enlarged form translated and published in the Chinese language in 1886. Henry Clay Sheldon published hisHistory of Christian Doctrinein 1886 and hisSystem of Christian Doctrinein 1903. John J. Tigert revised and published in 1888the Systematic Theologyof Thomas 0. Summers (1812-1882). John Miley's excellent work onSystematic Theology in two volumes appeared in 1892. Olin A. Curtis published hisChristian Faithin 1905, S. J. Gamertfelder, hisSystematic Theology(Evangelical Association) in 1913; and A. M. Hills, hisFundamental Christian Theologyin 1931. In addition to these a number of smaller works have been published representative of the Arminian type of theology, among which are Bank'sManual of Christian Doctrine(1897); Binney'sTheological Compend, (Binney and Steele) (1875); Field,Handbook of Christian Theology(1887); Ellyson, New Theological Compend(1905); Lowrey,Positive Theology(1853); Weaver,Christian Theology(1900) The Lutheran and Reformed Churches in the United States have depended largely upon German sources for their theological teaching. Knapp,Lectures on Christian Theologywas translated by Leonard Woods (1831) and widely read in America. Nitzsch,System of Christian Doctrine(1849); Martensen,Christian Dogmatics, a Danish work translated from the German by William Urwick (1892); Van Oosterzee,Christian Dogmatics(translated 1874), and Schmid,Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church(translated 1876) represent the principal evangelical works of Lutheranism. A more recent work, published in the United States is Stump,The Christian Faith(1932) The theologians of the Reformed Church represent two different schools. The Older Calvinism is represented by Charles

Hodge (1797-1878)Systematic Theology; A. A. Hodge, the son (1823-1886)Outlines of Theology; Robert J. Breckinridge (1800-1871)The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered(1859) andThe Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered(1860); William G. T. Shedd (1820-1894)Dogmatic Theology; Henry B. Smith (1815-1877)Introduction to Theology(1883),Systematic Theology(1884), a representative of the Christocentric viewpoint. These writers hold to the views of human depravity and divine grace as advocated by Augustine and Calvin and for this reason were known popularly as the Old School. The New School modified the older Calvinistic positions through a succession of writers from Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) to Horace Bushnell (1802-1876). These writers follow Jonathan Edwards in the following order: Joseph Bellamy (17191790), Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803), Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), Nathanael Emmons (1745-1840), Leonard Woods (1774-1854), Charles G. Finney (1792-1875), Nathaniel W. Taylor (1786-1858) and Horace Bushnell, who held to a more or less Sabellian view of the Trinity, and to the moral influence theory of the atonement

Other works of Reformed writers, are Gerhart,Institutes of the Christian Religion, William Adams Brown,Christian Theology in Outline(1906); Pond,Lectures on Christian Theology(1867); Dickie,Organism of Christian Truth(1930); John MacPherson,Christian Dogmatics(1898), and James Orr, Christian View of God and the World(1893) The Baptist theologians are A. H. Strong,Systematic Theology(1907), Alvah Hovey, Outline of Christian Theology(1870), William Newton Clarke,An Outline of Christian Theology(1917); Ezekiel Gilman Robinson,Christian Theology(1894); J. P. Boyce,Abstract of Systematic Theology(1887) The Anglican Theology is represented by PearsonOn the Creed, Burnet,The Thirty-nine Articles, Bicknell,Thirty-nine Articles(a more recent work 1919, last edition 1936), Hall,Dogmatic Theology(a complete treatise in ten volumes), Mortimer,Catholic Faith and Practice, Lacey, Elements of Christian Doctrine,Percival,A Digest of Theology, Mason,The Faith of the Gospel, Litton,Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, William and Scannell,A Manual of Catholic Theology, and Darwell Stone,Outline of Christian Dogma

04. Chapter 5 - THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

Chapter 5 - THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

Christian Theology as the science of the Christian religion, brings us at once to a consideration of its first underlying postulate, the fundamental nature of religion. The word religion is simply the Latin wordreligiobrought over into the English language, and is derived fromreligerewhich means literallyto go over again, orto carefully ponder. In the free translation of MacPherson it means "a careful reconsideration, a brooding over, a giving of the mind and all the faculties to a study of what seems to call for respectful and reverential inquiry." Lactantius held that the word is derived fromreligare,to bind backand therefore was significant of the personal relationship existing between man and his Creator. While most etymologists follow Cicero in rejecting this definition, Dr. Pope makes use of the two explanations together in describing the nature of religion. Following Lactantius, religion signifies "the eternal bond which binds man to God" and is therefore the relation of the human creature to the Supreme Creator, as acknowledged and borne witness to in all forms of theological teaching and worship; while with Cicero, the exercise of the human mind in pondering and considering divine things is signified by religion, which is, as it were, an instinctive and inwrought aspiration of human nature corrected and purified and directed to its highest issues in the true faith. Thus it is that both the objective and subjective relations of man meet in Religion, which is one of the largest and deepest terms with which we have to do (POPE,Compend Chr. Th., I, p. 1)

There are two other words used in the New Testament to express the idea of religion. The first iseusebeia(eusebeia) which is used in the sense of a reverential fear of God. At first it signified only the careful handlingof anything in a general way, but finally came to mean the careful, reverential treatment of divine things (Cf. Luke 2:25, Acts 2:5; Acts 8:2). The second word isthreskeia(qrhskeia) (Cf. James 1:26-27) and is used in a more outward sense to distinguish one form of worship from other forms (Cf. Acts 26:5, Colossians 2:18, James 1:26-27). A community, therefore, may bethreskos(qrhskoV James 1:26) because of its adherence to prescribed forms of worship; but it can beeusebeia(eusebeia Cf. Acts 3:12; 1 Timothy 2:2) only in the sense of being made up of pious individuals. This is further evidenced by the fact that the adjective ofeusebeia, eusebhV (Cf. Acts 2:5) is translated in our English version by the words "devout" and "godly" while the substantive is translated "godliness."

Definitions of Religion. In its essential idea, religion is a life in God. Stewart defines it as "fellowship with God"; Sterrett as "the reciprocal relation or communion with God and man, involvingFirst,revelation; andSecond,faith"; while William Newton Clarke, followed by William Adams Brown, defines it as "the life of man in his superhuman relations." Herbert Spencer maintained that "religion is ana prioritheory of the universe," to which Romanes added the qualifying statement, "which assumes intelligent personality as the originating cause of the universe, science as dealing with the ’how,’ the phenomenal process, and religion dealing with the ’who,’ the intelligent personality who works through the process." Holland makes the following

distinction between natural life, which is "the life in God which has not yet arrived at this recognition that God is in all things, and is not yet as such religious. Religion is the discovery by the son of a Father who is in all His works, yet is distinct from them all." MacPherson says that "religion consists in the fact of a real relationship subsisting between God and man."

Objectively considered, religion is man’s relation to the infinite, and subjectively, it is the determination of human life by that relation. HASE,Dogmatik.

ORIGINANDDEVELOPMENTOFRELIGION The question of the origin of religion has given occasion to many and widely divergent theories. Three branches of modern investigation have centered their attention upon this subject and through observation and research have made valuable contributions. These areFirst,the History of Revelation 1:1-20 igion, sometimes known as Comparative Religion;Second,the Psychology of Religion; andThird,the Philosophy of Religion The History of Religion.Great advances have been made in the study of religion since the publication of E. B. Tylor’s famous work onPrimitive Culturein 1871. Other works which have greatly aided this study are Menzies,History of Religion; M. Jastrow,The Study of Religion; C. P. Tiele, Elements of the Science of Religion; A. Lang,Myth, Ritual and Religion; Frazer,The Golden Bough; Brinton,Religions of Primitive Peoples, and De la Saussaye,Handbook of Religions. The fascination of this study in a field never before opened, led to many hasty deductions and ill-founded theories as to the origin and nature of religion. One of the distinct gains, however, was the collation of material drawn from wide fields of investigation, and its arrangement in scientific form The objects of worship in primitive culture were found to fall into four more or less distinct groups, (1) Nature worship; (2) Ancestor worship; (3) Fetish worship; and (4) the worship of a Supreme Being. As to which of these groups represented the most primitive form of religion was early a matter of controversy. Fetishism was for a time regarded as the earliest form of worship and the root from which all others sprang. The savage, according to this theory, took for his god some causal object of worship, and from this he was led to higher objects such as trees and mountains, sun and stars, until at last heaven became his supreme fetish. Then when he learned of spirits, he made spirit his fetish and came finally to the worship of the Supreme Being. Herbert Spencer and E. B. Tylor maintained that the worship of spirits was the earliest form of religion, butTylor’s system of animism seemed more comprehensive. The term "animatism" has been frequently applied to Spencer’s system which regarded all nature as alive or animated. Tylor, however, regarded nature as "ensouled" in man. "As the human body was held to live and act by virtue of its own inhabiting spirit-soul, so the operations of the world seem to be carried on by other spirits." It was therefore an easy step to the belief in spirits separable from the body, and moving about freely like the genii, demons and fairies which crowded the minds of antiquity. M. Reville advanced the theory that the minor nature worship was the earliest form of religion, while Max Muller and Ed. von Hartmann contended with like zeal for the primacy of the greater nature worship

While hasty and ill-formed conclusions were soon superseded, it is now generally admitted that the most primitive form of religion known to science is a belief inmanaas a nonpersonal, but supernatural force. It is in Melanesia that this idea finds its fullest development. Bishop Codrington says, "The Melanesian mind is entirely possessed by the belief in a supernatural power or influence, called almost universallymana. This is what works to effect everything which is beyond the ordinary power of men outside the common processes of nature; it is present in the

atmosphere of life, attaches itself to persons and things, and is manifested by results which can only be ascribed to its operations (Cf. WRIGHT,Philos. Religion,p. 25). Similar conceptions are found among the pygmies of Africa where the word used isoudah. Among the American Indians there was a similar conception of a supernatural force, which the Algonquins calledmanitou, the Siouxwakonda, and the Iroquoisarenda. Wright asserts that themanaidea may contain a further truth-that of a spiritual Being separate from the human minds whose support is available to men through worship. To him, therefore, mana may be the crude conception by which these lower strata of civilization become aware of the existence of God and the manner in which this assistance is to be obtained The material which enriched the study of historical religion was, according to the dominant philosophy of the time in which it was gathered, arranged on the evolutionary hypothesis. The natural religions were regarded as the basis from which, according to the process of evolution, man rose from animism and totemism to the higher religions of the spirit. These culminated in Christianity as the true ethical and spiritual religion. Hegel in his philosophy of religion classifies the lower primitive religions as the infancy of the race, the Greek religion as its childhood, the Roman religion as its early maturity, and the Christian religion as the full expression of man’s religious nature. We cannot so regard it. John Caird has pointed out that one can never get at the true idea or essence of religion merely by trying to find out something that is common to all religions; and it is not the lower religions that explain the higher, but conversely the higher religion explains all the lower religions" (CAIRD, Fund. Ideas of Christianity, I,p. 25). The origin of religion must be traced back to man’s original constitution. Man was made for personal fellowship with God, and as originally endowed, he had personal integrity and a sufficient knowledge of God to preserve him in the state in which he was created. But with the fall and the introduction of sin, fellowship with God was broken, and man’s mind became darkened through the loss of that spiritual light which forms the true principle of illumination in the things of God. We must, therefore, with Stump, regard the natural religion as "an attenuated and diluted remainder of man’s original constitution and endowment." It is true that these religions possess some elements of truth, but they have lost much of what was originally revealed, and are destitute of the saving knowledge of God The Scriptures regard the degeneracy of religion as a direct consequence of man’s sin, in which he willfully turned away from the purer knowledge and service of God. St. Paul outlines the steps in this decline in the following manner:(I) A rejection of the true God.Because that, when they knew God, they glorified himnot as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things(Romans 1:21-23). Here is indicated (a) A direct refusal to worship God. The rejection is ethical. The psalmist in the expression The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God meant not so much a denial of the existence of God as an ethical and spiritual rejection, "No God for me." (b) Rejecting God and setting himself up in his own right, man conceived of himself in a false independence which destroyed the ground of thankfulness. (c) Man, having lost the object of his worship, did not thereby lose his craving after God, and was compelled through vain imaginations to posit objects of worship for himself. (d) These objects of worship took the character of his own corrupt heart. (e) Through a profession of worldly wisdom, systems of religion were devised which included in their scope, man, birds, fourfooted beasts and creeping things. (f) Evidently St. Paul intends to indicate a gradual decline in the value of the objects of worship, through a blind impulse of a foolish and

darkened heart. Man naturally would be the first object of worship, since in the rejection of God he set himself up in his own right. Dr. Dorner remarks

Indeed, when we examine the history of the ancient pagan world, we are struck by the accuracy of the description which is given of it by St Paul in the first chapter of hisEpistle to the Romans. He asserts that they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man and to birds and four-footed beasts and creeping things. "They paid divine worship to oxen, to crocodiles, to birds and to reptiles. They metamorphosed beasts into gods and conversely transformed their gods into beasts, ascribing to them drunkenness, unnatural lusts, and the most loathsome vices. They worshipped drunkenness, under the name of Bacchus; and lasciviousness, under that of Venus. Momus was to them the god of calumny, and Mercury the god of thieves. Even Jupiter, the greatest of their gods, they considered to be an adulterer. At length the worship of avowedly evil beings became prevalent among them; and hence many of their rites were cruel and shockingly obscene. The floralia among the Romans, their festival in honor of Flora, the goddess of flowers was celebrated for four days together by the most shameful actions, and with the most unbounded licentiousness."-WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology,pp. 33, 34.

that the oriental religions set out from the divine, and attempt to bring God down to the human, issuing often in Pantheism; but the western religions set out from the finite and attempt to lift man up to God, issuing in the deification of heroes (DORNER,Doct. Person of Christ,I,p. 697). The second stage would include the aesthetical and useful, hence the totemistic birds and animals; while the third would extend the deification to all life as sacred, as in some of the forms of religion found in India. (II) The second downward step is a judicial abandonment to a perverse will. Through the lusts of their hearts they desired to serve creatures and creaturely things more than the Creator who is blessed forever. Amen. Unregulated by truth and moved by a false impulse worship became dishonorable even to Man 1:5 physical nature. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen (Romans 1:24-25). (III) The third stage downward is a judicial abandonment to evil affections. Glorifying the unclean and actuated by inordinate and unregulated affection, man degenerated into the abnormal and obscene, the results of which St. Paul presents in the shocking picture found in the next two paragraphs- Romans 1:26-27. Analogous appearances of degeneration are facts which must be taken into account in any theory of religion found in organic life. (IV) The fourth and last step in the decline is a judicial abandonment to a reprobate mind. This St. Paul sums up by sayingthat Even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate

Thus, to select a few instances out of many, the rites of the goddess Cybele were no less infamous for lewdness than for cruelty; and the practice of these rites spread far and wide, and formed a part of the public worship at Rome. Theaphrodista, or festivals in honor of Venus, were observed with lascivious ceremonies in many parts of Greece; and Strabo tells us that there was a temple at Corinth so rich that it maintained more than a thousand prostitute women sacred to her service. WAKEFIELD,Chr. Th., pp. 33, 34. (Cf. STORR:Chr. Relig. SEISS:Apoc. Churches. Other references on Prim. Relig.)

mind, to do those things which are not convenient, being filled with all unrighteousness(Romans 1:28-29). The three judicial sentences cover the entire range of personality in its volitions, its affections and its intellect. Desiring perverse things, they were abandoned to their own lusts; following their own lusts they were abandoned to evil affections; and in their degeneracy, they were given over to a reprobate mind. Or viewed from St. Paul's summary, there was first the substitution of a lie for the truth; then the love of that lie instead of the truth; and lastly, the belief of that lie for the truth. The last stage, therefore, in degeneracy, is to be filled with all unrighteousness, which the apostle proceeds to analyze into its constituent elements (Cf. Romans 1:29-31). The culmination of degeneracy, he finds in those who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them (Romans 1:32). According to St. Paul, then, the depth of wickedness consists in a direct and conscious violation of the will of God, in the clear knowledge of its consequences, and conjoined with pleasure in others who are alike sinfully minded: Thus there is built up what Martensen calls, a "sinful society." The arrangement of the facts in the science of religion does not concern us primarily, only in so far as they are woven into a philosophy which is contradictory to the plain teachings of the Scriptures. The facts themselves, however, are of great value to theology in establishing the universality of religion, and the certainty of its being grounded in the nature and constitution of man. For a time this was denied. Sir John Lubbock insisted that some atheistic tribes had been found among savage peoples, but later writers, with a much better understanding of primitive religion, have refuted this position. Quaterfages says, "Little by little the light has appeared and the result has been that Australians, Kaffirs, Bechuanas and other savage tribes have been withdrawn from the lists of atheistic people and are recognized as religious." Tiele affirms that "No tribe or nationhas yet been met with, destitute of belief in any higher beings, and travelers who asserted their existence have been afterward refuted by the facts (TIELE,Outlines Hist. Relig.,p. 6). Thus the History of Religion becomes a valuable propaedeutic to the study of Christian Theology, and serves to clarify and establish the view that religion belongs to the constitution and nature of man The Psychology of Religion.Another field of investigation has made a valuable contribution to this fundamental postulate - the Psychology of Religion. Like its companion study, the History of Religion, this new science entered with some hesitancy into its investigations, on account of the sacredness of the subject. Once, however, that it was under way, the very novelty of the field commanded the attention of scholars. Perhaps the greatest contribution that has been made to the study of religion is in establishing the fact of the variety and validity of religious experience. But in its attempts to explain the origin of religion it has made many and grotesque errors. These are not attributable to the science as such, but to the antagonistic attitude which has characterized many of its investigators. Many of the errors originate in a supposed projection of the idea of God from some inner human experience. God, therefore, on this basis has no reality. He is merely the objectification of certain inner psychological concepts. Wobbermin applies the term "illusionistic" to these theories of religion, and Knudsen classifies them in three main divisions: Psychological, Sociological, and Intellectualistic The Psychological Theory of Illusionism, with which we are now concerned, attributes the origin of religion to a projection of psychic phenomena. This theory was held by Lucretius of Rome (B.C. 99-55), who maintained that religion had its origin in fear - especially the fear of death. Religion would not therefore exist, were it not for ignorance and timidity. But the theory that men make gods in their own likeness dates back into the dawn of Greek history. It is found in the writings of

Xenophanes, the philosopher (100: 570 B.C.), whose attack was not against the existence of God, but againstthe anthropomorphic conception of God which men held. "If cattle could paint," he said, "horses would describe gods as horses, and oxen would describe them as oxen." For this reason "the Ethiopians represent their deities as having flat noses and black faces, while the Thracians picture theirs with red hair and blue eyes." Yet despite this attack, Xenophanes had a profound sense of the existence of God. "This Deity," he said, "is not begotten, for how can He be born of His equal; how of His unequal. If not born He cannot perish, since He is independent and by Himself."

It is in Feuerbach that this psychological type of illusionism finds its most significant expression in modern times. Here the origin of religion is attributed, not to fear, but to the quest after life and happiness. According to this theory, religion is "man's instinct for happiness which is satisfied in the imagination." The idea of God is "the realized salvation, the bliss of man." Wobbermin points out, that while Feuerbach in the beginning sought only to advance a speculative theory, he at last succumbed to the error he sought to avoid, and gave to the world a completely rationalized theory of religions-a system as completely rationalized as that of Hegel, whose philosophy he opposed. "The necessary turning point of the whole matter is this frank confession and admission that the consciousness of God is nothing but the consciousness of the species." Here one cannot fail to see the influence of Fichte's philosophy of subjectivism, which for a time was popular in philosophy as subjective theism, but which Professor Howison frankly termed "objective atheism." It must be evident to all that the philosophy of Feuerbach furnished the germ of that which later issued in Humanism. Since this theory is closely related to Positivism, it will be given further treatment as one of the Anti-Theistic Theories. But the error of Feuerbach not only issued in

Concerning his illusionistic theory of religion, Feuerbach says, "Man - this is the mystery of religion - projects his being into objectivity, and then again makes himself an object of this projected image of himself thus converted into a subject . . . . As God is nothing else than the nature of the man purified from that which to the human individual appears, whether in feeling or thought, a limitation of evil.

Humanism, it laid the foundation for the modern development of two other theories antagonistic to the Christian faith - Freudianism, and Marxism. The latter of these, however, must be classified as Sociological Illusionism.

Freudianism has greatly colored psychological and sociological studies in recent years. Through its theory of psychoanalysis, it has been closely related to medical science, and has sometimes been known as "medical materialism." Sigmund Freud (1856-1928) was a Viennese neuropathologist. Psychoanalysis, as he advanced it, was purely a medical method of technique. It consisted in an attempt to gain control over the subconscious life, and so of the unconscious forces in the substructure of the psychic world. Psychoanalysts have assumed that there are elementary wishes or instincts that have been repressed in the course of conscious development, but are still latent and may be uncovered. Freud and his followers, however, claim to have found these repressed instincts, almost if not exclusively, in the sphere of sexual pathology. They begin with totemism, which they attempt to explain by what they judge to have happened in the primitive horde of men. This gives rise to what is termed the Oedipus Complex in the emotional life of youth. These formulations claim to be decisive answers to the question as to what is the origin and nature

of religion. Through totemism belated love and reverence were bestowed upon an animal as a substitute for the father; and this feeling for the animal as a totem and representative of the father, was in time heightened and thus arose the idea of God. It would seem that nothing could more exactly meet the description of St. Paul when he spoke of those whoprofessing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. The theory has been exceptionally devastating to the minds of college youth The Philosophy of Religion.Having pointed out the contributions made by the History and Psychology ofReligion, we must now examine briefly the manner in which the philosophy of religion has built upon these fundamental presuppositions its various explanations of religion. These are necessary,First,in order to a proper understanding of the true nature of religion; andSecond,as a basis for the discrimination between a true and false emphasis of religion in the conduct of the Christian life The philosophy of religion has a different function from the science of religion. The former deals with the mental processes of inward development, while the latter is concerned with material processes of outward development. Comparative religion relies upon the similarities found in a community of experience, while the philosophy of religion is concerned with the eternal principle of religion which is manifested within itself. Neither of these can tell what religion is, but only the form in which it manifests itself. Nor can these afford assurance in personal religious experience. At best they can serve only as confirmatory evidences and furnish means of expression. Personal religion can be known only by the religious themselves, and carries with it the assurance of the truth of their convictions.He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself(1 John 5:10). But religion is never belief alone.The just shall live by faith(Galatians 3:11). Life is equally fundamental with faith, and the adjustments of life are an essential element in religion. The broad fact, to which all religion bears witness, is a belief in a higher order, proper relation to which is essential to the right adjustments of life. Here is a sufficient basis for the philosophy of religion, but we are concerned primarily with religion itself and the possibilities contained in it for the development of a theistic and Christian conception of God. Thus we lay the foundations upon which we shall later build our theistic arguments, and gather the material which we shall use in our criticism of the antitheistic theories

Waterhouse in hisModern Theories of Religionreviews nine developments in the philosophy of religion. These are (I) Religion as Feeling: Schleiermacher; (II) Personal Monism: Lotze; (III) Religious Conceptions asValue Judgments: Ritschl; (IV) The Transcendental Philosophy of Religion: the Neo-Hegelians; (V) Mysticism as a Religious Philosophy: Dean Inge; (VI) The Ethical Philosophy of Religion: Martineau; (VII) The Religious Philosophy of Activism: Eucken; (VIII) Pragmatism as a Religious Philosophy: William James; (IX) Personal Idealism: Rashdall. It would take us too far afield to study these various developments, and, furthermore, it is aside from our purpose

Schleiermacher (1768-1834) paved the way for the modern developments in the philosophy of religion. "Wherever a philosophy of religion is found," says Waterhouse, "which arises from the psychology of religious experience, there is a line which runs direct, through many junctions of converging tracts to the fervent speculation of Schleiermacher." He was the first to analyze and evaluate religion for its own sake. Previous to his time, little was known of the true inwardness of religion except among the mystics; since his time, no philosophy or theology can reckon without it.

Schleiermacher was brought up among the Moravians at Halle and was early the recipient of a profound religious experience. His entire system of theology and his philosophy as well, were dominated by his desire to give expression to the work of divine grace in his own. soul. But anchored to this intense religious experience, he allowed himself to wander in the fields of philosophical speculation, so that he has been aptly characterized as "the union of a pious soul with a philosophical mind." The Moravian influence, therefore, did more than create through Wesley, his contemporary, a revival of religion; it created through Schleiermacher, a revival of religious philosophy. The evangelical revival and the new epoch in philosophy, heralded by Schleiermacher, may be justly regarded as two sides of one and the same fact

Like Wesley, Schleiermacher found it necessary to break with the Moravian brethren, but the breach was caused by his intellectual independence rather than by any revolt from their spirit or from their methods. The letters which passed between him and his father at the time he had decided to break with the Brethren and was pleading to be allowed to enter the wider sphere of the University, show clearly enough the agony that he suffered-Cf. SELBIE,Schleiermacher,pp. 18, 17.

Religion is, according to Schleiermacher, a "feeling of dependence." It neither seeks like metaphysics to determine and explain the universe, nor like morals to advance and perfect the universe through the power of freedom. The feeling of dependence leads immediately to the thought of God upon which the soul must depend. Religious knowledge, therefore, is "the immediate consciousness of the universal existence of all finite things in and through the Infinite, and of all temporal things in and through the Eternal." It is to have life and to know life in immediate feeling. When this is found, religion is satisfied, when it hides itself, there is unrest and anguish, extremity and death (Cf.Redenp. 36). Out of this conscious knowledge of a sense of dependence and a personal relationship with the divine is built up a philosophy of religion

Hegel (1770-1831) regarded religion as absolute knowledge. It is the relation of spirit to Absolute Spirit, and it is the Spirit only which knows and is known. Religion, therefore, becomes the standpoint for the consciousness of the True, and God is this Absolute Truth. God is conceived by Hegel, not as a Supreme Being who is back of all experience, God is rather in all experience. It may be said that the sum total of all finite experience is the Mind of God. There is according to this theory but one experience - that of the Absolute. The finite is merely an essential moment in the experience of the Infinite. Religion is not so much our knowledge of God, as God coming to a knowledge of himself through

Waterhouse maintains that Schleiermacher finds the birth chamber of religion in the mysterious moment immediately prior to the breaking forth of consciousness, an instant so momentary that it can scarcely be described as an instant-a term which implies at least a fraction of time, in which sense and object are one and indistinguishable, when there arises the first contact of the universal life with an individual and in Schleiermacher’s own words "you lie directly on the bosom of the infinite world." It should be constantly borne in mind that for him, feeling stands primarily for the unity of consciousness, in which the opposition of knowledge passing through feeling to will, and will through feeling to knowledge, the common relation to feeling forming the bond of connection between them. The sphere of religion is found in this unifying element of feeling. He therefore regards sin as the conflict and salvation as the reconciliation between the God-consciousness and the world consciousness, and this is accomplished by Christ who possessed the

God-consciousness in absolute measure, thereby establishing His perfection and His divinity.

finite experience. It is a function of the human spirit through which it comes to know the universe, or what is equally true, the Absolute coming to full consciousness of itself. The universe therefore is to be conceived as a single huge process in which the Absolute is constantly coming to consciousness, or in Hegel's words, "the Divine Spirit's knowledge of itself through the mediation of a finite spirit." Thus is built up on the fundamental concept of religion, a system of monism closely related to ancient gnosticism. Nor does it differ greatly from the Stoicism of the ancient Greeks. In modern philosophy, Spinoza and Hegel are closely related in their theories of a single Substance

Ritschl (1822-1889) followed Schleiermacher and Hegel, but discounted philosophy as being detrimental to religion. His system has been characterized as "antidogmatic, antimystical and antimetaphysical." While Schleiermacher regards religion as feeling, and Hegel as knowledge, Ritschl regards it more from the volitional standpoint as power. Starting from the fundamental concept of religion, he draws a sharp distinction between the nature of things in themselves on the one hand, and what they mean for us, on the other. Science and philosophy attempt to explain the nature of things, and therefore deal with what he calls "existential judgments." This, however, is not the only way in which an object may be judged. Instead of inquiring as to its nature, we may ask, "What does it mean for us?" From this standpoint it takes on meaning as it affects the subject. This is a "value-judgment." Science and philosophy are concerned with the former, but religion is expressed in value-judgments. Thus he swings over from the idea of feeling or knowledge to that of volition, and

William Adams Brown points out that the sudden downfall of Hegelianism is one of the most striking facts in the history of philosophy. There were two tendencies, one which tended to identify religion and philosophy and developed into a critical movement. The other tended to approach the positions of traditional theology. Men like Daub and Marheinecke attempted to make Christianity the final synthesis, but the elements of conservatism were eventually overpowered by those more radical. Dr. Brown indicates that the clearest expression of this destructive tendency is found in Feuerbach'sEssence of Christianity.

religion becomes a practical affair. "In every religion," he says, "what is sought with the help of the supernatural spiritual power reverenced by man, is a solution of the contradiction in which man finds himself, as both a part of the world of nature and a spiritual personality claiming to dominate nature. For in the former role he is a part of nature, dependent upon her, subject to her, and confined by other things; but as spirit he is moved by the impulse to maintain his independence against them. In this juncture, religion springs up as faith in superhuman spiritual powers, by whose help the power which man possesses of himself is in some way supplemented, and elevated into a unity of its own kind which is a match for the pressure of the natural world (Cf. RITSCHL,Justification and Reconciliation,p. 199)

Edward Caird (1835-1908) and John Caird (1820-1898) are commonly known, together with Thomas Hill Green, as Neo-Hegelians. Following the customary Hegelian procedure, Dr. Edward Caird finds in conscious life, a thesis, the self; an antithesis, a not-self or the objective world; and a synthesis which is God. He differs from Hegel, however, in that he does not make this triad in consciousness, but is more closely related to Lotze, who identifies God with the principle of unity.

He sets out from the basic principle of religion to demonstrate the necessity of God, and he does this by interpreting religion as a rational consciousness. The principle, then, out of which the consciousness of God arises, is as much a primary element of knowledge as our consciousness of the self or of the objective world. The idea of God is accordingly described as "the ultimate presupposition of our consciousness."

Martineau (1805-1900) develops an ethical philosophy of religion. Here one would suppose the Kantian idea of religion as morality would be given a modern turn, but Martineau gives more attention to the argument from causality than he does from conscience, though the latter is not neglected. His idea of causality is that of Will, and that Will regarded as free. He admits of no second causes other than that of created minds

Religion resolves itself, therefore, into "a conscious relation on our part, to a higher than we; and on the part of a rational universe as large, to a higher than all" (MARTINEAU,Study of Religion, II,p. 1). It consists of an inward source, personally revealed, though Martineau regards this as intuition rather than as feeling. "Just as in perception we are immediately introduced to another than ourselves that gives us what we feel, so in the acts of consciousness we are immediately introduced to a Higher than ourselves which gives us what we feel." "I care not," he says, "whether this be called an immediate vision of God in the experience of conscience, or whether it is to be taken as an inference drawn from the data they supply. It is the truth contained in them" (MARTINEAU,Study of Religion, pp. 27, 28) FALSECONCEPTIONSOFRELIGION The philosophies which have been advanced in support of religion have, in most instances, served an admirable purpose. But philosophy has a tendency to usurp the place of religion and as such its influence is always baneful. The false conceptions of religion to which we call attention are such by virtue of an improper synthesis of the factors of personality. True religion must call out the whole personality and in its forms of expression represent a balanced emphasis upon the primary element of feeling, intellect and will

Religion is not mere feeling.We tread on delicate ground here, for the term feeling is used in widely different senses. As Schleiermacher most commonly uses it, feeling is the unity of consciousness in which knowledge and volition meet. It is not, therefore, what is commonly

In order to complete his construction, Martineau produces three reasons for the identification of the Will he has discovered behind phenomena, with the Law-giver revealed by conscience:(1) We unite m our persons subjection to both moral and physical law, inseparably intertwined. (2) Our springs of action are aroused by the external world; the data of conscience are found in life and humanity, and its problems set by the condition these impose. (3) The discipline required by moral law is enforced by physical law. . . . . These two aspects, however, the physical and the moral, are separate only in human apprehension. not in the divine existence.-MARTINEAU,Study of Religion,pp. 26ff.

termed emotion, but the deep underlying source out of which both intuition and emotion arise. Religion is neither doctrine nor ceremony, but experience. It is deeper down than either thought or conscience. It is to know life in immediate feeling. Those who agree with Schleiermacher interpret his idea of feeling in the scriptural sense of theheartor thespirit. To this there can be no exception, but it is not always clear that Schleiermacher uses the term feeling wholly in this sense. Apparently he sometimes means merely organic sensation. He argues that since "religion is feeling," then

"feeling is religion." ’Consequently he maintains that there is in the breast of every man, that which needs only recognition to be religion. Such a confusion of the spiritual affections of the heart with mere organic sensation destroys the very place which religion should occupy, and reduces it from the supernatural to a mere naturalistic plane. This position finds a modern exponent in Horace Bushnell, who conceived of grace as communicated through the natural relations of life, and therefore stated as a thesis, that the child should grow up so as to never know himself other than as a Christian. This theory forms the basis of much of the present day teaching on religious education. Religion is not a matter of unregulated emotion, nor is it "morality tinged with emotion." The religion of the heart must develop into a living consciousness through rational thinking, and must test its validity through action-the processes of which are induced and perfected by the conscience. In the Pauline statement, it isLove out of a pure heart, and a good conscience and a faith unfeigned(1 Timothy 1:5) that is, the stream of perfect love, flowing out of a pure heart, regulated by a good conscience, and kept full and fresh and flowing by an unfeigned faith

Religion is not mere knowledge.Hegelianism has been a determining factor in the rationalization of religion. But it has also emptied it of its emotional content and left it barren and unfruitful. Hegel did not entirely ignore feeling. Like Schleiermacher, he made it the primal element in consciousness, but he makes it tooelemental to be of any worth. Feeling as such, he says, is full of contradictions, the most debased as well as the highest and noblest. The value of religion lies in its rational content. Emotion in religion therefore came under the ban and the feelings were repressed until their sources were dried up The Hegelian triad furnished an unworthy concept of sin. All progress is by means of a thesis, an antithesis and a synthesis. Evil is such on any plane merely through contrast with its corresponding thesis. It may, however, be conjoined with this thesis in a higher synthesis, thus removing the distinctions and forming a new and higher thesis. Sin, therefore, is merely a relative matter. It is only partial good. It is regarded as evil, solely because we fail to see it in its higher meanings. It therefore becomes impossible to hold to the exceeding sinfulness of sin as the Scriptures teach us, and thus the whole redemptive idea is weakened. It is for this reason that Dr. Olin A. Curtis abhors any touch of the psychological climate of naturalism. The emphasis upon development has weakened also the belief in the crises of religion, at least in its practical outworkings. The deterministic position of Hegelianism has given rise to a new interpretation of freedom which regards man as self-determined in the sense that his actions are the expression or realization of himself. This puts the ultimate source of moral accountability in character, which is regarded, not as the result of free and responsible choices, but proceeds from man’s will as the expression of his whole self. Outward authority is therefore minified and man’s will becomes his rule of life

Religion is not simply action. We have pointed out some of the dangers of a disproportionate emphasis upon feeling and knowledge as factors in religion, and it remains to be shown that volition can no more lay claim to the prime place than those just considered. Attempts to identify religion with morality usually date back to the philosophy of Kant with its categorical imperative. While the two coincide, and there can be no true religion without morality, nor no true morality without religion, thetwo must be clearly distinguished in thought. Morality presupposes a capacity which has been developed by practice, while religion is a power bestowed from above. Morality knows no sin as such, only failure or deficiency. Sin and repentance are distinctively religious terms. The moral life calls for no worship and is essentially action; religion, while manifesting itself

in activity toward men, manifests itself also in worship toward God. Morality is primarily obedience to law; religion is submission to a Person. Christianity forever sweeps away all hope of justification through law, for by the law is the knowledge of sin; but as a redemptive religion declares that men may bejustified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus(Romans 3:24). Neither ethical philosophies, metaphysical cults, formal worship nor any other form of religion relying upon self-righteous works can bring man to a sense of deliverance from sin. "You are doubtless acquainted with the histories of human follies," cried Schleiermacher, "and have reviewed the various structures of religious doctrine, from the senseless fables of wanton peoples to the most refined deism, from the rude superstition of human sacrifice to the ill-put-together fragments of metaphysics and ethics, now called purified Christianity, and you have found them all without rhyme or reason. I am far from wishing to contradict you THENATUREOFRELIGION

Having examined the results of both the science of religion and the philosophical developments based upon the history and psychology of religion, we are now able to determine more fully the true nature of religion regarded in its most general sense. Four fundamental characteristics appear, and these may be found, whether in the lowest and most primitive forms of religion, or in the supreme and final Christian religion. No form or degree of religion is without them.First,there is the thought of a supernatural power-God-in the religion of revelation, or gods in the naturalistic religions

Second,there is a sense of need which seeks satisfaction from this supernatural power.Third,there is the idea of reverence, and the feeling that it is incumbent to do homage in worship, and to render willing obedience to the supernatural.Fourth,there is some sort of assurance of the manifestation of God. It is evident that the first three are dependent upon the interchange of relations between God and man; while the fourth or Revelation is recognized as a special favor from God A careful consideration of these characteristics reveal the fact of their necessity in religion. The Supernatural, for instance, may be regarded as the gods in polytheism, or even lower powers in animism, totemism, and Shamanism. In Christianity, there is a clear idea of the personal God as Father. The sense of need likewise may reach to the lowest forms of physical necessity in which divine aid is sought through superstitious practices and for lower ends. The third likewise varies, giving rise to heathen sacrifices on the one hand, and on the other to the loftiest moments of prayer and adoration in Christian worship. The fourth approaches the distinctness of the Christian religion, for only in the Old and New Testaments, given to Judaism and to Christianity as parts of one revelation, do we find a true manifestation of God, and this is in turn dependent upon Christ as the Eternal Word made flesh, thereby bringing to man the glorious and express image of the Father From the time of Barnabas the early apologist, to that of Kant in modern times, it was the custom of the Church to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the Christian religion and ethnic religions, declaring that the former was true and the others totally false. The fact that these other religions contained much of truth was wholly overlooked. With the development of the modern science of religion there has come a changed attitude, and with it the recognition of the true Pauline view so long submerged-that the Gentile religions were "wild olive branches" as over against the cultured branches of Judaism. But neither has St. Paul any place for the modern syncretistic position that Christianity isbut one among many other religions, which are equally beneficial expressions of the profound religious nature of man. While admitting the truth in any and all ethnic religions, he makes a sharp distinction between these and Christianity on a twofold

basis,Firstthe difference in ethical quality; andSecond,the difference in the character of the Founder. The first is found in his condemnation of the heathen religions, a fact attested by all who are familiar with the low moral tone, not only of primitive religion, but also of the so-called universal religions. The latter will form the basis of our next proposition From the historical viewpoint, we base our argument for the supremacy of the Christian religion over the ethnic religions on the fact of its all inclusiveness. Christianity is distinctive and therefore exclusive, because it is absolutely inclusive. "It is not an amalgamation of other religions," says Matheson, "but it has in it all that is best and truest in other religions. It is the white light that contains all the colored rays. God may have made disclosures of truth outside of Judaism, and did so in Balaam and Melchizedek. But while other religions have a relative excellence, Christianity is the absolute religion that contains all excellencies." By this method, therefore, we take firmer ground for the distinctness and finality of the Christian religion, than is possible by regarding it either as one religion among many, or one over against many, and we preserve what is true in both positions

Christianity is the distinctive and final religion. Having examined the false religions, it is evident that there is and can be but one religion in the sense of embracing all truth within itself. "Man is a religious being, indeed, as having the capacity for the divine life. He is actually religious, however, only when he enters into this living relation to God. False religions are the caricatures which men give to sin, or the imaginations which men, groping after light, form of this life of the soul in God" (Cf. STRONG,Systematic Theology, I,p. 23). We sum up our arguments for Christianity as the distinctive and final religion in the following propositions:

1.Christianity Is a Historic Religion. Christianity is something more than a philosophy of religion or a cult of worship. It is not a theory of the intellect but a redemptive power worked out on the plane of human history in the person of Jesus Christ, who, tested in all points as are other men, was yet triumphant over sin and death. It must therefore occupy a place in the history of religion, and be classified with the so-called universal religions which take their character from the personality of their founders. The difference between Christianity and the ethnic religions lies in the character of the founders-the infinite stretch between the human and the divine

2.The Founder of Christianity Is Jesus Christ the Divine Son of God.Christianity takes both its exclusiveness from the personality of its Founder. The argument of the author to the Hebrews is essentially this:God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds(Hebrews 1:1-2). Here the argument is, that in the olden time the revelation of God was partial and imperfect in that it was mediated through human means; now it can be perfect because mediated through divine means. This is the essential difference between Judaism and Christianity. The prophets furnishing only a human mediation, the revelation must therefore be external; being external it must necessarily be ceremonial; and being ceremonial must be preparatory. Christianity mediated through the divine Son is internal rather than external; is spiritual rather than ceremonial, and perfect instead of preparatory. Thus Judaism with its prophetic offices could be only preparatory to the fuller revelation of Christianity. This is brought out clearly by St. Paul, who, being asked what advantage the Jews have over the Gentiles, says, Much every way; chiefly because unto them were the oracles of God-that is, they were the intermediaries between God and the religions of the world. They werethus, not an end but a means-elected for a purpose. Their condemnation lay in this, that

they ceased to regard themselves as a people with a ministry, and made themselves an end in the Revelation 6:1-17 f God, and consequently despised others. But the Apostle John, in the Fourth Gospel, links the work of Christ directly to that of the Father apart from all earthly relationships. Choosing for his words, not the Jewish but the Greek concepts and terminology, he declares thatIn the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God

Paul's argument has been condensed into what amounts to a creedal statement - Our Lord Jesus Christ-the Lord (orkurios) signifying his divinity as the highest term applied to deity;Jesusthe human and historical relationship, andChrist, or the anointed one, as the office or mission of Christ

3.Christianity Is a Redemptive Religion.Throughout the entire New Testament, Christ is regarded in his redemptive aspects. Perhaps the most familiar text illustrative of the purpose of God in the incarnation is that of John 3:16,God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. Paul makes the soteriological aspect of Christ's coming the thesis of perhaps his most outstanding and systematic treatise on theology-the Epistle to the Romans. This thesis is,I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, the just shall live by faith. St. Peter likewise expresses the same profound truth.Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time(1 Peter 1:3-5). To Paul and Peter and John, Christianity was not simply a doctrine but a power. Tothe Jews it might appear a stumblingblock, and to the Greeks foolishness, but to the saved, Christ was the power of God and the wisdom of God. Christ they regarded not solely as a prophet, or a teacher, or a great man, but as a redeemer. Much that passes for the gospel therefore is no more than a system of ethics, or a profound philosophy of life. Anything which stops short of the power of God in salvation, stops short of the place where the message of Christ becomes a gospel

05. Chapter 6 - THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

Chapter 6 - THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

Christian Theology is based upon the revelation of God in Christ, the record of which, in both its preliminary and its perfect stages, is given in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Referring the reader to our basic assumptions concerning the relation of the written word to that of the Personal and Eternal Word, as found in our discussion of the Scriptures, we may here in an introductory way speak of revelation and the Christian faith as the objective and subjective forms of God’s disclosure of Himself to man. But Revelation refers them to God as the Revealer, while the Christian faith regards them as received by men. It is well to keep this before us in our discussions, for thus we preserve intact, both the formal and the material principles of revelation. What God is pleased to make known, man’s acceptance makes his faith. Both the revelation and the Christian faith are coincident with the Scriptures. We do not say identical, for Christian Theology must ever make Christ, the Living and Eternal Word, the supreme revelation of God. But the Holy Scriptures as the true and inerrant record of the Personal Word, and the medium of continued utterance through the Holy Spirit, must in a true and deep sense become the formal aspect of the one true and perfect revelation. Regarding the Scriptures, therefore, as the formal Rule of Faith, our subject divides itself naturally into three main divisions: (I) The Nature of the Christian Revelation; or REVELATION; (II) The Origin of the Christian Revelation, or INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES; and (III) The Evidences of the Christian Faith, or THE CANON OF HOLY SCRIPTURE By revelation, in the broader sense of the term, is meant every manifestation of God to the consciousness of man, whether through nature and the course ofhuman history, or through the higher disclosures of the Incarnate Word and the Holy Scriptures. It thus becomes at once, "the most elementary and the most comprehensive word of our theological system." It is customary to divide the subject broadly into (I) General Revelation; and (II) Special Revelation. Other terms used to express this twofold division are Natural and Supernatural, or External and Internal Revelation. MacPherson suggests the use of the terms Mediate and Immediate former being that made indirectly through the various mediating agencies and instrumentalities, the latter, the revelation made immediately to the spiritual nature of man. While these divisions are more or less conventional, they are distinctions admitted by the Scriptures themselves (Psalms 19:1-14, Romans 1:20; Romans 2:15, Acts 14:17; Acts 17:22-31); and the later and higher revelations of divine truth instead of abrogating them, seem to set them out in clearer light GENERALREVELATION By General Revelation as the term is used in theology, we mean that disclosure of Himself which God makes to all men-in nature, in the constitution of the mind, and in the progress of human history. There is a tendency frequently found among certain classes of theologians, to regard revelation as the divine aspect, of that which from the human plane may be viewed as the ordinary learning process. Thus Lipsius states that all revelation, both as to its form and its contents, is at once supernatural and natural; supernatural because it is the effect of the Divine Spirit in man, natural because it operates both psychologically and historically through consciousness regarded as embraced within the spiritual

nature of man. MacPherson calls attention to this fallacy, and warns us that it resolves itself into practically a deistical theory of God and the universe. More modern views of inspiration, as being merely differences in degree rather than in kind, have likewise proved detrimental to a right conception of the Holy Scriptures From the scriptural standpoint, however, the two terms apokaluyiV or an "unveiling," and fanerwsiV or a "showing forth" or "making known" are applied to the mysteries of religion solely, and not to the mere discoveries made slowly and gradually through the intellectual processes of learning

We have now to set forth in an enlarged manner, the results of the investigations learned in the science and philosophy of religion. These furnish undisputed evidence of the universality of religion, and of its ground in the nature and constitution of man. The philosophy of religion has shown that this natural religiousness of man is itself a revelation, and in its unfoldings, directly and of necessity leads to the revelation of the objective existence of God. Religion takes its moral character from the fact of conscience, by which man knows the fundamental distinction between right and wrong, and this leads immediately to the nature of the Supreme Being as holy. We approach the subject from a different angle, but we reach the same results when we use the term Revelation instead of Religion. Revelation in its general sense is made to man, (I) through nature, (II) through the constitution of man himself; and (III) through the progress of human history

Revelation through Nature.Here we mean the disclosure of God through the physical universe considered apart from man. This we have already pointed out in our discussion of nature as a source of theology. The argument need not be repeated. Nature is filled with the Divine Spirit and reveals God as the atmosphere is filled with sunlight and reveals the sun. But the language of nature falls upon darkened intellects and dulled sensibilities and must be read in the dim light of a vitiated

In this more general application other words are used besides apokaluyiV or revelation: such as fwtizein or the light of the Son in human reason which lighteth every man that cometh into the world; faneroun, or the declaration of the divine glory in the universe, and of the testimony of the Supreme to all men which may be manifest (Romans 1:19) and to the providential guidance of the Gentiles before whom He left not himself without a witness ouk amarturon (Acts 14:17). All of these lower and more restricted or improper revelations and methods of revelation are taken up into Revelation proper.-POPE,Compend Chr. Th, I,pp. 36, 37.

spiritual nature. However, as Ewald points out, "the more God is otherwise known, the more this whole infinite, visible creation declares His invisible glory, and reveals His hidden nature and will," and to this the testimony of every spiritually renewed soul bears joyful witness

It may be well to call attention to the fact also, that otherwise extraordinary experiences become through frequent repetition common and ordinary, and thereby lose the aspect of the miraculous. The most illuminating presentation of this fact which we have found is by Dr. Samuel Harris of Yale in hisSelf-revelation of God-an older work but a rich apologetic for Christian Theology. "Persons sometimes imagine," he says, "that if God had revealed Himself continually and to all men by working miracles before them, it would have been impossible to doubt His existence. But miracles are presented to the senses, and therefore, like the familiar works of nature are a veil which hides God while revealing Him; the mind must pass through them; just as it passes through the sensible phenomena of nature, to the God unseen and spiritual, behind the veil. And if miracles were as

common as summer showers and rainbows, they would attract no more attention than they. It is sometimes thought that if God should habitually reveal Himself in theophanies such as the Bible records, doubt would be no longer possible. But even in the theophanies the prophets did not see God; they saw only signs and symbols through which their spiritual eyes saw what can be only spiritually discerned. Ezekiel saw a cloud coming out of the north with whirlwind and with infolding fire and flashing lightning; and from its amber brightness a crystal firmament evolved borne on four cherubim, with wheels of beryl so high that they were dreadful, and all moving with flashing light and, to the very wheels, instinct with the spirit of life. On the firmament was a sapphire throne, and on the throne the appearance of a man. But if that vision should rise on our view every morning from the north, wherein would that miniature firmament reveal Godany more than the sun which rises every morning in the east, or the firmament with its thousands of stars which wheels majestically above us every night? What theophany presented to the senses can open to view -such energies, such swiftness of motion, such greatness and such fineness of being, such grand and harmonious systems, such powers instinct with the spirit of life, such manifestations of reason, such manifestations of God, as science is disclosing in the physical universe itself. We discover also a certain limitation in the nature of things to the revelation of God through words. Some may think it would be a great help to faith if "GOD IS LOVE" were written across the sky in letters of stars. We might ask in what language it should be written, and might suggest that such an arrangement would imply that the earth is the center of the universe, and that all other worlds exist for it. But were the words written thus, it would still be only an orderly arrangement of the stars through which the mind must look to read its significance; and such orderly arrangements we see everywhere in nature. How immeasurably more significant the revelation of His love which God has made in the life and self-sacrificing love of Jesus the Christ... So the words of the prophets and apostles fall without significance on the ear, until God by His divine action has disclosed their meaning. The hearer must first know God by his own experience of God’s grace, or by his knowledge of God’s action in nature, or in human history, or above all in Christ, in order to understand the prophet’s communication (HARRIS, Self-revelation of God,pp. 70, 71). Here we anticipate our argument for the necessity of a supplementary revelation The Revelation of God in the Nature and Constitution of Man. The next stage in natural revelation is to be found in the nature and constitution of man himself. Man knows himself to be a spiritual, personal being, and in the unity of this personality, he finds three moments or aspects of his being, that of intellect, feeling, and will. Man knows himself also to have a conscience, from which arises a sense of duty to an over Master or Lord. Norcan the root word be entirely overlooked. Conscience is the knowing along with someone. We may say, therefore, that consciousness is the self, apprehending the world and thereby distinguishing itself from the world; and we may say that conscience is the self apprehending God and thereby distinguishing itself from God. It knows further that as a person it is made for fellowship with the Supreme Person. In thinking of creation, the self posits a Creator; and in the idea of preservation, it posits a Ruler. But we are not through with this matter of conscience. Dr. Phineas F. Bresee in his chapel addresses frequently referred to Carlyle’s definition which he would ask the students to repeat with him, commenting on the importance of each word. Conscience is "that Somewhat or Someone within us which pronounces as to the rightness or wrongness of the choice of motives." Were the word "Somewhat" omitted, he asserted, we should have Isaiah’s definition of conscience. What is this which is a very part of our being, which when we have done our best to identify it with our own inner impulses, and know that however intimately

it is related to our selfhood, it is not of our earth-born nature, nor is it an individual possession, but is in its essence, timeless and eternal? Nor is this inner reality impersonal, a mere abstraction or quality, but "a vital, concrete personal Presence." This is What Dr. Bresee sought to impress upon those who were so fortunate as to sit under his ministry. We are driven to the conclusion, that as consciousness is that quality of the self which knows itself in relation to external things, and cannot exist apart from its object in the temporal order; so also conscience cannot exist without a Personal Object in the timeless and eternal order

Referring again to the elements of personality, we may say that God is known to man through his reason, both immediately in his consciousness and mediately through the universe. It is a necessary intuition of the mind. "By a necessary intuition," says Dr. Miley, "we mean one that springs immediately from the constitution of the mind, and that, under Proper conditions, must sospring" (MILEY,Syst. Th., I,p. 68). These revelations are not merely products of thought. "As everywhere diffused daylight comes from the reflection of the light of the sun from the atmosphere and innumerable objects, the mind is illuminated with intelligence by thought reflected from innumerable points of reality around it." Goethe says, "All thinking in the world does not bring us to thought. We must be right by nature, so that good thoughts may come before us like free children of God, and cry, 'Here we are!'" These thoughts are reflected from the objects of the physical and moral universe, and reveal the spiritual and divine that is in them. "So in the spiritual life," continues Dr. Harris, "the knowledge of God is not originated by thinking, but presupposes revelation. And there is a spiritual insight which sees into the significance of the reality revealed. In the revelation of God in Christian consciousness, the humblest mind has a vision of God and of the universe in relation to Him, which ungodly genius with all its powers cannot see" (Cf. HARRIS.Self-revelation of God,p. 87)

We must not allow a mechanistic psychology, or an agnostic philosophy to tie us down to the earth, nor must we lose the sense of reality through a false idealism. "Rationalism dug so deep for a foundation for faith," says Dr. Buckham, "that is buried under the soil upon which it should have built. Absolute Idealism spurned the earth and has always remained in the air. Man is at once a creature in nature, and a personal being transcending nature. The Scriptures tell us that he is the highest of the created earthly creatures from the physical standpoint, and also that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. In this he is the recipient of an imparted life and thus a son of God. Dr. Harris uses the terms "natural" and "supernatural" in this connection, but he does so by limiting the term "supernatural" to its strictly literal meaning as being "above nature," not as divine. The contrast between the human and the divine he thinksis better expressed by the terms "finite" and "infinite." "Man, therefore, as a personal and spiritual being is supernatural. He knows in himself reason and free will and rational motives, the essential attributes of a supernatural or spiritual being. As a spirit, he is like God who is a Spirit; he participates in reason the same as God, the eternal Reason; he recognizes as imperative in his own reason the same law of love which God commands, he can love like God. Thus he has something in common with God, while as to his physical organization he is in nature as really as the trees, is sensitive to its action on him, and so knows it in his conscious experience. In his spirit he is supernatural, is sensitive to the action of the supernatural on him, and knows it in his conscious experience. Thus he knows two systems in the universe, the natural and the spiritual or supernatural. . . . . His consciousness is the center upon which the powers of nature converge

and reveal themselves; it is likewise the center on which the powers of the spiritual system converge, and in which they reveal themselves. Thus he has knowledge of the system of nature and of the rational and moral system, and of their unity in the universe, which is the manifestation of God. The unity of the two appears in the subordination of nature to spirit and its harmony with it as the sphere in which it acts and through which it is revealed. If the physical organization of man is but the form and medium through which the human spirit reveals itself, if all nature is but the form and medium in and through which God and the spiritual system are revealed, the antagonism between nature and the supernatural disappears, but the distinction between them remains; and man by virtue of his spiritual and supernatural powers is participant in the light of the Divine Reason, and is capable of knowing God and communing with Him, of knowing the supernatural and participating in it. Thus man is at once a supernatural being in a supernatural or spiritual environment, and a participant of nature in a physical environment. If we once grasp this reality itwill be impossible to doubt that his spiritual environment may reveal itself in his consciousness through his spiritual sensibilities or susceptibilities, as his physical environment reveals itself through his senses. The spirit will no longer be conceived as ghostly or ghastly, but as essentially and distinctively human" (HARRIS,Self-revelation of God,pp. 85, 86) The Revelation of God in History. The progress of human history reveals the purpose of God in a higher manner than is possible in the constitution of a single individual. This fact, which forms the basis of the teleological argument concerning the existence of God, must likewise be unfolded in our discussion of the subject of Divine Providence. It is sufficient here, however, to deal only with those aspects which will not be included in the later discussions. History is not a disconnected series of events. History belongs to human volition. It is a record of what men have done. But there is an inner directing Presence in history and an Authoritative Will above it which directs all to an expressed goal, a fullness of time. This goal is the coming of the Word made flesh, the Incarnate Son of God standing out on the plane of human history as God manifest in the flesh. In the light of this historical fact, we are able to look back through the pages of history and recognize purpose in its events; and we are able to read the words of the prophets and see their predictions fulfilled. But as the central point of all history, He has had His impress upon it. "The striking and significant fact concerning this fresh illumination of the Jesus of history is that He proves so real and so magnetic to the world of today. Many centuries separate Him from us; mighty changes have swept across the intervening generations; civilization has moved on through diverse periods and vast developments, but the Man of Nazareth is the same yesterday, today and forever in His hold upon men. Above

MacPherson emphasizes the fact that although revelation is a spiritual communication to man, it is not concerned with natural knowledge, and therefore does not take into consideration the niceties of a metaphysical or psychological kind, but only with the facts that bear upon the relation of man to God (Cf. MacPHERSON,Chr. Dogm.,p. 20).

the now curious and outgrown ideas of His time, the meager life, the archaic customs, He rises supremely real, supremely commanding and supremely winsome" (BUCKHAM,Christ and the Eternal Order,p. 65). History in its clearer light of the revealed Christ, sheds its searching rays back along the path and we seethat He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. As in the metaphysical realm, He was the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world, and yet a Light which shined in the darkness, and the darkness

apprehended it not; so in the course of human history he was forever coming to His own, yet His own received Him not. This "somewhat" proves to be in clearer light a "some one," who as the pre-existent and eternal Word, in whose image man was made, by whose power the worlds were formed, and by whose presence the course of history has developed in spite of the darkness and antagonism of sin; so this One must continue until, according to the Scriptures, all things are gathered together in one, both in heaven and in earth, even in Him (Ephesians 1:10)

Watson tells us that Revelation gives information on those subjects which most immediately concern the Divine Government. It must, Watson tell us that Revelation gives information on those subjects therefore, (1) contain explicit information on those important subjects on which mankind had most greatly and most fatally erred. (2) That it should accord with the principles of former revelations, given to men in the same state of guilt and moral incapacity as we find them in the present day. (3) That it should have a satisfactory external authentication. (4) That it should contain provisions for its effectual promulgation among all classes of men. The Christian Revelation therefore must give us a knowledge of God’s will, the knowledge of the Mediator between God and man, Divine Providence, the chief good of man, his immortality and accountability and the future state (WATSON,Institutes, I,pp. 62, 63) The writers of the mediaeval period made this distinction: Natural religion gives truths which can be learned by the unaided reason; Revelation is concerned with truths which are beyond the power of natural reason. Natural Theology, however, has generally gone too far, (1) in claiming for its arguments a stronger and more coercive proof than rightfully attaches to it; and (2) the assumption that Revelation lies wholly without the realm of reason. Thomas Aquinas maintained that revelation operates through an inward light, which exalts the mind to the perception of those things which it cannot of itself attain. Just as intelligence, therefore, is assured of what it knows by the light of reason, so in the realm of revelation it has an assurance by means of this inward supernatural light

SPECIALREVELATION By Special Revelation we refer to the redemptive purpose of God manifested in Christ Jesus, as over against the more general revelation of His power as manifested in His creative works. Some have objected to the idea of a special revelation as being derogatory to the wisdom of God in that it appears to represent Him as mending or supplementing the former disclosures of Himself. The objection is not valid. God created the earth as a theater for the activities of men as personal beings, who indeed as to their bodies are an integral part of nature, but who in their spiritual beings transcend nature. and form a spiritual fellowship. General revelation is basic and fundamental, but from the very nature of things, implies a revelation on a higher and personal plane. Thus by the union of these two forms of revelation, man comes to know God not as mere law, or as force working through law, but as a Supreme Personality, who is not only capable of entering into fellowship with men, but who has created men specifically for communion with Himself. Again, since man has been created for personal fellowship with God, it is rational to suppose that He would make disclosures of Himself through human personality beyond those possible through restricted and impersonal nature. Finally, the fact that sin entered the world as an event later than the creative fiat, necessitates a special revelation if God’s attitude toward sin is to be understood, and His purpose of redemption effectually made known to men. As a corollary to this last position, a special revelation is necessary, because divine tuition must contend against the abnormal consequences of sin as discovered in the apathy, perversity and spiritual darkness which characterize the minds of men. "A single glance," says Sheldon, "at the

tragedy of human sin and folly, ought to dissipate the fiction that nature affords an adequate revelation for man in his actual condition. It may indeed be sufficient to involve a measure of responsibility, but it is not sufficient to supply the highest motive power orthe most efficient guidance" (SHELDON,System of Chr. Doct.,p. 75)

Strictly speaking we have here three grades of revelation-that made through impersonal nature, that made through man as a personal being in a peculiar sense transcending nature; and lastly that made through Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Word of God. It is evident, therefore, that the spiritual nature of man becomes the theater for the special revelation of God. Regarded from the lower standpoint, man represents the culmination of the revelation of God through Nature. Viewed from above, human nature becomes the organ of the Divine Revelation through Christ. In man, the human spirit rests in nature; in Christ the divine rests in the human. From the days of the early Church, there has been a speculative interest in the question as to whether or not Christ would have become incarnate in order to perfect the revelation of God through man, or whether He came solely in His redemptive purpose and power. However we view the question two comings are involved - one in humiliation, due to sin; the other a second coming in glory without sin unto salvation. Whether this second coming would have become aFirst,had sin not entered the world, can be only a matter of private conjecture. We are on safe ground, however, when we consider the revelation of God in Christ in its profoundest depths as an unfolding of the redemptive purpose of God In thus limiting the idea of a special revelation to the unfolding of the eternal counsel of God as it concerns the redemption of men through Christ, we bring before us three salient points.First,the redemptive purpose of God as revealed in Christ;Second,the perfected Scriptures as the final testimony of Jesus to sinful men; andThird,the coincidence of these with the Christian Faith

Christ’s Redemptive Mission.Only in a preliminary manner, and as it is directly concerned with the revealing work of Christ, do we call attention to the nature of His mission. "Revelation proper," says Pope, "is consecratedto the mystery hid with Christ in God, the one secret which it unfolds." To this the prophets bear witness, and it is common burden of both our Lord and His apostles. Christ himself is the sum of all revelati6n,the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power(Hebrews 1:3). The incarnation is referred to asthe mystery of godliness(1 Timothy 3:16); and Christ is himself called theMystery of God(Colossians 2:2)in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge(Colossians 2:3). St. Paul tells us that the knowledge of the glory of God is seenin the face of Jesus Christ(2 Corinthians 4:6). John sounds a deep and authoritative note in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel especially in such versesas In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God(John 1:1); and again,No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him(1:18). And in another place,He that hath seen me hath seen the Father(John 14:9). Matthew likewise tells usthat no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him(Matthew 11:27). In Christ, all the prophets with their lamps, all the priests with their altars and sacrifices, and all the kings with their thrones and scepters, are lost in Him who is our Prophet, Priest and King The Scriptures Contain and Are the Word of God. Christ was Himself the full and perfect revelation of the Father-the effulgence of His glory and the express or exact image of His Person. His testimony is the spirit of prophecy-the last word of all objective revelation. It is

because this testimony is perfected in the Scriptures, that they become the Word of God objectified. Dorner maintains that neither faith nor the Scriptures but only God in Christ, and in the Holy Spirit, is the principle of the existence ofChristianity (principium essendi), while faith is primarily the principle of the knowledge of Christianity (principium cognoscendi); and that for dogmatic theology, faith with its contentsappropriated from the Scriptures, constitutes the immediate material. On the contrary, we must hold with MacPherson, that it is not faith with the Scriptures as its content, but the Scriptures, as the record of divine revelation, which claim acceptance from man. When received by faith in God who therein reveals Himself, the Scriptures become the principle of knowledge, and the Rule of Faith. Francke's position against which Dorner argues, is much more in harmony with the Protestant doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which makes the Scriptures theprincipium cognoscendi objectivum, and then places the believing subject alongside, co-ordinated with the Scriptures as theprincipium cognoscendi subjectivumGod himself, then as theprincipium essendi, binds these two together into ultimate unity. "Christianity thus owes its existence to Christ, the revealer of God, but the knowledge of Christianity is immediately set forth in the Scriptures, which must be received and understood by the heart and mind of the believer (Cf. MacPHERSON,Chr. Dogm.,p. 27) The Scriptures and the Christian Faith.The Revelation of God given to man in the Holy Scriptures, becomes the Christian faith when received by him. We must therefore regard the body of truth as addressed primarily to the principle of faith, and secondarily as presenting its credentials to reason in order to win the assent of those who are not yet of the household of faith. Concerning theFirst,we must now discuss more at length (I) The Christian Book and (II) The Christian Faith. Concerning the second we must give attention to (III) The Credentials of Revelation with its subtopics THECHRISTIANBOOK The first subject in any discussion of the Christian revelation must of necessity be the Christian Book since here alone are to be found its documentary records. This leads us immediately to a consideration of the nature and function of the Scriptures as the oracles of God. Christ the Personal Word was Himself the full and finalrevelation of the Father. He alone is the true Revealer. Not merely His words and acts, but He himself as manifested in His words and acts. In this sense it may be truly said that "the Oracle and the oracles are one." To rightly understand, then, the nature and function of the Bible, it must be viewed as occupying an intermediate position between the primary revelation of God in nature, and the perfect revelation of God in Christ-the Personal Word. If we place at the very center of Revelation the idea of the Eternal Word, and draw about it a series of concentric circles, the first and nearest would represent the Word incarnate or the revelation of God in Christ the Personal Word. The second circle farther removed would represent the Bible as the written Word. It is in this sense that the Bible is at once the Word of God and the record of that Word. The Gospels were given to us by the evangelists who, under the inspiration of the Spirit, recorded the words and deeds of the Christ in the flesh. The Acts, the Epistles and the Apocalypse were given by the direct energizing of the Spirit, in fulfillment of Christ's purpose to give the Church the Scriptures of the New Testament as supplementary to, and a completion of, the Old Testament. It is evident, then, that the Bible bears the same relation to the Living and Personal Word, that our words spoken and recorded bear to our own persons. The third and outer circle would represent the revelation of God in nature and the created universe. In order, therefore, to correctly understand the Bible as the written Word, we must estimate it in its relation to nature on the one hand, and the Personal Word on the other The Relation of the Bible to Nature.The revelation of God in the Holy Scriptures is not meant to supersede His revelation in nature but to supplement it. It is important that we keep

before us, constantly, the fact that the mind rises to spiritual conceptions through the use of material things.That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural: and afterward that which is spiritual(1 Corinthians 15:46). What did we know of spiritual things when we were children? And how could weever have learned them, had it not been for the analogy of earthly things? Is not this the meaning of Jesus of whom it is recorded thatwithout a parable spake he not unto them?(Matthew 13:34). When Jesus would lead His disciples into the deeper truths of the Spirit, He pointed to the lilies by the roadside, the grass of the field, the sparrows. From these observations He leads not directly to spiritual truth, but first to the realm of historical fact and then to spiritual values.Consider the lilies of the field-this is His primary observation, the basis of all scientific investigation.Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these-this is the realm of secondary or historical knowledge.How much more shall your heavenly Father clothe you-this is the spiritual value which forms the ultimate goal of His instruction-a knowledge of the Father and personal trust in Him. There is a deep and profound philosophy here. The Earth and the Bible are God's two texts, each having its place, time and function in progressive revelation. Nature is the primary source of knowledge, the Bible is the supplementary source. Nature proposes mysterious questions, and the Bible in so far as it is understood solves them. The Bible furnishes us with ideals, Nature gives us the tools with which to work them out. The one tells us of His eternal power and Godhead, the other of His mercy and love. Without the Bible the universe would be a riddle; without Nature, the Bible would be meaningless. When Nicodemus desired the knowledge of spiritual things, Jesus said unto him, If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?(John 3:12) The Relation of the Written Word to the Personal Word.The Bible on the other hand, must be considered in relation to Christ the Living Word. Not from themselves do the inspired books give forth light. The original source of the Christian knowledge of God must ever be, the Lord Jesus Christ. To Him as the everliving Light the written word is subordinate. The Personal Word manifests Himself in and through the writtenWord. The books which were written concerning Him by evangelists and apostles bear a relation to His Divine-human life resembling His own spoken words to His Person; and these books through the succeeding ages derive their light and their truth uninterruptedly from Him who is the Light and the Truth. Mystically connected with the Christ of God, the Scriptures continue to be the objective medium through which by the Spirit, the original Light shines into the hearts of true believers. When, however, the living synthesis of the written Word and the Personal Word is lost, the Church thereby sunders the Bible from the spiritual communion in which it perpetually stands, and comes to view it as an independent book, apart from the living Presence of its Author. Divorced from its true meaning and mystical ground, the Bible holds a false position for both theologian and teacher

False Conceptions of the Bible.It is evident that anything, however good, which sets itself up in a false independency and thus obscures or obstructs the revelation of the Living Word, becomes in so far a usurper or pretender to the throne. The history of Christendom reveals three such perversions of divine things. Three worthy monarchs have had scepters thrust into their -hands and were thereby forced into a false and unworthy position before both God and man. The first of these was the Church. Founded by her Lord as a holy fellowship of Christ with His people, the Church was composed of redeemed saints in loving obedience to their Lord. As such, the Church was spiritual and triumphant. Nothing could withstand the power and the glory which were hers in communion with her Lord. But through false teachers and a mistaken concept of the Church itself,

she soon set herself up in the place of her Lord. She became an end in herself, instead of a medium through which the believer could approach to God, and thus a usurper of Christ's throne. It was against the tyranny of a false position concerning the Church that Protestantism revolted. Those who protested did not thereby cease to be Christians, but they did assert that they werefree in Christ, and refused to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage. They insisted that one is their Master, even Christ, and that all they are brethren (Matthew 23:8-10) The next worthy monarch to be forced into the position of a usurper was the Bible. Before the second generation of Reformers had passed away, a movement was set up to place the Bible in the position formerly held by the Church. The Reformers themselves strove earnestly to maintain the balance between the formal and the material principles of salvation, the Word and Faith, but gradually the formal principle superseded the material, and men began unconsciously to substitute the written Word for Christ the Living Word. They divorced the written Word from the Personal Word and thus forced it into a false position. No longer was it the fresh utterance of Christ, the outflow of the Spirit's presence, but merely a recorded utterance which bound men by legal rather than spiritual bonds. Men's knowledge became formal rather than spiritual. The views of God attained were merely those of a book, not those of the Living Christ which the book was intended to reveal. As a consequence Christ became to them merely a historical figure, not a living Reality; and men sought more for a knowledge of God's will than for God himself. They gave more attention to creeds than to Christ. They rested in the letter, which according to Scripture itself kills, and never rose to a concept of Him whose words are spirit and life. The Bible thus divorced from its mystical connection with the Personal Word, became in some sense a usurper, a pretender to the throne

Lastly, Reason itself was forced into a false authority. Severed from its Living Source, the Bible was debased to the position of a mere book among books. It was thus subjected to the test of human reason, and as a consequence there arose the critical or critico-historical movement of the last century known as "destructive criticism." Over against this as a protest arose a reactionary party, which originating in a worthy desire to maintain belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and itsgenuineness, authenticity and authority as the Rule of Faith, resorted to a mere legalistic defense of the Scriptures. It depended upon logic rather than life. Spiritual men and women-those filled with the Holy Spirit, are not unduly concerned with either higher or lower criticism. They do not rest merely in the letter which must be defended by argument. They have a broader and more substantial basis for their faith. It rests in their risen Lord, the glorified Christ. They know that the -Bible is true, not primarily through the efforts of the apologists, but because they are acquainte4 with its Author. The Spirit which inspired the Word dwells within them and witnesses to its truth. In them the formal and material principles of the Reformation are conjoined. The Holy Spirit is the great conservator of orthodoxy. To the Jew, Christ was a stumblingblock, and to the Greeks foolishness;but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God(1 Corinthians 1:24) THECHRISTIANFAITH The next subject in our discussion of revelation is the Christian Faith, which may be defined as the acceptance by man of the revelation of God given in Christ and recorded in the Holy Scriptures. It becomes, therefore, the body of external revelation as surely accepted and believed by all Christians, because they are assured of its evidences, and have made it the ground of their personal trust. It is something more than merely external revelation, it is that revealed truth incorporated in personal life, it is the truth made vital and living by being embodied in human personality. The body of Christian truth is addressed primarily to faith, and only secondarily to reason. As appealing to that universal

principle of human nature, the faculty of believing, this body of truth is the Christian Faith. As related to reason, it presents its credentials in order to acceptance on the part of those who seek the truth The Body of Truth as Addressed to Faith. The principle of faith belongs to human nature as certainly as does reason. Faith- is the highest exercise of man as a personal being, and calls into action the full range of his powers-the understanding of the mind, the love of the heart and the volitional powers of the will. It is that power of personality, deep-seated in its spiritual constitution, by which it is able to accept truth presented to it on sufficient evidences, whether that evidence be consciousness, intuition or testimony. The revelation of God is personal. The Spirit demonstrates the truth to the intellect, the feelings and the will. Furthermore, the divine revelation is always made ultimately to the understanding. It is not always immediately so, for it is frequently mediated through the feelings, or the will. As such, however, the revelation may not be said to be fully personal. If the feelings be overemphasized in our knowledge of God, we have mysticism, which in so far as it insists upon immediate communion with God in the conscious experiences of men, is true and strong. Its chief error lies in the fact that it attempts to limit religious

We are justified, therefore, in holding that the Scriptures of revelation and Christianity, as the Christian Faith, cover the same ground and strictly coincide we have to do only with the general fact that in all sound theology the Bible and Christ are inseparably connected. Not that they are in the nature of things identical: we can suppose the possibility of an Incarnate Revealer present in the world without the mediation of the written word. Indeed we are bound to assume, as has already been seen, that there is a wider revelation of the word in the world than the Scriptures cover. Moreover we may assert that His revelation of Himself is still, and even in connection with the Scriptures, more or less independent of the word. But as the basis for the science of theology the Bible is Christianity. It has pleased God from the beginning to conduct the development of the great mystery by documents containing the attested facts, the authenticated doctrines, and the sealed predictions of enlargement of the Volume of the Book. That Book is the foundation of Christianity; the lord of the Bible and the Bible are indissolubly the Rock on which it is based. We have no other Christian religion than that which is one with its document and records; we have no documents and records which do not directly pay their tribute to the Christian Religion; and there is no revelation in any department of truth of which the same may be said. All revelation is identical with Christianity and summed up in it. Hence, generally speaking, and as yet regarding the Scriptures only as a whole, we may say that the character of Christianity is the character of the Bible; the claims and credentials of the one are the claims and credentials of the other. This observation will lead us by an easy transition to the counterpart of Revelation: the Christian Faith.-POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology,p. 41.

experience to the range of the emotions, instead of recognizing it as rooted in the spiritual constitution of man. It thus excludes the light of reason, and degrades the Word of God by claiming for itself an inspiration equal to the theopneustic utterances of Holy Scripture. It is a direct inlet to the most baneful error, that the body of truth accepted as the Christian Faith was not given from above as a complete whole, but left by the spirit of inspiration to be finished by endless supplements and communications made to individuals. On the other hand, if reason be unduly emphasized, or unchecked by religious experience and historical revelation, it issues in rationalism and falls short of the true knowledge of God. To those who receive the truth, however, revelation becomes an organic whole. To them it is both objectively .and subjectively the Christian Faith

objectively as a body of revealed truth, subjectively as having become their own in faith and assurance. It is more than a philosophy of life, the glory of their powers of reason; and it is more than a tradition received by inheritance however rich that might be - it is the richer inheritance of the Holy Spirit who has quickened their belief into the assurance of personal knowledge and experience. As reason did not give them this body of truth, it cannot

Dr. Daniel Steele describes a fanatic as one who "abjures and pours contempt upon that scintillation of the eternal Logos, human reason. This lighted torch placed in man's hand for his guidance in certain matters, he extinguishes in order ostensibly to exalt the candle of the Lord, the Holy Ghost, but really to lift up the lamp of his own flickering fancy. Reason is a gift of God, worthy of our respect We are to accept it as our surest guide in its appropriate sphere. Beyond this sphere we should seek the light of revelation and the guidance of the Spirit The fanatic depreciates one perfect gift from the Father of Lights, that he may magnify another. Both of these lights, reason and the Holy Ghost, are necessary to our perfect guidance. To reject one is to assume greater wisdom than God's. Such presumptuous folly He will glaringly expose. He who spurns the Spirit will be left to darkness outside the narrow sphere of reason; and he who scorns reason will be left to follow the hallucinations of his heated imagination, instead of the dictates of common sense." "'Tis reason our great Master holds so dear;

'Tis reason's injured rights His wrath resents.;

'Tis reason's voice obeyed His glorious crown; To give lost reason life, He poured His own;

Believe, and show the reason of a man;

Believe, and taste the pleasure of a God Through reason's wounds alone thy faith can die."

take it away. They received it by faith, and hence live and move in that realm whichis the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen(Hebrews 11:1)

Faith as Allied with Reason.The Christian Faith is addressed to the principle of believing in man, and also to reason as subordinate to that faith. God is revealed to man through reason, both immediately in consciousness and mediately through the physical and moral systems of the universe. Basing his argument upon the threefold nature of personality as involving the affections, the will and the reason, Harris points out that there are three elements in our knowledge of the historical, and the rational; and that only in the synthesis of these three is the largest knowledge of God possible. Each of these must test, correct and restrain the others, and at the same time clarify, verify and supplement them. To attain this synthesis is the great problem of religious thinking, a synthesis which can be attained only through the medium of historical revelation. Religious experience and theological thought must center in the living Christ. In Him is life;

There are therefore three elements in the knowledge of God, which may be called the experiential, the historical, and the rational or Ideal. Theological knowledge is the comprehension of these three elements in a unity or synthesis of thought. The historical is the medium for the synthesis of the experiential and the rational. . . . . The necessity of this synthesis is evident from the fact that thought, which recognizes only one or two of these three elements, issues in disastrous error. when the experiential belief withdraws into itself, the result is mysticism. when the rational or ideal isolates itself, the first result is dogmatism; the later result is rationalism. In each case the Bible, as

the record of God’s revelation of Himself recedes toward the background, and ultimately is disregarded. when the historical isolates itself, the result is unspiritual and arid criticism of the Bible, and anthropological and archaeological investigation.-HARRIS,Self-Revelation of God,p. 122

Christianity does not come to men primarily as a system of doctrine demanding the assent of the intellect, but rather as a practical remedy for sin asking the consent of the will to its application. The gospel offers pardon for sin on the ground of Christ’s atoning work, restoration to fellowship and sonship with God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit as the power by which sin may be overcome and holiness attained. The means or instrument by which this is appropriated is faith in Christ-a faith which consists primarily in trust, an act of the will, a giving of oneself in entire submission into the hands of the Saviour. Now this offer can be tested in only one way, that is, by personal trial. It belongs to the realm of inward and personal experience, and those who have fully and fairly tried it have never found it to fail. STEARNS,Present Day Theology,pp. 37, 38.

in Him also are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The Bible as the objective body of Christian truth must be held in solution in theological thought, and through the Spirit must be made vital in Christian experience. The gracious work of the Holy Spirit which awakens faith in the believer exerts an influence upon the whole range of his being. It not only purifies the affections so that they center in their living Lord, but it humbles reason to receive those mysteries which it cannot understand. Nor is this in any sense derogatory to reason. Faith honors reason when thus restored to soundness, and gives to it perfect authority in that field over which reason should preside. Reason approves the evidences upon which faith rests and therefore in the whole economy of redemption the Scriptures of revelation and the voice of sound reason blend into one perfect and harmonious whole. This leads us immediately to the credentials of revelation, presented to the reason as evidences THECREDENTIALSOFREVELATION

Having discussed the objective character of revelation, and having treated it from the subjective standpoint as the Christian faith presented for man’s acceptance, it remains now to consider the subject as presenting its evidences to reason. For this we have scriptural authority. The believer is exhorted to be ready, or prepared, to give a reason or an apology (proV apologian) for the hope that is within him (1 Peter 3:15). So also Luke, known as the Evangelist of the Evidences, addresses

The Christian Faith presents to the faculty by which the infinite and eternal are perceived a system of truth which human reason cannot fathom or understand, against which it naturally rebels. But the same Spirit who opens the eye of faith gives reason its perfect soundness, so that it consents to accept what it cannot itself verify. Here, of course, we regard Revelation as one organic whole, which has for its unifying principle one overwhelming truth, the union of God and man in Christ. Around this center revolve other equally incomprehensible - doctrines; and beyond these in a wider orbit many which are not in the same sense beyond the human faculties. And speaking of the one vast Revelation we may say that it is committed to faith and submissively wondered at by reason. Faith is elevated to receive it and reason humbled to submit to it.-POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology, I,pp. 45, 46.

his Gospel to Theophilus that he might "know the certainty of those things" wherein he had been instructed (Luke 1:4). Here the word epignwV denotes accurate and systematic knowledge. While

the Christian believer has the stronger evidence of thetestimonii Spiritus sancti, he must not overlook the value of the credentials as a means of bringing the unbeliever to listen to the voice of revelation. And yet these external evidences apart from the internal demonstration of truth by the Holy Spirit, cannot have the same strength as the combined credentials and therefore too much cannot be expected of this form of evidence

We present the Credentials of Revelation under the following heads:(1) Miracles; (2) Prophecy; (3) The Unique Personality of Christ; and (4) The Witness of the Holy Spirit

We cannot give attention to the so-called "presumptive evidences" other than to point out that the rudimentary nature of religion as grounded in a feeling of dependence, necessitates such a revelation of God as shall satisfy the natural cravings of his heart. This was the plea of Augustine - "Thou hast created us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." The Christian revelation evidences its value in that it appeals directly to a preparation in the human spirit. Throughout the whole of Scripture, the Voice of the Creator speaks directly to the inner needs of His creatures. The positive strength of the Scriptures, therefore, lie in this, that there is no possible question growing out of created human nature, to which response is not given by the Creator. Again, man requires immediate communion with God in order to preserve him from moral degradation. We have shown that the ethnic religions are the outgrowth of a failure to retain the knowledge of God. It may be presumed, therefore, that God who created man a social being, would provide such instruction as to order social institutions in righteousness. Consequently, not only did John, the Forerunner of Jesus, begin his preparatory ministry with the cry,Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand(Matthew 3:2); butJesus also camepreaching the gospel of the kingdom of God(Mark 1:14). Thus there is given a corrective to the false structures of religious and social life by the revelation of Jesus Christ who becomes the center of a new redemptive order. Thus, also, is fulfilled the ancient prophecy,he correcteth the Gentiles-their chastisement performing the functions of the law in Israel-that of a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ (Cf. Psalms 94:10; Galatians 3:24). Lastly, since the former revelations were imperfect, we may presume that God, who reveals Himself through His created works and in the progress of human history, would perfect this revelation by an authoritative and satisfying disclosure of Himself in His spiritual perfections. Christianity answers as a credential of revelation, in that it is the explanation of all the preparatory disclosures, and the consummation of them all. God has not left Himself without a witness in every age, a chosen company to whom He has made known His will, and these preliminary revelations of truth have at once satisfied human hearts and kindled within them deeper desires and higher aspirations. Christianity comes, then, as the final answer to this continuous expectation. It comes "as the perfecting of its earlier self, the final and sufficient response to the expectation it had kept up from the beginning. This is its supreme preparatory credential. It is the last of many words, and leaves nothing to be desired in the present estate of mankind" (POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology, I, p. 59)

This is in fact, the crowning presumptive argument in its favor, that it is the end and completion of a revelation that has been going on from the beginning. It is not a religion that literally began in Judea with the advent of Jesus. It does not profess to be the first supernatural communication to mankind, it is not the opening of the heavens for the first time. It finishes a testimony that began with the fall of man; in the best sense, therefore, it is as old as Creation. . . . . This is in fact its glory. It is the last accent of a Voice which spoke first at the gate of Paradise. That Voice was the

primitive revelation from the perversions of which all the innumerable forms of mythology arose. But that Voice awakened the desire of the human race to which all revelation has been a response, and has constantly deepened that desire whilst it responded to it, but only in a peculiar line and within a limited area. On either side of that line, and beyond that area, men groped after the lost Creator and the forfeited Paradise in their own way, being dealt with in both justice and mercy. The mercy of the Supreme has in every age guided the instincts of all the sincere. (Cf. Acts 10:34-35; Romans 1:21) POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology, I, p.58.

The Evidence of Miracles. Before turning our attention directly to a consideration of miracles, we need to remind ourselves that Revelation is throughout wholly supernatural. God is immanent in the world, but not in the same sense that He is the Personal Presence in the economy of revealed Truth. Nature, as governed by certain fixed physical and metaphysical laws, must be touched if not permeated by the supernatural. But God is transcendent as well as immanent, and the invisible world and all spiritual interventions must necessarily be supernatural, if they are to bear witness to the transcendent purpose of God. "Hence it follows that the introduction of man into this system of things was a supernatural intervention; and all revelations of the unseen in the constitution of his nature are supernatural; and all evidences of the presence and glory of God in the universe as seen by man are supernatural" (POPE,CCT, I,p. 62). God, as a free Personality, is not merely back of nature as its metaphysical ground, but over it, and free to work within it or upon it according to His pleasure.It is manifest, says St. Paul,that he is excepted which did put all things under him. In a preliminary way we may say, then, that an intervention of Divine Power in the established course of nature, beyond that of creaturely measure, is regarded as a Miracle; while the same intervention in the realm of knowledge is termed Prophecy The intervention of God as a free Personal Being, is not a violation of law nor a suspension of it, but the introduction of a sufficient cause for any effect He would produce. Sheldon points out that the free working of men introduces effects into nature without destroying the integrity of the system, and the higher range of miracles

These three credentials of Miracle, Prophecy and Inspiration ought to be united; they mutually give and receive strength and are strongest when combined. The miracle, of course, is most demonstrative to the extant generations of beholders, the prophecy only to the generations which come afterward. . . . . Inspiration embraces the two in one; it records the fact of the miracle, and as inspiration makes it present to every age; while as inspiration, its record of a prophecy makes the fulfillment as if it were already come or were already past to those who hear it.-POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology,I,p. 98.

has the same effect, so that the greatest miracle is as harmless as the least physical expression of man’s free agency. As an illustration of the harmonious blending of the natural and supernatural, he calls attention to a man who may by his free choice cast a branch into a stream, which is immediately borne on in accordance with the laws of nature, though those laws might never have brought it into the stream. So also the physical effect of a miraculous work enters immediately into the stream of natural causes and is borne on by its ceaseless flow. Miracles, then, do not undermine nature, any more than the stream generates the effect or is turned aside by it (Cf. SHELDON,System of Christian Doctrine, p.106ff)

Miracles are expressed in the Scriptures by a variety of terms. In his sermon on the Day of Pentecost Peter describes the Lord Jesus asa man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you(Acts 2:22). Here are three words used to describe what we commonly term miracles, and the Apostle John uses aFourth,that of "works." The first isdunamis(dunameiV), which signifies "powers" and looks more especially to the agency by which they were produced-which God did by Him. This power dwells in the Divine Messenger (Acts 6:8; Acts 10:38, Romans 15:19), and is that by which he is equipped of God for his mission. The word came later to mean "powers" in the plural, as separate exertions of power, and is translated "wonderful works" (Cf. Matthew 7:22). The second term isterata(terata), which denotes wonders, and has regard primarily to the effect produced on the' spectator. The astonishment with which the beholders were seized is frequently described by the evangelists in graphic terms. Origen points out that the term "wonders" is never applied to the miracles except in connection with some other name. They are constantly described as "signs and wonders" (Cf. Acts 14:3, Romans 15:19, Matthew 24:24, Hebrews 2:4). The third termsemeia(shmeia) is that of signs. It has particular reference to their significance as the seals which God usesto authenticate the persons by whom they are wrought. These three terms, "wonders," "signs," and "powers" occur three times in connection with one another (Acts 2:22, 2 Corinthians 13:12 and 2 Thessalonians 2:9) and are to be regarded as different aspects of the same work rather than different classes of works. This is illustrated in the healing of the paralytic (Mark 2:1-2) which was awonderfor "they were all amazed"; it was a power, for at Christ's word the man took up his bed and went out before them all; it was a sign, for it was a token that One greater than man was among them, and was wrought that they mightknow that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins(Cf. also 1 Kings 13:3, 2 Kings 1:10). The fourth termerga(erga), signifying works, occurs only in the Gospel of John. It occurs frequently in the words of Jesus himself as when He says, though ye believe not me, believe the works"; or again, if I had not done among them works which none other man did, they had not had sin (John 10:38; John 15:24). Taken in connection with the deity of Christ, the term suggests that what men regarded as wonders requiring the exercise of mighty power, were in the estimation of the Lord himself simply works. They required no more exertion at His hands than that which was common or ordinary with Him as Divine. In this connection Trench says, "He must, out of the necessity of His higher being, bring forth these works, greater than man's. They are the periphery of that circle whereof He is the center. The great miracle is the Incarnation; all else, so to speak (Isaiah 9:6), are works of wonder; the only wonder would be if He did them not. The sun in the heavens is a wonder; but it is not a wonder that, being what it is, it rays forth effluences of light and heat. These miracles are the fruit after its kind which

The Hebrew historian or prophet regarded miracles as only the emergence into sensible experience of that divine force which was all along, though invisibly, controlling the course of nature. SOUTHAMPTON,Place of Miracles,p. 18

If we look at a conflagration through smoked glass, we see buildings collapsing, but we see no fire. So science sees results, but not the power which produces them; sees cause and effect, but does not see GEORGE ADAM SMITH, Isaiah 33:14.

the divine tree brings forth; and may, therefore, with deep truth, be styled the "works" of Christ with no further addition or explanation" (TRENCH,The Miracles, p. 6). Donne calls attention to the fact, also, that there is in every miracle a silent chiding of the world, and a tacit reprehension of them

who require or need miracles. Did they serve no other purpose than to testify of the liberty of God, whose will, however habitually declared in nature, is yet above nature; were it only to break a link in the chain of cause and effect which otherwise we should substitute for God, and be brought thereby under

The miracles, then, not being against nature, however they may be beside and beyond it, are in no respects slights cast upon its everyday workings; but rather when contemplated aright, are an honoring of these In the witness which they render to the source from which these all originally proceed, for Christ healing a sick man with His word, is in fact claiming in this to be the Lord and Author of all the healing powers which have exerted their beneficent influence on the bodies of men, and saying, "I will prove this fact, which you are ever losing sight of, that in me, the fontal power which goes forth in a thousand gradual cures resides and is manifested' on this occasion by only speaking a word and bringing back a man to perfect health"; not thus cutting off those other and more gradual healings from His person, but truly linking them to it. so when He multiplied the bread, when He changed -the water into wine, what does He but say, "It is I and no other, who by the sunshine and the shower, by the seedtime and the harvest, give food for the use of man; and you shall learn this, which you are evermore unthankfully forgetting, by witnessing for once or twice, or if not actually witnessing, yet having it rehearsed In your ears forever, how the essence of things are mine, how the bread grows In my hands, how the water, not drawn up into the vine, nor slowly transmuted into the juices of the grape, but simply at my bidding changes into wine. The children of this world sacrifice to their net, and burn Incense to their drag, but it is I who, giving you in a moment the draught of fishes which you yourselves had long labored for. In vain, will remind you who guides them through the ocean paths, and suffer you either to toil long and to take nothing, or to crown your labors with a rich and unexpected harvest of the season." Even the single miracle which wears an aspect of severity, that of the withered fig tree, speaks the same language, for in that the same gracious Lord is declaring, "The scourges are mine, wherewith I punish your sins, and summon you to repentance, continually miss their purpose altogether, or need to be repeated again and again; and this mainly because you see in them only the evil accidents of a blind nature; but I will show you that it is I and no other who smites the earth with a curse, who both can and do send these strokes for the punishing of the sins of men." And we can perceive how all this should have been necessary. For if in one sense the orderly workings of nature reveal the glory of God (Psalms 19:1-6) in another they hide that glory from our eyes; if they ought to make ;1s continually remember Him, yet there is danger that they may lead us to forget Him until this world around us shall prove not a translucent medium through which we behold Him, but a thick, impenetrable curtain, concealing Him wholly from our sight." -TRENCH,The Miracles,pp. 15, 16.

the iron chain of inexorable necessity, miracles would serve a great purpose in the religious life of mankind

Miracles are commonly defined as manifestations of the supernatural which have their theater in the sphere of sense-perceptions. Fisher defines a miracle as an event which occurs in connection with religious teaching, and which the forces of nature, including the natural powers of man, cannot of themselves produce, and which must therefore be referred to a supernatural agency. Dorner's definition is similar: "Miracles," he says, "are sensuously cognizable events not comprehensible on the ground of causality of nature and the given system of nature' as such, but

essentially on the ground of God’s free action alone" (DORNER,System of Chr. Doct.,Sect.55)

We come now to a consideration of the nature of miracles as credentials, and to an examination as to wherein their value as evidences lies. We may say, in a general way, that revelation appeals to the whole body of evidence that God has interposed in human affairs; and that this evidence is so transcendent and extraordinary as to warrant a belief in the miraculous. Christian Faith, therefore, rests a strong claim on the fact that to the whole scope of Christianity, in both its preparatory stage and its perfect fulfillment, there attaches a series of miracles and signs and wonders which no candid person should deny. But in a more specific sense, their value

A created universe which was in itself so perfectly organized that the entrance of the direct agency of God could not be admitted . would be a barrier for God, and consequently, as a creature, most imperfect.-RICHARD ROTRE

Lotze, that great philosopher, whose influence is more potent now than at any other time In present thought, does not regard the universe as a plenum to which nothing can be added in the way of force. He looks upon the universe rather as a plastic organism to which new impulses can be imparted from him of whose thought and will it is an expression. These impulses, once imparted, abide in the organism and are therefore subject to its law. Though these impulses come from within, they come not from the finite mechanism, but from the immanent God. "He makes the possibility of the miracle depend upon the close and Intimate action and reaction between the world and the personal Absolute, In consequence of which the movements of the natural world are carried on only through the Absolute, with the possibility of a variation in the general course of things, according to the existing facts and the purpose of the Divine Governor" (Cf. STRONG,Systematic Theology, I,p.123).

lies in the fact that they are an authentication of the messengers of God to their contemporaries. This seems -to be generally expected by men and was given expression by Nicodemus in the words,Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man could do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him(John 3:2). Here, however, the sign precedes the teaching, while for later generations, the message is the more prominent and the attestation secondary. We must therefore include original miracles with other branches of evidence, and examine more particularly wherein their evidential values lie, this being commonly known as the criteria or test of miracles

Since miracles are signs intended to convey truth as well as to attest it, we may sayFirst,that they must be an integral part of revelation itself. Their evidential value, important as it is, must never be regarded as secondary, and the divine impulse and the needs of men primary. In this sense there is not a miracle in Scripture that does not demonstrate either the power or the wisdom of God, His mercy or His justice. They are never regarded as mere portents, but always faithful to the character of God.Second,the missions which miracles authenticate must be worthy of God. Here again the miracles of the Bible meet every demand of a true credential. The earlier miracles were not only authentications of the messengers of God, but also of the dread name of Jehovah. The miracles of Moses and his economy attested at every critical hour that God reigned. This is equally true in the New Testament as in the older economy. The supreme miracle, however, is that of the Divine Person, which because of its importance must be considered as a separate credential.Third, as credentials, miracles must allow the application of proper criteria in the case of

those who witnessed them, and must be supported by such evidence as their posterity may demand. Our Lord recognized this when He said,I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort and in secret have I said nothing(John 18:20). What was true of His wordswas equally true of His miracles. As to the historical evidences for posterity, there are no events which have been better substantiated, or more circumstantially attested than the whole range of central miracles. Of these the resurrection was crucial, the establishment of which assured all the rest. This was guaranteed by many infallible proofs, and believed by a large body of mentally sound and conscientious persons, many of whom sealed their faith with their blood. Again, the miracles are witnessed by their connection with public monuments. As the Passover was an abiding testimony to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, so the Lord’s day is an undeniable testimony to the resurrection of Christ. So also the Church as an institution is a perpetual memorial of Christ’s life, death and resurrection, and has been so regarded from the earliest time to the present.Fourth,there is a credential or postulate which belongs to faith more specifically than to reason - that which regards the miracles as the economy of a supernatural order. This we have discussed in the opening paragraphs of this chapter. Two questions arise,First,the undeniable occurrence of what the Scripture terms "lying miracles" and which admit that these things are permitted for reasons too incomprehensible for us to understand. They are readily identified as being out of harmony with the character of God and are a stumbling block to those only whose faith does not recognize this clear distinction. We are commanded to try the spirits and John gives us the distinguishing test.Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and 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(1 John 4:2-3). Here the test is ethical and spiritual. That which admits the incarnation as a divine revelation of God to man, and is in conformity with the spirit and purpose of Jesus Christ in His life among men, is of God. That which is out of harmony with character and works of Christ is not of God. This test is infallible

Second,there is the question of the continuation of miracles in the Church. To a faith, however, that views miracles as belonging to a supernatural economy, and God as an Infinite Personality over against a mere philosophical Absolute, or a metaphysical ground of Reality, there is no occasion for doubting that God, according to His good pleasure, may endow His servants with the gift of prophecy or of miracle

Prophecy as a Credential of Revelation.Prophecy, like miracle, is vitally connected with revelation. Unlike it, however, prophecy is cumulative in its evidential value, each fulfilled prediction becoming the basis for further prediction. As a credential, therefore, it is of the highest order. Prophecy may be defined as a declaration, a description, a representation, or a prediction of that which is beyond the power of human wisdom to discover. The primary meaning of the word is "forth-telling" by which is meant the declaration of the will of God without special reference to the time order. It is also used in the narrower sense of prediction or "foretelling," this latter being the meaning most commonly attached to it in ordinary speech. There are two Hebrew words applied to the prophets also. The earliest is that ofseer, which carries with it the implication that the prophets received their messages through visions from the Lord. The second term isannouncer, and directs the thought more to the message itself. This message, however, was not merely the expounding of the law

already given, as was done by the priests, but a fresh utterance from the Lord, a supernatural and authoritative disclosure of divine truth. There is a reference to this distinction in 1 Samuel 3:1 where it is statedthat the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was

No divine act can contradict divine righteousness. By the verdict of the Bible, no impure wonder-worker has any claim to credence. All marvels, in proportion as they are not plainly linked with the holy ends, are properly subject to doubt, while those which are discovered to be antagonistic to moral interests are but lying wonders, products of human or diabolical fraud. In general it may be affirmed that an increased demand is placed upon testimony' in the measure that any supposed case of miracles fails to meet either of the two other tests.-SHELDON,System of Christian Doctrine,p. 107ff.

no open vision.Whether, therefore, a vision was presented to the interior eye of faith, or whether the truth was lodged in the understanding, the prophet in his utterance performed what in another domain would be called miracle, and what in the realm of prophecy is frequently termed a "miracle of knowledge."

Prophecy as prediction is the divine impartation of future knowledge. It is plain from the whole' tenor of the Scriptures, that prophecy in this sense of foreannouncement was intended to be a permanent credential in the Church. God in speaking through Isaiah the prophet sanctions this form of credential.Remember the former things of old; he says, for I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning or, futurity from the former time and from ancient times to the things that are not yet done(Isaiah 46:9-10). Our Lord gives the same sanction for the New Testament.And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass ye might believe(John 14:29). But prediction itself follows certain well-defined principles. Dr. Pope in his excellent discussion of this subject calls attention to four of these laws of prophetic prediction. (1)Christ is its Supreme Subject. It is to Him that all the prophets give witness (Acts 10:43). "Nothing is more certain in the annals of mankind," he says, "than that a series of predictions runs through the ancient literature of the Jews which has had a most exact fulfillment in the advent and work of Jesus. This is the supreme credential of prophecy in revelation." (2)The Law of Progression. According to this principle, each age is under the sway of some governing prophecy, the accomplishment of which introduces a new order of prophetic expectation. Thus the first period of prophecy was from the protevangelium, which was the first prophecy with promise, to that of the exilic prophets, the theme being the gospel which binds time and eternity into one and commands the whole scope of redemption. The second prophetic period was from the exile to "the last days" or the "fullness of time," when all the prophecies were gathered upand fulfilled in Christ. Three things characterize the prophecy of this period, "the voice of the Son" (Hebrews 1:2), the Atoning Blood (1 Peter 1:11; 1 Peter 1:20), and "the Effusion of the Spirit" (Acts 2:17). With Christ the supreme fulfillment, a new age of prophecy begins, and to His second coming we now bear the same relation, as did the ancient Jews in their expectation of the Messiah. (3)The Law of Reserve,by which He has so ordered that in every prediction, and every cycle of predictions, sufficient truth is given to encourage hope and anticipation, and enough concealed to shut up the prediction to faith. "Every generation could rejoice in the fulfillment of the prophecies that had gone before concerning itself; but as to its own future it was under the sway of an indefinite hope. There is no exception to this law throughout the economy of prophecy" (Cf. POPE,CCT, I,p. 83). (4) Prophecy has been constituted a sigh to each succeeding generation.The

books of the prophets furnish an inexhaustible fund of information and instruction apart from the predictive elements, and this makes it clear that prophecy was intended to be an abiding credential throughout the whole course of time The Unique Personality of Christ.The supreme credential of Christianity is Christ. He is the Great Fulfillment of all prophecy. In Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Colossians 2:3). To Him also is given all power in heaven and in earth .(Matthew 28:18). In Him Revelation becomes essentially an organism of redemption. In His sacred presence, the sphere of miracle is immediately enlarged. His advent was a miracle, and His words and works, His life, death, resurrection and ascension were but a continuation of this one great miracle. In Him there is an immediate act of divine omnipotence and an immediate display of divine omniscience, both of which find their expression in the redemptive economy. Here it may be clearly seen that miracle is essential to redemption, and without it there can be no genuine Christian revelation

We may be permitted now to lift our discussion of miracles to a higher plane, and to consider them from ascriptural rather than a philosophical viewpoint. Since the evangelists could not record all the miracles of our Lord (John 20:30) a careful analysis shows that the recorded miracles were selected according to a twofold plan,First,their theandrical considerations as Pearson uses the term; andSecond,for their evidential value. By the first is meant a consideration of miracles as the outflow of Christ's nature or as an influence radiating from His Person. The great miracle is the hypostatic union before which the miracles of nature pale into comparative insignificance. Hence the Evangelists regard the miracles of Christ as having their source in this hypostatic union. This is perhaps expressed most simply in the healing of the woman who touched the hem of Christ's garment and virtue went out from Him (Mark 5:30); and again whenthe whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all(Luke 6:19). The aim of the miracles was to manifest the glory of God, this being expressly stated in the first miracle of Cana in Galilee (John 2:11). The transfiguration revealed the majesty of Christ (Matthew 17:1-8, 2 Peter 1:16-18; the raising of Lazarus was for the inspiration of faith in His power (John 11:15); while the high priestly prayer of Jesus (John 17:1-26) has as its supreme purpose the glory of the Father (Cf. John 17:1; John 17:4-6; John 17:26). The miracles of Christ were a revelation also of His mercy, not merely as transitory and dissociated acts of sympathy, but the deep and abiding principle which characterizes the whole work of redemption. Both Irenaeus and Athanasius taught that the works of Christ were manifestations of the Divine Word, who in the beginning made all things, and who in the incarnation displayed His power over nature and man. These works include both a manifestation of the new life imparted to man, and a revelation of the character and purposes of God (Cf. John 1:14). We must therefore, regard the redemptive purpose of the miracles in the same light as the doctrine and life of the Eternal Son of God. In the second place, as indicated above, the miracles were selected for their evidential value. This follows naturally from the previous discussion. Referring again to the miracle of Cana, it is recorded that because of this the disciples believed in him. Jesus himself constantly referred to His works as evidences of His deity and His mission, declaring that they had greater value than the testimony of John the Baptist (John 20:31). While a few miracles have been selected and the details given more or less minutely, it must be borne in mind that for the people living in the time of Christ, the multitude of unrecorded miracles had great bearing on His mission

Prophecy also takes on a new aspect when considered in direct relation to the unique personality of Christ. What earthly biography was ever preceded by such a preface as that furnished our Lord in the Messianic prophecies. For a thousand years, a picture was gradually unfolded of One who should be Son of man and Son of God; and who should within His unique personality manifest the full range of both divine and human attributes in glorious harmony. The rough outline given at the very gates of Eden was filled in by more than a

Are the miracles, then, to occupy no place at all in the array of proofs for the certainty of the things which we have believed? On the contrary, a most important place. we should greatly miss them if they did not appear in sacred history, for they belong to the very idea of a Redeemer, which would remain most incomplete without them. We could not without having that idea infinitely weakened and impoverished, conceive of Him as not doing such works; and those to whom we presented Him might very well answer, "strange that one should come to deliver men from the bondage of nature which was crushing them, and yet Himself have been subject to its heaviest laws -Himself wonderful, and yet His appearance accompanied by no analogous wonders in nature - claiming to be the Life, and yet Himself helpless in the encounter with death; however much He promised In word, never realizing his promises Indeed; giving nothing in hand, no firstfruits of power, no pledges of greater things to come." And who would not feel that they had reason In this . . . . that He must show Himself, if He is to meet the wants of men, mighty not only in word but in work? When we object to the use often made of these works, it is only because they have been forcibly severed from the whole complex of Christ's life and doctrine; and presented to the contemplation of men apart from these; it is because when on His head are "many crowns," one only has been singled out In proof that He is King of kings and Lord of lords. The miracles have been spoken of as though they borrowed nothing from the truths which they confirmed (but those truths, everything) when Indeed both are held together in a blessed unity, in the Person of Him who spake the words and did the works.-TRENCH, The Miracles,pp. 73, 74.

hundred predictions uttered by men of all types and under varying circumstances of time and place. The psalmist describes Him as the Lord's Son to whom the heathen will be given as an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession (Psalms 2:7-8). He will be a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek (Psalms 110:4). He shall judge the people with righteousness and the poor with judgment, and shall have dominion from sea to sea, and His name shall endure forever (Psalms 72:2; Psalms 72:8; Psalms 72:17). In glowing terms Isaiah declaresthat there shall come forth a rod out. of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord(Isaiah 11:1-3). He should have as His mission, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house(Isaiah 42:7), words which Jesus applied to Himself in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:18-21). Jeremiah shared the same hope with the rest of the prophets and exclaimed,Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS(Jeremiah 23:5-6). Micah and Zechariah give utterance to the prophecies which were used during the lifetime of Jesus on earth as evidences of

prophetic prediction.But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting(Micah 5:2).Rejoice greatly, 0 daughter of Zion; shout, 0 daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass(Zechariah 9:9). It is Daniel,however, who gives us the picture of the majesty of Christ, and who prophesies of the kingdom beginning in Him and stretching on into the future when all things shall be put into subjection to Him and God be all in all.I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed(Daniel 7:13-14) The wealth of Christ's person, however, transcends the predictions of prophecy. His historical manifestation exceeds in glory anything that the heart of men might conceive, or that perhaps the prophets themselves could fully comprehend, even when speaking under the inspiration. of the Spirit. One can but sympathize with Herman Shultz, who in commenting upon Isaiah 53:1-12 says, "The figure from which he starts is the actual historical figure of which he has so often spoken. But he is raised above himself. The figure which he beholds is embodied in an ideal figure in which he sees salvation accomplished, and all the riddles of the present solved. If it is true anywhere in the history of poetry and prophecy, it is true here, that the writer, being full of the Spirit, has said more than he himself meant to say, and more than he himself understood" (SCHULTZ,Old Testament Theology, II,pp. 431-433). That God should Himself create a living creature in His own image, a reflection of Himself is glorious; but that God himself in the Person of His Son should appear in the flesh and take upon Him the likeness of men transcends in glory all other manifestations human or divine. When we consider that the Incarnation was in itself redemptive as representing a new order of creation; and that it was provisional in its relation to the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension; and further, that to this glorious being was given the power of so transforming a sinful creature as to bring him into possession of the divine holiness, andso exalt a debased and groveling worm of the dust that he shall sit with Him on the throne of His majesty; then, this is not only indescribable but inconceivable. Yet here the glory of God and the glory of man are conjoined. In Him we find not only our calling's glorious hope, but in Him likewise are made the praise of His glory The Witness of the Holy Spirit.The last and highest evidence of revelation is found in the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and His witness to sonship in the hearts of individuals. It must be constantly kept in mind that the Holy Spirit was not given to supersede Christ, but to enlarge and make more effective the work begun in the Incarnation. The spiritual Christ, or the Christ of the Holy Ghost, is not less personal than the historical Christ, nor is He less potent, but rather more potent than when tabernacling in the flesh. This our Lord himself conceded when He said to His disciples,I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!(Luke 12:50). In His farewell address, therefore, our Lord promises the Comforter to His disciples saying,It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you(John 16:7). This Comforter is the Spirit of truth, which proceeds from the Father and testifies of Christ (John 15:26); He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment(John 16:8) and shall glorify Christ, speaking not of Himself, but receiving from Christ the things to be revealed to the disciples (John 16:14) The early Church recognized this testimony as

its strongest evidence. Peter in his sermon at Pentecost declares, This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses, and follows this with his testimony concerning the Holy Ghost as the promise of the exalted Christ. This is stated with even greater clearness in his address to the council, where he declares thatWe are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost. whom God hath given to them that obey him(Acts 2:32-33; Acts 5:32). The Apostle Paul builds a strong argument upon the witness of the Holy Ghost, maintainingthat the presence of unbelief as regards the Christian revelation is directly due to the rejection of the Spirit. He reminds the Corinthiansthat No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost(1 Corinthians 12:3). He declares further, that his preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdombut in demonstration of the Spirit and of power;that theirfaith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God(1 Corinthians 2:3-4). Here St. Paul bears witness to a principle which is found throughout the Scriptures, that the Christian revelation is a gift of God, bestowed in connection with the prudent and prayerful use of our human faculties. John in his first epistle cites the double witness of the human and the divine. He opens his epistle by referring to thatwhich we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life(1 John 1:1); but adds tothis if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater(1 John 5:9). As to the nature of this witness he says,it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth(1 John 5:6). But close attention to the apostle's thought shows that not only the individual believerhath the witness in himself(1 John 5:10); but that the Holy Spirit witnesses to the entire objective economy of salvation, both the water and the blood. The water evidently refers to Christ's baptism, by which He entered upon a new order of ministry and opened a new order of life to the believer; and the blood refers to the atonement by which full propitiation was made for the sins of the past. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews likewise bears witness to the objective work of Christ.But this man,he says,after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us(Hebrews 10:12-15). Here the Holy Spirit is regarded not in the specific sense as witnessing to the salvation of the individual believer, though this is included, but inthe more general sense of attesting the truth of the atoning and intercessory work of Jesus Christ. The weight of this evidence as the writer regards it, and as the Church has ever received and borne witness to it, is best shown in the exhortation with which we close this discussion of the credentials of revelation.See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven(Hebrews 12:25-26)

Works on prophecy are numerous. Ralston treats the subject under three main heads, (I) Prophecies in relation to the Jews; (II) Prophecies in relation to Nineveh, Babylon and Tyre; and (III) Messianic Prophecies. Watson states that there are more than one hundred references to the Messiah in the various prophecies, and discusses several of these at great length. Riehm in his work onMessianic Prophecycites such references as 1 Kings 22:17-36 where it was predicted that Ahab and Josiah would be defeated by the Syrians; Isaiah 7:18-25; Isaiah 8:5-7 that Rezin and Pekah would not succeed in taking Jerusalem; also Isaiah 7:18-25 where Assyria would afflict Judah; and the destruction of Sennacherib's army 14:24-27. Jeremiah predicted the overthrow of the Jewish kingdom (Jeremiah 5:15-18) and also the return after seventy years (Jeremiah 25:12).

-A. KEITH, "Evidences from Prophecy" is one of the older but authoritative books on this subject. Another of the older and standard works is Home's "Introduction to the Scriptures" which has in the Appendix a large collection of the prophecies and their fulfillment.

06. Chapter 7 - THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE

Chapter 7 - THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE

Religion and Revelation as we have seen, indicate the particular sphere in which the material of theology is to be sought. They must, therefore, in their application to religious faith in general, be regarded as more inclusive than Christian Theology. But these must be regarded in the broader sense of religious faith in general, rather than that of Christian Theology. The latter, as the science of Christianity, is based upon the documentary records of God’s revelation of Himself in Christ Jesus. The Holy Scriptures are thus recognized by all schools asthe fons primariusor true source of Christian Theology. They are the documents of the Christian religion, the depository of the Christian revelation. It is evident, therefore, that we should direct our inquiry to the nature and authority of the Holy Scriptures, which contain both the records of historical development and the finished result of divine revelation. This authority lies in the fact that they are an inspired revelation of God to man. They are divine in their origin-the product of the Holy Spirit’s inspiration. In a theological sense, then, inspiration signifies the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the writers of the books of the Bible in such a manner that their productions become the expression of God’s will. It is by this means that the Scriptures become the Word of God

Definitions of Inspiration.Having pointed out the general nature of inspiration, it remains for us to define it more specifically, and to point out the varying uses of the term. The term "inspiration" is derived from the Greek wordtheopneustos, which signifies literally, "the breathing of God," or "the breathing into," and is therefore "that extraordinary agency of the Holy Spirit upon the mind in consequence of which the person who partakes of it is enabled to embrace and communicate the truth of God without error, infirmity, or defeat" (DR.HANNAH). And this must be understood to apply to the subjects of communication whether immediately revealed to them, or with which they were before acquainted. "By inspiration," says Farrar, "We mean that influence of the Holy Spirit which, when inbreathed into the mind of man, guides and elevates and enkindles all his powers to their highest and noblest exercises." Pope defines it as "the inbreathing of God and the result of it." Strong shifts the emphasis of inspiration from a mode of the divine agency to the body of truth which is a product of this agency; and further, he holds that inspiration applies only to the whole body of Scripture when taken together, each part being viewed in connection with what precedes and what follows. His definition is as follows: "Inspiration is that influence of the Spirit of God upon the minds of the Scripture writers which made their writings the record of a progressive divine revelation, sufficient when taken together and interpreted by the same Spirit who inspired them, to lead every honest inquirer to Christ and salvation." In an earlier but scholarly work entitled, The Inspiration of Scripture, William Lee takes essentially the same position, maintaining that "the various parts of Holy Scripture, in order to be rightly understood, or justly valued, must be regarded as the different members of one vitally organized structure; each performing its appropriate function, and each conveying its own portion of truth. . . . . Had there been but one Gospel, the Church’s teaching might have been, in like manner, one-sided. From the Gospel of St. Matthew the higher nature of Christ could not have been so clearly proved to the Ebionites, as

from that of St. John; while the former was better

"By Inspiration we understand that actuating energy of the Holy spirit, guided by which the human agents chosen by God have officially proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.-FIELD, Handbook of Christian Theology,p. 53

"On this subject the common doctrine of the Church is, and ever has been, that inspiration was an influence of the Holy spirit on the minds of certain select men, which rendered them the organs of God for the infallible communication of His mind and will. They were In such a sense the organs of God, that what they said, God said."-HODGE,Systematic Theology,p. 154.

calculated to oppose the dreams of the Gnostics. But the four Gospels, having been combined in the Canon, the Church has thus been defended on all sides. Hence the Gospels were well termed by an early father (Irenaeus) the four pillars of the Church, each supporting its own portion of the structure, and guarding it from subsiding into any of those forms of false doctrine to which partial views of the truth had given rise" (pp. 31, 32). While the views of the Church concerning the theories have varied widely, there is no subject on which there has been a closer agreement as to the fact of inspiration itself. This we may summarize in this general definition, Inspiration is the actuating energy of the Holy Spirit by which holy men chosen of God have officially proclaimed His will as revealed to us in the sacred Scriptures

Inspiration and Revelation. By Revelation we understand a direct communication from God to man of such knowledge as is beyond the power of his reason to attain, or for whatever cause was not known to the person who received it. By Inspiration we mean the actuating energy of the Holy Spirit through which holy men were qualified to receive religious truth, and to communicate it to others without error. The disclosure of the mind of God

"But whence the title Holy Scriptures?" inquires William Lee. "Traced to its true source, this notion depends upon the fact, that the ideas of the Eternal word, and of the Divine Spirit, are here to a certain degree correlative. The Word as divine and eternally creative, has the Spirit as the divine and eternally animating principle, in and with Himself. By. the agency of the Divine Spirit the meaning and will of the Eternal word are introduced into the real being of things. All divine activity In the world is organic. So also the arrangements of God’s Revelation form a system which comprehends all things; which aids In bringing light into darkness; whose center is Christ, to whom every revelation in earlier times must be referred, and from every revelation, of a later period, has proceeded, by virtue of that Holy Spirit imparted through Him to the world. This agency of the Holy Spirit, by the very force of the term, forms the essence of the idea of inspiration; and the two conceptions thus pointed out, of the Eternal word as the Divine Person who reveals, and of the Holy Spirit as the Divine Person who inspires, are the pillars upon which must rest any theory respecting the Bible and its origin which can deserve serious notice.-WILLIAM LEE,The Inspiration of the Scripture,pp. 25, 26. In God as Logos, Word and Act are ever united: He spake, and it was done, He commanded, and it stood fast (Psalms 33:9) The transition to a written document, composed according to God’s will, can detract in no respect from the power and efficacy of His Word. On this assumption rests the whole notion of Inspiration.-RUDELBACH (Cf. LEE,Inspiration,p. 25).

to man is Revelation when viewed from the standpoint of the truth unveiled; it is Inspiration when viewed in relation to the methods of its impartation and transmission. These distinctions find their deepest meaning in the differences of office as it pertains to the Son or to the Spirit. The Son is the Revealer, the Holy Spirit is the Inspirer. The Son is the living and eternal Word of God in whom dwelt the fullness of grace and truth (John 1:14),and in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge(Colossians 2:3). Jesus as the Divine Word was both Revealer and Revelation. As Revealer, our Lord declared that no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him(Matthew 11:27 cf. Luke 10:22). As Revelation He is Godmanifest in the flesh(1Tim. 2:16). The Holy Spirit is the inspirer, whose office work is to make known to men the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Jesus is the Truth, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth. Hence it is said,He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you(John 16:14). There are some expressions in Scripture which exhibit both revelation and inspiration, as in Hebrews 1:1-2.God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past to the fathers by the prophets; hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.Here there is a reference to revelation as the body of truth received by the prophets, and also to inspiration as the method by which they received and administered this truth. The "sundry times" can only refer to the progressive nature of revelation and indicates the successive stages in which God revealed the truth to the ancient prophets. The "divers manners" refers more especially to the fact of inspiration which includes visions, dreams, ecstasy or other forms of manifestation found in the Old Testament. Here then revelation and inspiration are conjoined, and what was implicit in the Old Testament comes to its perfection in the New Testament, and this as it concerns both content and method The Possibilities of Inspiration. Unquestionably the Father of spirits may act upon the minds of His creatures,and this action may be extended to any degree necessary for the fulfillment of the purposes of God. This truth has given rise to what is known as degrees in revelation, but which more strictly should be regarded as factors in all revelation. The first is "superintendence," by which is meant a belief that God so guides those chosen as the organs of revelation, that their writings are kept free from error. Following this is the factor of "elevation" in which the minds of the chosen organs are granted an enlargement of understanding, and an elevation of conception beyond the natural measure of man. The highest and most important is the factor of "suggestion," by which is meant a direct and immediate suggestion from God to man by the Spirit, as to the thoughts which he shall use, or even the very words which he shall employ, in order to make them agencies in conveying His will to others. These factors in varying degrees must enter into any clear thought of inspiration, but to regard them as different degrees of inspiration, as if the several portions of the Scripture were in different degrees the Word of God is necessarily to weaken the authority of the Bible as a whole. The error springs from a failure to distinguish between revelation as the varying quantity, and inspiration as the constant; the one furnishing the material by "suggestion" when not otherwise attainable, the other guiding the writer at every point, thus securing at once the infallible truth of his material, and its proper selection and distribution. For this reason we conclude that the Scriptures were given by plenary inspiration, embracing throughout the elements of superintendence, elevation and suggestion, in that manner and to that degree that the Bible becomes the infallible Word of God, the authoritative rule of faith and practice in the Church Nor can our inability to explain this extraordinary

Abstract the idea of the Inspiring Spirit guiding the pen of the sacred writer in every sentence, word and letter, from the holy Gospels, and the heavenly unction-the divine power of the Book is gone.

It is no longer the record of heaven we trace - no longer the voice of God which we hear. The Shekinah has left the mercy seat; the divine sacrifice ceases to smoke upon the altar, and the glory has departed from the Christian temple.-RALSTON,Elements of Divinity,p. 600.

action of God upon the human mind be an objection to the doctrine of inspiration. Psychology cannot satisfactorily explain the interaction between the mind and body in human personality, nor the manner in which ideas are impressed upon the mind. But it would be impertinent to deny the existence of such interaction. If men can communicate their thoughts by means of language and thus make themselves understood by others, most certainly the Author of our being can reveal Himself to men. It is unreasonable to suppose that God as the "Father of spirits" does not have it in His power to communicate truth to the minds of men, or to instruct them in those things which concern their eternal wellbeing. The Necessity of Inspiration.That inspiration is necessary, grows out of the nature of the subjects which the Scriptures unfold.First, there are truths which could not otherwise be known except by special inspiration. There are historical truths, past facts, which if God had not revealed them in a supernatural manner could never have been known, such as the creation of the world and the history of antediluvian times. Granting that there were written sources and oral traditions which had been handed down from former times, even then the inspiration of superintendence would have been necessary in order to a true and inerrant account.Second,'the authoritative language of the Scriptures argues the necessity of inspiration. The writers do not present to us their own thoughts but preface their communications with aThus saith the Lord. On this ground alone they demand assent. It follows, then, that either the sacred writers spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,

It is reasonable that the sentiments and doctrines developed In the Holy Scriptures should be suggested to the mind of the writers by the Supreme Being himself. They are every way worthy of His character, and Proverbs 6:1-35 motive of the highest interests of man; and the more important the communication is, the more it is calculated to preserve men from error, to stimulate them to holiness, and to guide them to happiness, the more reasonable it is to expect that God should make the communication free from every admixture of error. Indeed, the notion of Inspiration enters essentially Into our ideas of a revelation from God, so that to deny it is the same as to affirm that there is no revelation. - WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology,p. 72.

or they must be acknowledged as impostors, a conclusion invalidated by the quality and enduring character of their works. Again, if the Scriptures were not divinely inspired, they could not claim as they do, to be the infallible standard of religious truth. Only as we are convinced that the writers were aided by a supernatural and divine influence, and this in such a manner as to be infallibly preserved from all error, can the sacred Scriptures become a divine rule of faith and practice THEORIESOFINSPIRATION

Various theories have been advanced, in an attempt to harmonize and explain the relation of the divine and human elements, in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Christianity, however, is based upon the fact of inspiration, and is not dependent upon any particular theory as to the origin of its sacred writings. The rationalistic explanations emphasize unduly the human element, while the supranaturalistic theories minify it, maintaining that the sacred writers were so possessed by the Holy Spirit as to become passive instruments rather than active agents. The dynamical theory is advanced in an attempt to mediate between the two extremes, and is the theory most generally

accepted in the Church. The so-called erroneous theories it will be noted, are such, not because they are essentially wrong, but because by unduly emphasizing one' particular element, they thereby become inadequate as explanations of the wide range of Scripture phenomena. We shall classify these theories as follows: (1) The Mechanical or Dictation Theory which emphasizes the supranaturalistic element; (2) the Intuition and Illumination Theories which stress the human element; and (3) the Dynamical or Mediating Theory The Mechanical or Dictation Theory.This theory emphasizes the supranaturalistic element to such an extent that the personality of the writer is set aside, and he becomes under the direction of the Holy Spirit a mere amanuensis or penman. As a representative of this extreme position, Hooker says, "They neither spakenor wrote any word of their own, but uttered syllable by syllable as the Spirit put it into their mouths." In order to account for the peculiarities of individual expression on this theory Quenstedt says, "The Holy Ghost inspired his amanuenses with those expressions which they would have employed, had they been left to themselves." An extravagant doctrine of mechanical inspiration grew up among the Jews after the exile and prevailed in the time of Christ. Some of the Talmudists held that Moses wrote all the Pentateuch including the description of his own death which he did with tears. By most Talmudists the last eight verses are attributed to Joshua. Christ's freedom in the use of the Scriptures shows how far He rose above the bondage of the letter. If He said, "It is written," He also said, "But I say unto you." Against the weakness of this theory may be urged the following objections.First,it denies the inspiration of persons and holds only to the inspiration of the writings; whereas the Scriptures teach thatholy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost(2 Peter 1:21). It is for this reason that Dr. I. A. Dorner in hisSystem of Christian Doctrine(I,p. 624) speaks of this as a "docetic theory," in that the writers were only so in appearance, all second causes being done away in the pure passivity of the instruments.Second,the Mechanical Theory does not comport with all the facts

According to Philo, "A prophet gives forth nothing at all of his own, but acts as interpreter at the prompting of another in all his utterances, and as long as be is under the inspiration he is in ignorance, his reason departing from its place and yielding up the citadel of the soul, when the divine Spirit enters into it and dwells in it and strikes at the mechanism of the voice, sounding through it to the clear declaration of that which he prophesieth." "Josephus holds that even the historical narratives were obtained by direct inspiration from God," so that as the Rabbis said, "Moses did not write one word out of his own knowledge."

Dr. Charles Hodge, who holds that the inspiration of the Scriptures extends to the words, says that "this is included in the infallibility which our Lord ascribes to the Scriptures. A mere human report or record of a divine revelation must of necessity be not only fallible, but more or less erroneous. The thoughts are in the words. The two are inseparable. If the words priest, sacrifice, ransom, expiation, propitiation by blood, and the like, have no divine authority, then the doctrine which they embody had no such divine authority." It is evident, however, that in so far as Dr. Hodge's statement is true, it belongs rather to the dynamical than to the mechanical theory of Inspiration.

It is evident from the Scriptures themselves that the writers were actuated in different ways-though by the inspiration of one Spirit. Some of the disclosures of truth were in audible words.And when Moses was gone into the tabernacle of the congregation to speak with him, then he heard the voice of one speaking unto him from off the mercy seat that was upon the ark of testimony, from between the two cherubim, and he spake unto him(Numbers 7:89). Again in Acts 9:5 Paul

exclaims,Who art thou, Lord? and the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.These Scriptures can mean nothing else than a revelation in audible words. (Compare also Exodus 2:4; Exodus 20:22, Hebrews 12:19, Daniel 4:31, Matthew 3:17; Matthew 17:5, Revelation 19:9 also 1:10, 11.) But the writers in a number of instances referred to sources, or they used their own knowledge of history, or recorded their own experiences. Such is the case in Luke's Gospel and also in the Acts of the Apostles.Third,and perhaps the strongest argument against this theory is the fact that it is out of harmony with the known manner in which God works in the human soul. The higher and more exalted the divine communications, the greater the illumination of the human soul and the more fully does man come into possession of his own natural and spiritual faculties. The Mechanical Theory may apply in a few instances, but it is too narrow and insufficient to establish a general theory of inspiration The Intuition Theory.According to this theory, inspiration is only the natural insight of men lifted to a higher plane of development. It is rationalistic in the extreme, and virtually denies the supernatural element in the Scriptures. Its weakness lies in this, that man's insight into truth is vitiated by a darkened intellect and wrong affections.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 Corinthians 2:14). He cannot therefore of himself penetrate the divine mysteries, and needs a direct communication of truth through the Spirit. "The Intuition Theory," says Sheldon, "disparages the notionof the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, and implies that the educated faculties of the scriptural writers, by their own virtue grasped all the truth which they conveyed." The Illumination Theory.This theory differs from the preceding in that it holds to an elevation of the religious perceptions instead of the natural faculties. It has been likened to the spiritual illumination which every believer receives fr6m the Holy Spirit in Christian experience. The inspiration of the writers of sacred Scripture, according to this theory differs only in the degree not in kind, from that which belongs to all believers. While illumination through intensification of experience may prepare the mind for the reception of truth, it is not in itself a communication of that truth. It will be seen that the element of "elevation" mentioned previously is here expanded beyond its rightful place, and thus becomes the basis of an erroneous theory of inspiration The Dynamical Theory. This is a mediating theory and is advanced in an effort to explain and preserve in proper harmony, both the divine and human factors in the inspiration of the Scriptures. It maintains that the sacred writers were given extraordinary aid without any interference with their personal characteristics or activities. It preserves the scriptural truth that God speaks through human agencies, but insists that the agent is not reduced to a mere passive instrument. Against this theory little objection can be urged. It has been held by such standard theologians as Pope, Miley, Strong, Watson,

Among those who have held to the Illumination Theory may be mentioned the following: E. G. Robinson, "The office of the Spirit in Inspiration is not different from that which he performed for the Christians at the time when the Gospels were written"; Ladd, "Inspiration, as the subjective condition of biblical revelation and the predicate of the word of God, is specifically the same illumining quickening, elevating and purifying work of the Holy Spirit as that which goes on in the persons of the entire believing community."

A. A. Hodge rejects the Illumination Theory. "Spiritual illumination," he says, "is an essential element in the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit common to all true Christians. It never leads to the knowledge of new truth, but only to the personal discernment of the spiritual beauty and power

of truth already revealed in the Scriptures."-HODGE,Outlines of Theology,p. 68.

Wakefield, Summers, Ralston and Hills, and with some modification by Curtis, Sheldon, Martensen and Dorner. In opposition to the Intuition Theory, it maintains there is a supernatural element in inspiration, as over against mere intuitive natural reason. In harmony with the Illumination Theory, it maintains that there was an "elevation" on the part of the sacred writers which prepared their minds and hearts for the reception of the message, but insists that the theory is inadequate, in that to the prepared agencies there must be in addition a divine communication of truth SCRIPTURALPROOFSOFDIVINEINSPIRATION The Scriptures claim to be divinely inspired. Since the term inspiration denotes the specific agency of the Holy Spirit as Author of the sacred Scriptures, it is required of us to give first place to the testimony of the Bible itself. Pope points out that it is not arguing in a circle to receive the witness of the Bible concerning itself, if we remember that in things divine credentials are alwaysFirst,and must be sustained by their own evidences. These credentials will be considered in the following order,First,the Witness of the Old Testament;Second,the Declaration of our Lord; andThird,the Testimony of the Apostles The Witness of the Old Testament. Communications of divine truth were given at sundry times and in divers manners, to the writers of the Old Testament. The patriarchs received revelations from God, and some of these were written down, but it is evident that these records were not by themselves officially declared as Scripture. Moses seems to have been given a special prerogative as the founder of Israel as a nation, for it is recorded of himthat there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face(Deuteronomy 34:10). To him was granted the privilege of creating the first body of literature known as sacred Scripture. Knowing that he was inspired of the Spirit, Moses frequently reminded those whom he addressed, that his messages were given by divine authority and no phraseis of more frequent recurrence than the well-known words,The Lord spake unto Moses. David laid claim also to divine inspiration, saying, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue(2 Samuel 23:2). The later prophets delivered their predictions, not only in the name of the Lord, but as messages immediately inspired by the Spirit. Isaiah frequently introduced his prophetic messages with the words, Thus saith the Lord; while Jeremiah, Ezekiel and a number)f the minor prophets used such expressions as The word of the Lord came unto me, The Lord said unto me, or Thus saith the Lord. Moses seems to have anticipated in his prophecy the coming of a new age, in which the Holy Spirit should be communicated in His prophetic offices to all the people of God. Would God that all the Lord’s people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them! (Numbers 11:29). This is doubtless a prophetic reference to Pentecost, and must be understood in a different sense from that by which original revelations were given to men. Christ is the true and highest revelation of God, and the coming of the Spirit is the realization and interpretation of the truth as it is in Him The Declaration of Our Lord.Christ declared the Old Testament to be of divine authority, and His testimony must be the final word as to the nature and results of inspiration. His witness is perfect in meeting the demands of Christian faith. He regarded the Old Testament as a completed canon, and expressly declared that the least ordinance or commandment must have its perfect fulfillment. This is the meaning of the wordsone jot or tittle(Matthew 5:18). To this we may add that the nature of our Lord’s testimony is such, that while sanctioning the whole body of sacred writers, he speaks as one above them. He never claims for Himself the limited inspiration of the prophets forit pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell(Colossians 1:19) and again,For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily(Colossians 2:9). In this connection, also, we have the testimony

of John the Baptist to the supreme authorityof Christ.He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. . . . . For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him(John 3:31; John 3:34). Here the fullness of revelation and the highest form of inspiration are conjoined in the words of Christ To the Jews who opposed Him, He said, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by' your tradition?(Matthew 15:3; Matthew 15:6). Here the Old Testament is expressly stated to be the Word of God. To the tempter in the wilderness, Christ replied,It is written, a formula which among the Jews signified that the quotation was from one of the sacred books and therefore divinely inspired. Jesus quotes from four out of the five books of Moses, from the Psalms, from Isaiah, Zechariah and Malachi. He recognized the threefold division of the Scriptures which was common among the Jews-the law, the prophets and the psalms (Luke 24:44-45), and declared that these testified of Himself. This is brought out again in a controversy with the Jews, in which He says,Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me(John 5:39). He further asserted that the Scriptures were the Word of God, and that the Scriptures cannot be broken (John 10:35). In His post-resurrection exposition to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, it is said thatbeginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself(Luke 24:27). Here He recognized the whole content of Scripture in its unity and declares specifically that it refers to His own Person and work The Testimony of the Apostles.It remains for us to consider now, the testimony of the apostles concerning the inspiration' of both the Old and the New Testaments.First,consideration must be given to the testimony of the Apostle Peter, who immediately before Pentecost stood up among the apostles and other disciples and said,Men and brethren, this scripture must needshavebeen fulfilled, which the Holy' Ghost by' the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus(Acts 1:16). This statement has been regarded by some as a general definition of inspiration-the Holy Ghost spake, the mouth of Davidwas the instrument, and the result wasScripture. (Cf. POPE,Compend. Chr. Theology, I,p. 164). St. Paul quotes the Old Testament constantly in his writings, using a wide variety of terms, such asthe scriptures of the prophets(Romans 16:26),the holy scriptures(2 Timothy 3:14), and other similar expressions. He asserts the unity of the scripture in the text, All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and declares its purpose asprofitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works(2 Timothy 3:16-17). The nature of the Epistle to the Hebrews is such that the whole composition depends upon the Old Testament as Holy Scripture. This it regards as the oracles of God, spoken by the Holy Spirit and preserved to the Christian Church in a book quoted as authoritative and infallible. Another peculiarity of this epistle lies in the fact that the same expression is used to indicate both the testimony of the Spirit and the personality of the writer. In quoting Jeremiah 31:31 the writer of the epistle says,The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those day's, saith the Lord, I will put my' laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them(Hebrews 10:16-17). A further contribution of this epistle is to be found in the fact that it regards the Old Testament as a rudimentary phase of divine revelation, and the Christian or New Testament as the completion of that previously begun. Hence we read the injunction of the writer thatye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, that is, the Old Testament (Hebrews 5:12)

We must consider also the testimony of the apostles as to the inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures. As a body of men, they are united in their belief thattheir messages are from God their Saviour and by His Holy Spirit. Everywhere the fact of inspiration is implied. But there are direct assertions also which form indisputable evidence of inspiration. Referring to St. Peter we have the exhortation tobe mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour(2 Peter 3:2). Here the revelation made to the Old Testament prophets, and that made to the New Testament apostles, are placed side by side as being of equal authority. This thought is further developed later on in the chapter, where he speaks of some things hard to be understood in the writings of St. Paul,which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction(2 Peter 3:16). Here is a direct and definite testimony to the inspiration of the writings of St. Paul, which are classed with"other scriptures"as of equal authority. St. Paul himself, ascribes his revelations to Christ, and his inspiration to the Holy Spirit. Of the first he testifies that God called him by His grace,to reveal his Sonin him, that he might preach Him among the heathen (Galatians 1:16); and again that it wasby revelationthat the mystery was made known unto him (Ephesians 3:3); while of the second he testifies,Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth: comparing spiritual things with spiritual(1 Corinthians 2:12-13). Nor can we omit the testimony of St. John, who in his First Epistle speaksof an unction from the Holy One(1 John 2:20), a privilege which in some measure belongs to all true believers, but in its highest degree, as before pointed out, belongs only to the company of apostles and prophets as the writers of the Christian Scriptures. However, in the Apocalypse, it is expressly stated that he wasin the Spirit(Revelation 1:10), which in connection with a verse in the last chapter indicates that the writer was thinking of the expression in the sensein which it was used of the Old Testament prophets who spoke by inspiration. Consequently we read,These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done(Revelation 22:6). As to the two historical evangelists, St. Mark and St. Luke, these did not share directly and immediately in the promise to the apostolate, but only indirectly and mediately through St. Peter and St. Paul. Further consideration will be given to these writers in the study of the Canon VALUEOFTHESUBJECTFORTHEOLOGY No subject has been of greater importance in the study of theology, than that which has been under consideration-the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Referring again to the verse, the Holy Ghost spake through the mouth of David(Acts 1:16) we may consider the theological value of the subject from three aspects:First, the Holy Spirit as the Source of Inspiration;Second, holy men as the organs of inspiration; andThird, the Holy Scriptures as a divinely inspired body of truth The Holy Spirit as the Source of Inspiration.As paternity is the property of the Father and filiation the property of the Son, so procession belongs to the Spirit. As the Son is the revealer of the Father and therefore the eternal Word, so the Inspiring Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, is the sole basis of communication between God and man. It is seen, therefore, that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, and as such, presides over the impartation of all truth. As it relates to the revealing work of the Son, He alone is the Author of Inspiration. We may say, then, "that while the Scripture is God-inspired, only the Spirit is the inspiring God." The Organs of Inspiration.In stressing the fact that the Bible is the Word of God, and hence inspired by the Spirit which gives it divine authority, we must not overlook

the fact, also, that the Bible has in it a human element. Not only did the Holy Spirit speak through David, David also spoke. Holy men, we are told, spake as they' were moved by the Holy Ghost, a better renderingbeing, "Holy men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." The two Scriptures are not opposed to each other, but together express the full-orbed range of inspiration. As Jesus the Word of God was at once divine and human, so the written Word of God must be viewed in the same light. To overlook the two natures in Christ is to turn to unitarianism on the one hand or docetism on the other. To overlook the two elements in the written Word, is to undervalue either its divine authority or its human appeal. As Jesus was crucified through weakness, yet lived by the power of God, so the Bible has been ceaselessly and bitterly attacked by its enemies, yet ever lives as an enduring monument of divine truth. As it was necessary for Jesus to become a partaker of our infirmities in order to appeal to the hearts of men, so also the Bible is extremely human in its character, searching the hearts of men,quick and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged 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(Hebrews 4:12) The organs of inspiration had both character and preparation. They were holy men. They were sanctified through the truth and thus prepared for their office and work. As moral and spiritual truth can be understood only by moral and spiritual men, the organs of inspiration must of necessity have been holy in heart and life. Their faculties were prepared by the immediate influence of the inspiring Spirit, and He used them for the accomplishment of the end in view, the formation of the sacred Scriptures. They were not merely passive instruments, but active agents in the full range of their powers. Their natural characteristics and endowments were not submerged but elevated and strengthened The Holy Scriptures as a Divinely Inspired Body of Truth.It follows that if God spake through holy men, their utterances must constitute a body of divine truth. It is to this body of truth that we apply the term Holy Scripture. As such we must regard the Bible as given to us by plenary inspiration. By this term we do not referto any one of the particular theories of inspiration already cited, but to the character of the whole body of truth. By plenary inspiration, we mean that the whole and every part is divinely inspired. This does not necessarily presuppose the mechanical theory of inspiration, as some contend, or any particular method, only that the results of that inspiration give us the Holy Scriptures as the final and authoritative rule of faith in the Church In this connection the question sometimes arises as to what assurance we have that Christ intended to preserve and continue His teachings in a new volume of sacred Scripture. All that we need is given to us in one comprehensive promise made to His disciples. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you(John 16:12-14). Our Lord sanctioned the Old Testament Scriptures as the preparatory records of His own gospel and kingdom. It was necessary, therefore, that these be brought to their perfection by the New Testament Scriptures, which should fill out their meaning, and set upon the entire body of Scripture the seal of His perfect revelation.

Christ made full provision for the preservation of His perfected doctrine. All that we need to assure our hearts was given In one large promise, which declared that His sayings should be revived in their unbroken unity In His disciples' memory. He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you; that which He could not yet speak concerning His Person, His Spirit should reveal, He will guide you Into all truth; and that the same

Spirit should show them things to come. The Spirit was no other than Himself by His Agent reuttering His own words, revealing His own Person and work, and filling up His prophecy of the future. Hence, lastly, our Lord's sanction makes the complete scriptures the finished revelation, never to be superseded. Nothing can be more plain that the entire fullness of what the Revealer had to say to the world was to be communicated to the apostles by the Holy Ghost; and that, not as a further disclosure on the part of the Spirit, but as the consolidation of the Saviour's teaching into its perfect unity, and its expansion Into its perfect meaning. No future streams of revelation were to rise higher than the fountain-head of truth opened in Himself. Hence we may repeat concerning the Book what has been said concerning our Lord's teaching; the Bible means all revelation, and all revelation means the Bible.-POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., I,pp. 40, 41.

07. Chapter 8 - THE CANON

Chapter 8 - THE CANON

We have considered the subject of Revelation, objectively as an apocalypse or divine unveiling of the truth, and subjectively as the faith received by man; and we have further considered the divine-human manner in which this revelation was committed to writing through the inspiration of the Spirit; it remains for us to complete this study by considering more in detail the specific character of, the Bible as containing the divinely authorized documents of the Christian faith. This leads us directly to a study of the Canon of Holy Scripture, which we must regard not only as the Christian rule of faith and practice, but also as the ultimate critical standard of religious thought By the canonicity of a book is meant its right to a place in the collection of sacred writings. The word canon (kanwn) means literally, a straight rod, or a measuring reed. It is used in both an active and a passive sense-active as a test or standard of measurement, passive as applied to that which has been measured. In this dual sense, the word canon is applied to Holy Scripture. In the objective sense, the canonical books are - those which have measured up to the standard tests. In a subjective sense, these measured or canonical books become the Rule of Faith in the Church. This seems to be the meaning of Galatians 6:16 where the Apostle Paul pronounces a benediction uponas many as walk according to this rule. Semler and others held that the wordcanonoriginally meant simply a list and was employed by early ecclesiastical writers to designate a catalogue of things that belonged to the Church. In this sense it was applied to a collection of hymns to be sung on festival occasions, and in some instances to the list of the names of church members. It was particularly applied to the publicly approved catalogue of all the books thatmight be read in the Church for edification and instruction. In this sense it is thought to discriminate between the canonical books which might be read authoritatively in the Church, and the apocryphal which might be read for instruction but not as a standard or rule of faith. Bicknell agrees with this, pointing out that the word canonical (kanonizein) was sometimes applied to a single book, but indicates that it soon came to be used in the more general sense as a standard to which an appeal could be made (Cf. BICKNELL,Thirty-Nine Articles,p. 176) The wordcanonis first found in the writings of Amphilochius (380), though Athanasius uses the wordcanonicalin his Festal Epistle (367). Since the time of Jerome, the termcanonhas been used in both the objective and subjective senses, the one dependent upon the other. The wordBibliahas been in use since the fifth century and signifies a collection ofbooks par excellence.It was probably first used by Chrysostom Before taking up a more detailed study of the development of the canon, the following observations are necessary

1. The canonicity of a book was not settled by the authority of the primitive Church, but by its testimony. This is an important distinction. As the church does not rest its belief in miracles on the authority of the early Christians, but on their witness and attestation, so in the matter of the Gospels and Epistles, it was not their decision as to the inspiration of the contents that renders them authoritative now, but their testimony as to their apostolic authorship. "The authority of the first Christians," says Dr. Shedd, "is no higher than that of any other Christians, but their testimony

is" (SHEDD,Dogm. Th.,I,p. 142).

Dr. Shedd refers to a statement by Coleridge to this effect, that "we receive the books ascribed to John and Paul as their books, on the judgment of men for whom no miraculous discernment is pretended. shall we give these less credence than to John and Paul themselves? The modern Church does not receive John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles as canonical, on the 'judgment' or decision of the primitive Church respecting their contents, but on their testimony respecting their authorship." SHEDD,Dogm. Th.,p. 142.

2. The tests which the early Christians applied to the books circulated among the churches were simple, being limited generally to apostolic origin or authorization. It was held as an unquestioned fact that the Lord committed to the apostles alone the authority to direct the Church, and therefore all that was demanded was a certain knowledge of apostolic authority. For this reason the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke were never questioned, for they were understood to have been written - by the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul. When authorship was uncertain, the so-calledRegula Fidei,or "rule of faith" as indicated above was brought to bear, and in addition to this the testimony of those churches that held these documents. But this harmony with the rule of faith, and this testimony of the individual churches, were always regarded as subordinate though sufficient tests

3. The human element in the formation of the canon needs to be given proper consideration also. In this respect there is a parallel between the Holy Scriptures and Him of whom they testify. This parallel we have already indicated, but must now give it further emphasis. As there is in the Person of our Lord a divine and a human side, united in the one life of the God-man; so in the sacred Scriptures there is divine revelation, law and promise on the one side, and human apprehension and representation on the other. As in the doctrines concerning the Person of Christ there was Docetism on the one hand which minified the humanity of Christ in order to exalt His deity, so there was on the other hand, Socinianism which magnified His humanity at the expense of His divinity. The Scriptures have likewise had their Docetists and their Socinians, an exaltation which amounted almost to bibliolatry on the one hand and a rationalism on the other, which had as its avowed purpose and attempt to reduce the Bible wholly to a human plane. Van Oosterzee says that at every step the impartial reader must exclaim, "How divine!" and again "How human!" As a failure to grasp and hold the great truth that the Personal Word incarnate was both divine and human led to heretical opinions, so any undue emphasisupon either phase of the Scriptures to the detriment of the other will prove disastrous, to both correct doctrine and genuine experience THEOLDTESTAMENTCANON The Old Testament Scriptures were arranged in three main divisions, (I) The Law (Torah); (II) The Prophets (Nebiim); and (III) The Writings (Kethubim), the latter being generally known as theHagiographa. The first division included the Pentateuch; the second was divided into the Former or Earlier Prophets which included the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings; and the Latter Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve; the third division included the Psalms, Proverbs and Job, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, the Chronicles, and the five "rolls" orMegilloth-Songs of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes and Esther. Since the Psalms formed the first book in the third division, the Scriptures are sometimes referred to as theLaw, theProphetsand thePsalms(Matthew 11:13, Luke 16:16, Acts 26:22, Romans 10:5) The beginnings of the Old Testament canon are shrouded in mystery. We are told that Moses before his death wrote a book of the law, which he commanded the Levites to put in the side of the ark,that it may be there for a witness against thee(Deuteronomy 31:26). In

this book of the law it is enjoined upon every future king that it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: andit shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life(Deuteronomy 17:18-19). Later it is recorded that Joshua made a covenant with thepeople and wrote these words in the book of the law of God(Joshua 24:26). This appears to have been an addition to that which was in the keeping of the Levites. Still later Samuel, previous to the establishing of the people under the kingship of Saul,told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord(1 Samuel 10:25). Under the reforms of Jehoshaphat (100: 914 B.C.) there was a purification of worship which took away the elements of Baalim and exalted the worship of Jehovah. At this time under the direction of the king, the princes together with certain Levites and priests taught inJudah and had the book of the law . . . . with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people(2 Chronicles 17:9) But the outstanding date in the formation of the Old Testament canon, is 621 B.C., when Hilkiah the high priest discovered the book of the law in the temple, during the earlier part of the reign of Josiah.And Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. . . . . And Shaphan the scribe shewed the king, saying, Hilkiah the priest hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king(2 Kings 22:8; 2 Kings 22:10). Immediately following this Josiah the king called a great convocation composed of the elders of Judah and Jerusalem, the priests, the prophets and all the people, both small and great,and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord. And the king stood by a pillar and made a covenant before the Lord. . . . that were written in this book. And all the people stood to the covenant(2 Kings 23:1-3). This is considered a landmark in the history of the canon. While there are references to the law of God as early as Amos (B.C. 759-745) and Hosea (B.C. 743-737), they do not give us the extent of the books which were then included in the canon. (Cf. Amos 2:4 and Hosea 8:12). In commenting on this convocation of Josiah, Sanday says that we have here a solemn religious act, by which the king and the people alike accepted the book read before them as expressing the divine will, and took its precepts as binding upon themselves. This is the essential meaning that, as applied to a book, is contained in the epithet "canonical" which means "authoritative," and authoritative because in its ultimate origin divine (Cf. SANDAY,Bible E. R. E.,ii 565) The next important date concerning the first division of the Old Testament canon is the promulgation of the Law in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (100: 500-450 B.C.). The Law of Moses,which the Lord had commanded to Israel(Nehemiah 8:1 ff) was read before the people, and a covenant was made which was sealed by the princes, Levites and priests (Nehemiah 9:38; Nehemiah 10:1 ff). From a study of Nehemiah chapters 8-10 it seems evident that the Book of Joshua was included with the Pentateuch, or the Hexateuch, substantially as we now have it. There is in this connection also, the testimony of the Samaritan Pentateuch which likewise dates from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (500-450 B.C.). It is significant, however, that the Samaritans accepted as canonical, only the Pentateuch, which seems to indicate that at this early date when the Jews and Samaritans formed their separate communities, the canon contained only the Pentateuch. We may allow that the first division of the Hebrew Scriptures-that of the Torah or Law, was fully accepted as canonical by 440 B.C The story of the Samaritans is told in 2 Kings 17:6; 2 Kings 17:24; 2 Kings 17:26-28; 2 Kings 17:33. The king of Assyria brought these people to Palestine to take the place of the Jewish captives which had been carried away to his own land. Later, owing to their belief that the God of Israel was against them, a

captive Jewish priest was sent to teach them, but the people combined Jehovah worship with that of their own gods. When Nehemiah restored Jerusalem, hostility arose between them and the Jews. Green says, "that after being repulsed by the Jews, the Samaritans, to substantiate their claim of being sprung from ancient Israel, eagerly adopted the Pentateuch which was brought to them by a renegade priest." But this fact witnesses to our Pentateuch as existing in its present form as far back as the time of Ezra and Nehemiah The second or Prophetico-Historical section of the Old Testament canon, commonly known as the "Prophets," was likewise gradual in its development. Bicknell thinks that the reason Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as Chronicles were not included in this second division wasdue to the possibility that when these books were composed, the canon was at least well on its way to being closed. Also that the free manner in which the Chronicler treats the text of Samuel and Kings, together with the strange variations in the Septuagint translation of Samuel, seems to indicate that these books were not fully recognized as canonical by the year 300 B.C. The earliest reference to the "Prophets" as a definite collection of writings is found about 200 B.C. There is a reference in Ecclesiasticus (100: 180 B.C.) to the "twelve prophets" as being parallel to Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Sir 49:10), and a reference in Daniel which quotes Jeremiah as authoritative (Daniel 9:2). We may regard this portion of the canon, therefore, as being closed about 200 B.C The third division or Hagiographa is even more obscure. As the name indicates, this division contained writings of a diverse character. The earliest reference made to it is in the prologue to Ecclesiasticus (130 B.C.) where the expression The Law, the Prophets and the other writings" is used. In I Maccabees (7:17) Psalms 79:1-13 is referred to as Scripture. We may regard this section of the canon as being closed about 100 B.C. Wakefield thinks that the canon of Old Testament Scripture originated somewhat in the following manner. When the Jews returned from Babylon and re-established divine worship, they collected the inspired books which they

"There is no sufficient reason," says Pond, "for supposing that any of the canonical books of Scripture have been lost. We can hardly reconcile it with our ideas of the wisdom and the goodness of God, that He should suffer such an event to take place nor is it likely that He has. Mention is indeed made in the Old Testament of certain books which are no longer extant; such as "the book of Jasher" (Joshua 10:13) and "The book of the Wars of the Lord" (Numbers 21:14). But there is no evidence that either of these was ever included in the Jewish canon, or was entitled to be there. And the same remark may be made respecting "The book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel" so often referred to in the first Book of the Kings. This was not the Book of Chronicles which we have in our Bibles, but the authorized records of the kingdom of Israel, made and kept by the kings' scribes It was the register of what we would call the Secretary of State. The three thousand proverbs of Solomon, and his songs which were one thousand and five together with his works on botany and natural history, would no doubt: be very entertaining, if we had authentic copies of them but there is no evidence that these works ever claimed inspiration or were ever admitted into the sacred canon of the Jews.-POND, Lectures on Christian Theology,p. 53.

still possessed, and in this manner began a sacred library as before they had done with the Law. To this collection they afterward added the writings of Zechariah, Malachi, and other distinguished prophets and priests, who wrote during the captivity or shortly after; and also the Books of the Kings, Chronicles, and other historical writings, which had been compiled from the ancient records of the nation. The collection thus made was ever afterward considered complete, and the books

composing it were called the Holy Scriptures; or the Law and the Prophets. Sometimes also they used the threefold division as we have previously pointed out, referring to the Scriptures, as "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms."

Jewish authorities recognized the canon of the Old Testament as we now have it, as being in existence at the time of Christ. Josephus says, "We have only twenty-two books which are to be trusted as having divine authority, of which five are the books of Moses. From his death to the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, the prophets, who were the successors of Moses, have written thirteen books. The remaining four contain hymns to God, and documents of life for human edification" (Against Apion1:8). Our present Bible makes twenty-four by separating Ruth from Judges, and Lamentations from Jeremiah. Philo of Alexandria never quotes from an apocryphal book, although he does quote from nearly all the books of the Hebrew canon. We may regard the action taken by the Council of Jamnia 90 A.D. as the final stage in the fixing of the Jewish canon. After the fall of Jerusalem, Jamnia became the center for Palestinian Judaism, and the action taken there included in the canon all the books in the English Old Testament and no others (Cf. BICKNELL,Thirty-Nine Articles,p. 178) The highest witness to the canon of the Old Testament as divinely inspired, is for the church, to be found in the fact that it was ratified by our Lord and His apostles. The importance of such supreme testimony cannot be overestimated, in establishing the Old Testament Scriptures as the sufficient and infallible Oraclesof God, for the preparatory dispensation. It is just this,. in fact, that seals the Jewish canon as Christian Scriptures to be united with those which should afterward be given by the same Spirit, thus completing the objective canon of all the sacred Scriptures of the two dispensations. Of this evidence Dr. Pope writes that their divine origin is guaranteed to the Church by the fact "that the Saviour has given His authenticating testimony to the whole body of them in their integrity. That sanction,First,makes the Old Testament the revelation of Christ. As it testified of Him so He testifies of it. He took it into His hands, and blessed it, and hallowed it forever as His own. As revelation is Christ, and Christ is the subject of the Old Testament, the Old Testament is of necessity the revelation of God. Knowing better than any human critic can know all its internal obscurities, He sealed it nevertheless for the reverence of His people. The canon of the ancient oracles, precisely as we hold them now, no more no less, he sanctified and gave to the Church as the early preparatory records of His own Gospel and kingdom. That sanction,Second,assures us that the New Testament is His own authoritative completion of the Scriptures of revelation" (POPE, Compend Chr. Th.,pp. 39, 40) THENEWTESTAMENTCANON The formation of the canon of the New Testament Scriptures was likewise a gradual process, extending over a considerable period of time. It runs through the entire ante-Nicene period and may be said to have been closed at the end of the fourth century - every vestige of doubt concerning any of the books having disappeared by that time. The earliest stage in the formation of the New Testament canon, is to be found in the collections of writings made by the local churches, and in some instances by churches within a given area. That there was an early collection of the Pauline Epistles is indicated in 2 Peter 3:16 where it is statedthat in all his epistles, there are some things hard to be understood In Colossians 4:16 the author requests thatwhen this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea. There is evidence also that the epistle to the Ephesians was at first a circular letter, for in the two oldest MSS the words "at Ephesus" (1:1) are omitted. On this basis these words were added because the epistle was finally lodged at Ephesus. Some have thought, also, that the Epistle to the Romans was used as a

circular letter without the addition of the last chapters. It may be readily understood how each church would preserve its own epistles and thereby, almost unconsciously, began the growth of the New Testament canon The Earliest Canons.The earliest mention of a definite canon is that of Marcion (140 A.D.). He collected St. Paul's Epistles, rejecting the Pastoral Epistles, and adding a mutilated version of St. Luke's Gospel. Regarded as a heretic by the Church, he recorded only those epistles which seemed to accord with his heretical opinions, and made changes in the Gospel of Luke to substantiate his positions. The other three Gospels were rejected. The Muratorian Canon was formed about 200 A.D., a fragment which contained a list of the books regarded as authoritative in Rome. This includes the four Gospels, Acts, all the Epistles of St. Paul, the Apocalypse, two Epistles of St. John, St. Jude, and the first Epistle of St. Peter. Hebrews, St. James, and one, probably the third Epistle of St. John, are omitted. The second

The only books of the New Testament which have been accounted lost, are an Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, supposed to precede what we are accustomed to regard as his first epistle; and his Epistle to the Laodiceans (Colossians 4:16). But the epistle of which Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 5:9 was undoubtedly the very epistle which he was then writing. The passage is badly translated in our version; not "I wrote unto you in an epistle," but "I have written unto you in the epistle"; that is, in this epistle - the very writing which I now send. . . . . The Epistle to the Laodiceans has been justly regarded as no other than the Epistle to the Ephesians. As Ephesus was the chief city of proconsular Asia, this epistle may have been designed for all the churches In the province; among which was the church of the Laodiceans. There was an Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans extant in the fifth century; but it was manifestly a forgery, and never had a place in the sacred canon.-POND,Lectures on Christian Theology,p. 53.

Epistle of St. Peter is regarded as doubtful. Hermas is to be read privately but not in the Church. Dr. Shedd thinks that the reference made here is to a conception that was gradually forming in the minds of Christians, that of a New Testament as a companion to the Old Testament, and therefore the books of the New Testament are cited as Scripture The Early Catalogues of Scripture. At a very early period, catalogues or lists of the books of the New Testament were drawn up by different persons. The earliest of these was that of Origen (210 A.D.), who for some reason omits the Epistles of James and Jude, while acknowledging them in other parts of his writings. The next is that of Eusebius (315) A.D., who makes a distinction between thehomologoumenaand theantilogoumenawhich we shall treat in our next section. The catalogue of Athanasius is of the same date as that of Eusebius, and exactly corresponds with our present canon. Bicknell places this catalogue at even an earlier date than that of Eusebius (307 A.D.), and states that the canon of Epiphanius in his work on Heresies is also identical with our own. The catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem (340 A.D.) and that of the Council of Laodicea (364 A.D.) contain all the New Testament books except the Apocalypse, which is rejected also by Gregory Nazianzen (375 A.D.) and Amphilochius of Iconium. Philostrius, Bishop of Brescia (380 A.D.) leaves out both the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews; but Jerome (382 A.D.), Ruffinus (390 A.D.) and Augustine (394 A.D.) contain the full lists of the New Testament books as acknowledged. It may be mentioned in this connection also, that the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS belong to the middle of the fourth century (100: 325-350 A.D.). The former contains all the books except Philemon, Titus, I-II Timothy, Hebrews and the Apocalypse. The latter contains all the Gospels, all the Epistles and the Apocalypse

TheHomologoumenaand theAntilogoumena. The catalogue of Eusebius as previously mentioned, gives a list of all the books as accepted by his contemporaries,but arranges them in two classes as the acknowledged books,homologoumena(omologoumena), and the disputed books,antilogoumena(antilogomena); to which he adds a third class also, the spurious or rejected books,notha(noqa). In the first class, he places the following: the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of St. Paul, I Peter and I John, and with some hesitation mentions the Apocalypse. In the second class are the following: St. James, St. Jude, II and III John and II Peter. Here he again mentions the Apocalypse. Hebrews is not mentioned, but it is probably classed with the Epistles of St. Paul. He admits, however, that the authorship is disputed by the Roman Church. In the last class he mentions the Acts of Paul, Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Didache or so-called "Teachings of the Apostles." It seems, also, that the Apocalypse is included, though this is doubtful. It will be seen from this that the Apocalypse was not as yet fully classified. It should be observed that the seven books classified as antilogoumena were not rejected books, but subjected merely to suspended judgment, some because the authorship was not certain, as in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, some were written to the Christians at large and were not under the protection of any particular church, while others were addressed to individual men, and on that account were not readily accepted. In later times the antilogoumena were sometimes classified as Deutero-Canonical. In the third class mentioned above, the rejected books were not regarded as spurious in the sense of not being truthful, but only as not having sufficient warrant for canonicity. A few of these small treatises were received in the earlier church with great veneration, as written by men who had been companions to the Apostles. Among these were the epistles of Clement of Rome, Barnabas and Hermas. They were included in the earliest Codices, where they still may be found, but only as supplements

Conciliar Action. The first conciliar action concerning the establishment of the canon, was taken by the Synod of Carthage, which formally ratified the canon asit now stands. This date according to Bicknell is either 397 A.D. or 419 A.D. This decision was confirmed by the Trullan Council in 692 A.D. As previously stated, the action of these councils did not authorize the present canon of Scripture, but only confirmed what had already been accepted by general usage. "So we may sum up the history of the Canon," says Bicknell, "as the gradual work of the collective consciousness of the Church, guided by the Holy Spirit. It was a task of not only collecting but sifting and rejecting. . . . . It was a work in which all members of the body played their part. The devotional taste of the multitude was guided and corrected by the learning and spiritual enlightenment

The final ratification was brought about by the pressure of persecution directed against the sacred writings; but there ought to be no doubt that this was under the special supervision of the Holy Ghost. The parallel (with the formation of the Old Testament canon) is so far complete. But there were some peculiarities In the case of the new collection. The gospel was diffused over the world, and every church was the guardian of its own holy books, while every province of early Christendom had its own special selection of Scriptures; there were also numberless heresies, multiplying their spurious productions. These two circumstances tended to make the concurrence of the Christian Church in the final acceptance of the New Testament writings a more remarkable fact than the unanimity of the Jewish Church In regard to the Old Testament."-POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., I,p. 199 The four Gospels were from the first distinguished from the apocryphal. Justin Martyr (163 A.D.) speaks of "memoirs" of Christ as the work of the evangelists. Irenaeus (202

A.D.) cites passages from all four of the canonical Gospels. Clement and Tertullian (220 A.D.) do the same. Tatian (172 A.D.), and Ammonius (200 A.D.), arranged harmonies of the four Gospels. Theodoret (457 A.D.) found two hundred copies of Tatian's harmony in the Syrian churches, which he took away from them, because of some heresy it contained. Neander supposes that Tatian mixed some things with the canonical Gospels from the apocryphal. Origen (250 A.D.), writes a commentary on Matthew and John. These facts prove the general acceptance of the four Gospels as canonical, prior to 250 A.D. Yet there was no action of the church in a general council to this effect.-Cf. SHEDD,Dogm. Th.,p. 146 As an evidence of the genuineness of the New Testament writings, we may cite quotations from Clement as early as the first century. Also from Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Athenagoras and Theophilus of Antioch. Eusebius collected this testimony, especially that of the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, from Ignatius to Origen, and published it as early as 325 A.D.). It may be found in his History (III, xxv; VII, xxv) and also in his work entitledDemonstratio Evangelica

Another evidence of the genuineness of the canonical books of the N. T. is found in the early versions. The Peshito Syriac translation was made about 175 A.D. and the Old Latin (Itala) about the same time. The two Egyptian versions were made about 250 A.D. and the Ethiopic about 350 A.D.

of its leaders. Their decisions approved themselves to the mind and conscience of the whole Church." - BICKNELL,The Thirty-Nine Articles,p. 182. As the Old Testament canon was not closed until the Spirit of inspiration was withdrawn, so when the time was fully come, we may believe that the same Spirit closed the volume of the New Testament. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.As previously stated, the Jewish canon was regarded as complete by about 100 B.C. However edifying books continued to be written, and were widely used and quoted, but were not regarded as on the same plane with the canonical Scriptures. But this was true only in Palestine. The Hellenistic Jews, especially those of Alexandria took an entirely different attitude. They not only adopted a different arrangement of the books but included among them many later writings, these for the most part being the books now regarded as apocryphal. Thus the early Christian Church as it extended its borders beyond Palestine, found itself confronted with a greater and lesser canon. Since many of these were uninformed, the great body of the Church went on using the Greek Bible and the Alexandrian canon. But Jerome and other learned men who understood the Hebrew language recognized that there was a narrower and truer canon. This Jerome accepted and defended. He was opposed by Augustine, through whose influence in the Councils of Hippo (393 A.D.) and of Carthage (397 A.D.), the apocryphal books were declared to be canonical Scripture, and were thereafter quoted as such by later writers The wordApocrypha, which came to be applied to the extra-canonical books in the second century, has a number of different meanings. Originally it meant "hidden," and referred to either a secret origin or a secret authority. But the idea of an esoteric teaching was repugnant to the spirit of Christianity, and soon came to mean heretical or spurious. As used by Jerome, however, it simply meant noncanonical. It is in this sense that the Apocrypha is now understood. Protestantism rejected the Apocrypha and accepted the Jewishrather than the Alexandrian canon, the Jewish Scriptures rather than the Septuagint

ThePseudepigraphaas the name implies was a collection of spurious writings outside both the canonical Scriptures and the Apocryphal books, and never having had any reception in the Jewish or Christian Church. Athanasius, as did the earlier church fathers, distinguished between the

canonical (omologoumena), those worthy of being read, though not canonical, (antilogomena), and the fictitious works of heretics (noqa). In the first class he placed the twenty-two Hebrew books which make the Jewish canon, in theSecond,what we call the Apocrypha, and in theThird,thepseudepigrapha. The Greek Church retains the same order

What is commonly called the New Testament Apocrypha is a collection of spurious writings, which were never published in connection with the canonical Scriptures. They were, however, in part at least, gathered

Enoch Pond in hisLectures on Christian Theologygives the following arguments against the inspiration of the apocryphal books. (1) They are not found in the Hebrew Bible. They were written originally not in Hebrew but in Greek-a language which was not common among the Jews perhaps not known among them, until after the Old Testament was closed. (2) These apocryphal books have never been received into the sacred canon of the Jews. They are ancient Jewish writings but have never been regarded by that people as Inspired. (3) The apocryphal books are never quoted or referred to in the New Testament as possessing any divine authority. (4) The internal evidence is decisive. (5) The writer of the Maccabees disclaims inspiration. He says, "I will here make an end of my narrative. If I have done well, it is what I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is what I could attain unto." As internal evidence against the apocryphal books, Pond cites the following: "They inculcate false doctrine, and a false and unchristian morality. In the Second of the Maccabees we read, "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins (12:44-45). The writer of the same book both justifies and commends suicide, "when he was ready to be taken, he fell upon his own sword, choosing to die nobly, rather than fall into the hands of the wicked" (14:41, 42). In several places in the Apocrypha, atonement and justification are represented as being secured by works. "whoso honoreth his father, maketh atonement for his sin" (Sir 3:3). "Alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin" (Tob 12:9). - POND,Lect. Chr. Th.,p. 48 The addition of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah by Origen and others was occasioned by their being appended to the genuine writings of that prophet in the MSS of the Septuagint. This too will account for the fact that Ambrose, Augustine, and others after them, In the Latin Church, who used the Septuagint, spoke of the apocryphal books as canonical, because they were placed with the canonical books, as being in the same language. - SUMMERS,Syst. Th., I,pp. 503, 504.

up and published under the title "Apocryphal Books of the New Testament." There is no evidence that can be claimed for them as inspired writings, and they have never been accepted by the Church as any part of the Scriptures

Later History of the Canon.As may be inferred from our discussion of the Apocrypha, the question of the canon was for a long time an open and perplexing one in the mediaeval Church. In 1441 A.D. the Council of Florence passed a decree which declared most of the apocryphal books to be canonical. At the time of the Reformation when the lines were being drawn so closely between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism, the Council of Trent in 1546 abolished all differences between the books and declared them all canonical. This action being taken by a council reputedly few in number and in opposition to former catalogues, attempts were made by some of the later Romanist theologians to soften the position by distinguishing between Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical books, or a higher and a lower canon. The Greek Church, after many attempts

to separate the apocryphal books from the canon, finally adopted the Apocrypha as canonical at a Jerusalem Synod under Dositheus in 1672 A.D. Protestantism universally rejected the Apocrypha as canonical. Luther, however, admitted the apocrypha as valuable for edification, but the Swiss Reformers were more rigorous in their rejection. The English Church is conciliatory and

The books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are classified in various ways. The following is the usual classification: The Old Testament Apocrypha:I Esdras, II Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Additions to Esther, wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus (or Wisdom of Sirach), Baruch, Epistle of Jeremy, Song of the Three Children, The Story of Susana, Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manassah, I-II-III-IV Maccabees The New Testament Apocrypha: The Gospel of the Birth of Mary, The Protevangelium of James, The Gospel of the Infancy, the Gospel of Nicodemus (or Acts of Pilate), The Acts of Paul and Thecla The Pseudepigrapha: The Book of Jubilees, The Letter of Aristeas, The Books of Adam and Eve, The Martyrdom of Isaiah, I Enoch (Ethiopic), The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Sibylline Oracles, The Assumption of Moses, II Enoch (or the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, Slavonic), II Baruch (or the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch), III Baruch (or the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch), The Psalms of Solomon, Pirke Aboth, the Story of Ahikar, and The Fragments of a Zadokite Work.

regards as fully canonical, only those books of whose authority there was never any doubt, but admits public reading of some parts of the Apocrypha. The earlier Arminians adopted both the canonical books and the Apocrypha as Scripture, but the Methodist bodies everywhere, in common with the Westminster Confession, wholly rejected the apocryphal books as canonical THE CANON AS A RULE OF FAITH The objective canon of Scripture in the sense of the accepted and approved connection of writings, becomes in turn the rule of faith in its application to the Christian Church. Here we define the objective canon as including the canonical books of both the Old and the New Testament, exclusive of the apocryphal books. These latter we regard on the human plane as comparable with other uninspired writings. They are of value from the historical standpoint, and their content in most instances, 15 edifying. We judge them as to their worth solely on the plane of human effort and ability, and in no sense view them as a rule of faith. The New Testament, however, declares itself as the consummation of Scripture, filling out or completing the revelation made through the Old Testament. This brings us directly to one of the earliest problems of the primitive church-that of the relation between the Old and the New Testament

ARTICLE VI of the English Church is as follows: Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite necessary to salvation. (Here follows a list of the canonical books.) All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical. And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine. (Here follows a list of the apocryphal books.)

Mr. Wesley in arranging the Twenty-Five Articles of Methodism uses the Sixth Article of the Anglican Confession, but omits all reference to the apocryphal books. He also substituted the names "The Book of Ezra" and "The Book of Nehemiah" for the I and II Books of Esdras as they are called In the Anglican Confession. In the last sentence, he omits the word "them" before "canonical."

ARTICLE IV. Church of the Nazarene: "We believe In the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures by which we understand the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testament, given by divine inspiration, inerrantly revealing the will of God concerning us in all things necessary to our salvation; so that whatever is not contained therein is not to be enjoined as an article of faith."

The Relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament. One of the first problems to rise in the early Church was that of its relation to Jewish Law. The Jews themselves were reluctant to give up any portion of their regulations, and the Gentiles were loath to receive them. Then, too, the historical perspective, having as yet little or no meaning to the Church, the backwardness of certain parts of the Old Testament constituted a real difficulty for the Christian conscience. It was on this ground of unchristian morality that Marcion and his adherents rejected the Old Testament. The problem became acute when the Apostle Paul declared that it was not necessary for the Gentiles to become Jews before becoming Christians. His Epistle to the Galatians is his declaration of independence as it concerns Judaism in itself. This rough but strong statement is given to the Church in its polished and perfected form in the Epistle to the Romans. The great apostle likewise declared his independence of paganism, in a like rugged and strong epistle - that to the Colossians. This we have in its finished form in the Epistle to the Ephesians. The controversy became so acute, that a council of the elders was called at Jerusalem, over which the Apostle James presided. The Pharisees demanded that the Gentiles be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. Peter, arguing from his experience at the household of Cornelius, and Paul and Barnabas citing the miracles and wonders which had been wrought of God, James rendered the final verdict in these words: Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day (Acts 15:19-21). This was a victory for the liberal party, but the problem has been persistent in every succeeding age of the Church. At the opening of the Reformation Period, the problem came to the front again. Here it took a twofold form- that of minifying the Old Testament on the one hand, and an attempt to enforce the minute Jewish ceremonial regulations on the other. The earliest attempt in the English Church to settle this problem was the TEN ARTICLES of 1536, which passed rapidly through other statements and was given a more definite expression in the FORTY-TWO ARTICLES of 1553. The present ARTICLE VII of the Anglican Confession was formed by Archbishop Parker out of two of the earlier articles of 1553, and was directed against Romanism on the one hand, and the errors of the Anabaptists on the other. This represents, not only the conclusions of English Protestantism, but is in accord with all Protestantism. As finally settled, the solution took the form of three declarations.First, the Old Testament was not to be considered contrary to the New Testament, but to be regarded as an earlier and preparatory stage for Christianity We are to view the Old Testament as a progressive unfolding of God’s revealed will, and that at each stage men and their actions are to be judged m accordance with the accepted standards of their times and m harmony with the amount of divine light accorded them.Second,God’s promises to the Jews carried with them, not only promises of material blessing, but of spiritual light and salvation. They were not therefore to be regarded as "transitory," but as revelations on various levels and in varying degrees, of the one Messianic hope which found its perfect fulfillment in Christ (Cf. Hebrews 1:1).Third, the question of the relation of the Church to Jewish Law was solved, by making a distinction between civil and ceremonial law on the

one hand and moral law on law on the other. This is admittedly a radical distinction, for to the Jew every part of the law was equally

ARTICLE VII, Anglican Confession: The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look for only transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil Precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

sacred. Nor could it have been made unless our Lord himself had first abrogated that part of it which belonged solely to the earlier economy. Thus that which was in Judaism as a logical accident and necessary to its earlier expression, is to be superseded by other and more spiritual forms of expression, though through all there abides the truth eternal. His direct statement as to His own relation of superiority to the law and his avowed purpose of lifting it to higher forms of expression (Cf. Matthew 5:38-39; Matthew 5:43-44); his assertion of lordship over even the Sabbath (Cf. Mark 2:28); and his references to the new cloth and the old garment (Mark 2:21-22) and the new wine and the old wineskins, are sufficient proof that He anticipated new and higher forms of expression, for the truth to be revealed through the Holy Spirit. The Council of Jerusalem (A.D. 51) claimed the specific direction of the Holy Ghost, which Jesus had promised should be given as a Spirit of truth (Acts 15:28); and the decision was so definite as to what was to be retained, that there should be no doubt as to its intended abrogation. To this also, St. Paul's epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans bear direct evidence, declaring that the ritual and ceremonial law was abolished by One who had the authority so to do This may be summed up as follows: The civil portions of the Law belonged to Israel as a nation. Since Christianity was regarded as a religion of universal import, these civil restrictions could not possibly be binding upon the Church. The new and spiritual Israel demanded new and universal laws, for in 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 (Galatians 3:28). This new law must be applicable to all nations, all peoples, all degrees of civilization and culture, and without distinction as to sex. It can therefore be nothing less than the law of faith (Cf. Romans 3:21-28). Likewise, also, the ceremonial rites found their offices in the proper instruction of those who observed them. They admittedly pointed forward to Christ as their perfect fulfillment. Hence St. Paul arguesthatwhen we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons(Galatians 4:3-5).Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by' faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster(Galatians 3:24-25) As respects the moral law, Christ did not abolish it, but declared his intention to deepen and vitalize it. And this He did because as such, the moral law is God's will for all men, and not necessarily entangled with the accidents of religious ceremonies or civil obligations. It belongs to the nature of man-is the law of His true being and could not be abrogated without the destruction of the human in its higher spiritual aspects. Then again the Christian is inspired by the new law of love as an inner impulsive power, and this exceeds a forced obedience to an outwardly imposed law. Hence there are many

injunctions in the Scriptures, exhorting men to walk worthy of their profession by loving obedience to the moral law (Cf. Romans 13:9, Ephesians 6:2, James 2:10) EVIDENCESOFTHERULEOFFAITH

Having given in brief, the evidences which support the claims of the several books of the Bible to canonicity, we must now make mention of those which are urged in favor of the Scriptures as the authoritative rule of faith and practice in the Church. These evidences properly belong to the field of Apologetics, which on account of its wide range of research and investigation is now generally regarded as a separate branch of theological science. Due to the assaults of infidelity in the past, and the attacks of destructive criticism in modern times, this field is peculiarly difficult. It should demand the attention of only those more mature students who have had the proper scholastic preparation for this work, and who in addition have access to the literature of modern research. This literature will be found in the numerous Introductions to Biblical Science, the various histories of the Canon and the general field of Apologetics. It is evident that the limited scope of this work prevents any extended treatment of the subject. Furthermore, we deem the objections of unbelief as of little worth to the student of theology generally. They do not usually arise from honest intellectual inquiry, but from an evil heart of unbelief. They are always short4ived, and therefore frequently replaced by newer and equally contradictory hypotheses. The development of modern historical research, and the recent discoveries in philology and archaeology, have in each instance served to strengthen and confirm the faith of the Church in the authenticity of the sacred Scriptures. Again, we have endeavored in our previous discussion of the Scriptures, to show that their life is not bound up solely with historical evidences, but is to be found also in thetestimonium Spiritus Sancti, or the inner witness of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit dwelling within the hearts of true believers through the atoning work of Jesus Christ, is found to be the same Spirit who breathes in the pages of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the strongest evidence for the authority of the Scriptures is to be found in the fact ’that the Spirit of Inspiration, to whom we are indebted for the authorship of the Bible, is Himself the Divine Witness to its genuineness and authenticity

Classification of Evidences. The evidences offered in support of the claims of the Bible as the authoritative rule of faith and practice in the church, are usually classified as External, Internal and Collateral. External evidences are so-called because they are regarded as external to the Bible, such as miracle and prophecy. These we have previously treated in connection with the subject of Revelation. Internal evidences are those found within the book itself and consists in the arguments for the genuineness, authenticity and integrity of the Holy Scriptures. By Collateral evidences are meant those miscellaneous matters which cannot be properly classified as either External or Internal evidences, and yet areof sufficient importance to demand attention. Here are usually classified such evidences as the rapid expansion of Christianity during the first three centuries, and the beneficial influences of Christianity. upon mankind wherever accepted. Reference is sometimes made also to presumptive evidences, by which are meant those arguments which tend to dispose the mind toward the presentation of other evidences. The evidences are further classified as Rational and Authenticating. By a Rational argument is meant the endeavor to convince the mind of the truth of the proposition presented. It has to do with the truth or falsity of a proposition. By an Authenticating argument is meant an attempt to prove that the teacher is divinely commissioned, and may have no further bearing upon the truth of the proposition itself. However, if the claims of the teacher to divine inspiration can be supported by an authenticating

argument, this is at least presumptive evidence that the doctrines taught are likewise divinely inspired and therefore true In substantiation of the claims of the Old Testament to genuineness and authenticity we may mention: (1)The Antiquity of the Old Testament.Josephus quotes such writers as Manetho and Apollonius as agreeing that Moses was the leader of the Hebrew people when they left Egypt. Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus, Juvenal and others mention Moses; and Justin Martyr affirms that nearly all of the ancient historians, poets, philosophers and lawgivers refer to him as the leader of Israel and the founder of the Jewish state. (2)The Septuagint.The Old Testament was translated into Greek for the use of the Alexandrian Jews about 287 B.C. This translation is known as the Septuagint and is proof positive that the Pentateuch existed at that time. But it must be admitted that if the Pentateuch existed at that date, it must

Older works on Apologetics. Cf. Nelson,The Cause and Cure of Infidelity; William Lee,The Inspiration of Holy Scripture: Its Nature and Proof; Rawlinson, The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records; Gleig,The Most Wonderful Book in the World(New Ed. 1915); Horne,Introduction to the Holy Scriptures. Cf. also works on evidences by Paley, Whately, McIlvaine, Conybeare, Cudworth and Lardner.

have existed also in the days of Ezra (100: 536 B.C.), for the circumstances of the Jews in their captivity were such as to preclude its authorship between these two dates. Furthermore, Hebrew ceased to be the living language of the people soon after the time of their captivity, and after that date all important documents appear in either Greek or Chaldee [Aramaic]. Both Ezra and Nehemiah mention "the law of Moses" (Ezra 3:2, Nehemiah 8:1), which at the request of the people, was brought forth and read by Ezra before the whole congregation of Israel. (3)The Samaritan Pentateuch. In our discussion of the Canon we mentioned the two extant copies of the law of Moses, one received by the Jews, the other by the Samaritans. It is evident that these were both taken from the same original which must therefore, have existed previous to the divided kingdom, this claim being substantiated by the magnificent temple of Solomon and the elaborated ritual which attached to its services. From Moses to David, about four centuries, the circumstances of the period were such as to preclude any possibility of its authorship. When, therefore, it is declared that Joshua

On the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the following works will be found helpful: Green,The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch(1895),The Unity of the Book of Genesis(1895); Bissell,The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure(1885); Naville,The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch(1923); Clay,The Origin of Biblical Traditions(1923); Griffith,The Problem of Deuteronomy(1911) andThe Exodus in the Light of Archaeology(1923); MacDill,Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch; Firm,The Author of the Pentateuch(1931); Pilter, The Pentateuch: A Historical Record(1928); Orr,The Problem of the Old Testament(1911); Wiener,The Origin of the Pentateuch(1910),Pentateuchal Studies(1912); McKim,The Problem of the Pentateuch(1906); Bartlett,The Veracity of the Hexateuch(1897) The works on Archaeology are numerous. There are some very late books on this subject. Ramsay,The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament; Barton,Archaeology and the Bible(Sixth Ed. 1933); Clay,Light on the Old Testament from Babel(1906); Conder,The Tel el Amarna Tablets;The Bible and the East;and The Hittites and Their Language; Davies,The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses(1905); Grimme, The Law of Hammurabi and Moses(translated by Pilter); Kyle,The Deciding Voice of the Monuments(1921);Moses and the Monuments(1920);The Problem of the

Pentateuch(1920); Naville,The Discovery of the Book of the Law Under Josiah(1911);Archaeology and the Old Testament(1913) Price,The Monuments and the Old Testament(1925); Sayce, The Higher Criticism and the Monuments;The Hittites;Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments; Tompkins, The Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore; Urqahart,Archaeology's Solution of Old Testament Problems(1906).

wrote the book which bears his name (Joshua 24:26), and which appears to have been an addition to a previous volume known as the "Book of the Law," or the "Book of the Law of Moses" (Deuteronomy 31:24-26), there is no sound reason for denying the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. As to whether Moses had access to previous documents, or whether his inspiration was of the nature of a "vision hypothesis" is a matter of conjecture. St. Luke clearly states that he used historical material in preparing the book which bears his name, and yet the inspiration of this book has never been called in question. That the Pentateuch was compiled by redactors from previously written documents as affirmed by those who hold to the modern "documentary hypothesis" does not appear to be substantiated by the facts. (4)Archaeological Discoveries. Objections were formerly made to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, on the grounds that writing was not yet invented in the time of Moses, and that the moral standards of the decalogue were far in advance of his time. Both of these objections have been disproved by the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi at Susa, Persia, probably the Shushan of the Book of Esther. The date of this Code is about 2250 B.C. It proves conclusively that writing was in vogue at least a thousand years before the time of Moses, It contains two hundred forty-eight laws formulated by the king of Babylon, some of them remarkably like those given by Moses on Mount Sinai, and answers all objections against the moral standards existing in the time of Moses. It has been abundantly proved, however, that the Mosaic Code was not borrowed from the Babylonians.The Tel el Amarna Tabletswere found in 1887 and contained cuneiform inscriptions dating back to about 1400 B.C. These tablets represent conditions in Egypt precisely as they are related in Genesis and Exodus, and thus corroborate the testimony as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Another discovery which has

For further study Cf. Spencer,Did Moses Write the Pentateuch After All?(1901); Firm,The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch;Thomas,The Organic Unity of the Pentateuch(1904).

confirmed the truth of the Pentateuch, is that of the Hittites. Until recently critics have discredited the biblical statements concerning this ancient and powerful people, but the discoveries of archaeology have confirmed the biblical accounts, and added another proof to the authenticity of the Scriptures. One of the most outstanding evidences of archaeology, however, is the discovery of the city of Pithom, where in some parts of the store-chambers there are bricks made with straw, others with stubble, and some without straw but bound together with sticks. This is in exact accordance with the biblical account of the Hebrews during their bondage in Egypt

Genuineness and Authenticity of the Scriptures. Bygenuinenessas used in this connection, we understand a reference solely to authorship. A Book is genuine when it is the production of the author whose name it bears. The term is frequently confused withauthenticitywhich refers not to the authorship of a book but to the truth of its content. In this sense a book may be genuine without being authentic, or authentic without being genuine. There is, however, confusion as to the use of the term in theology and various writers attach different meanings to the words in question. It is

admittedly difficult to sharply distinguish between the two in any discussion of scriptural evidences, for if a book is not written by the author it acknowledges, then not only is the question of its genuineness involved but that of its authenticity as well. For this reason it is a common practice with many theologians to treat both subjects under one head The authenticity of the New Testament has been

Later works on General Apologetics: Cf. Fisher,Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief(1911); Ingram,Reasons for Faith and Other Contributions to Christian Evidences(1910-1914); McGarvey, Evidences of Christianity(1912); Cairns,The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith; Bissell,The Historic Origin of the Bible(1889) Lindberg,Apologetics: A System of Christian Evidences(1917); Luthardt, Fundamental Moral and Saving Truths of Christianity(3 vols.); Rishell,The Foundations of the Christian Faith(1899); Wright, Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences(1906); Wells,Why We Believe the Bible(1910); Stewart,Handbook of Christian Evidences; Row,A Manual of Christian Evidences; Ebrard,Christian Apologetics or the Scientific Vindication of Christianity(3 Vols.); Christlieb,Modern Doubt and Christian Belief(2nd Ed. 1874); Robertson,The Bible at the Bar(1934); Shiner,The Battle of Beliefs(1931); Short,The Bible and Modern Research(1932).

previously discussed and we need not repeat the arguments here. It is sufficient to summarize these arguments as follows:(1) There are quotations from the New Testament found in the writings of the earliest fathers, dating back to the first century and immediately following, such as Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. (2) There is the testimony of the opponents of Christianity such as Celsus in the second century, Porphyry and Hierocles in the third and Julian in the fourth century, all of whom bear witness to the[,.existence of the New Testament in their day. (3) There are the early catalogues of the books of the New Testament. The earliest of these was that of Origen (100: 210A.D.) which lists all of the books of the New Testament except James and Jude and these are mentioned elsewhere in his writings. (4) The Roman historians whose antiquity has never been questioned bear witness to Christ and early Christianity. Suetonius mentions Christ by name, Judaeos impulsore Christo assidue tumultantes Roma expulit(Edit. Var.,p. 544); while Tacitus mentions Pilate as procurator of Judea, and refers to Christ as the Founder of the sect of Christians. (Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante, per procuratoreum Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. -Annal., 1, 5.) (5) The style of the books in each case is suited to the age and circumstances of the reputed writer, and the characteristic differences are evidence that the work was not that of one person but of many. (6) The character of the writers is evidence in favor of the authenticity of their writings. They were holy men and incapable of forgery or deception. There is a straight-

For further reading cf. MullinsWhy Is Christianity True?StearnsThe Evidences of Christian Experience (1890); Wright,Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences(1906)Kreitzmann The New Testament in the Light of a Believer’s Research(1934) Marston,New Bible Evidence(1934); Robertson, Luke the Historian in the Light of Research(1920) Machen,The Origin of Paul’s Religion(1921) Noesgen,The New Testament and the Pentateuch(1905); Watson,Defenders of the Faith: The Christian Apologists of the Second and Third Centuries(1899); Carrington,Christian Apologetics in the Second Century(1921); Cobern, The New Archaeological Discoveries and Their Bearing on the New Testament(1917); Ramsay,Was Christ Born in Bethlehem? The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.

forwardness and frankness about these writers which impostors could not well counterfeit. (7) The writers refer to incidents, persons and places, which can be confirmed by history, and which an impostor would overlook or conceal. They are characterized by an artless simplicity, and relate even those things which no writers of less integrity would mention. It has been truthfully said that in the New Testament we have stronger evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the books which compose it, than is afforded the books of any other class, sacred or profane The Integrity of the Scriptures.Have the sacred books, even though divinely inspired, been transmitted to us in an uncorrupted manner? May we be confident that we are in possession of the truth of the original text? By the integrity of the Scriptures we mean that they have been kept intact and free from essential error, so that we may be assured of the truth originally given by the inspired authors. Here again we must present only a brief summary of the evidences for the integrity of the Scriptures. (1) There is no evidence that the Scriptures have been corrupted. The burden of proof is upon the objectors. Nor need we have any fear as to the result of careful investigation. No proof has ever yet been furnished of essential alterations, and it is certain that

Wakefield sums up the evidences from the credibility of the writers as follows:(1) They were men of strict and exemplary virtue. (2) They were in circumstances certainly to know the truth of what they relate. (3) The apostles were not influenced by worldly interests. (4) Their testimony was in the highest degree circumstantial." - WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology,pp. 68-71

Pond gives the following as the laws of valid testimony:(1) There must be a competent number of witnesses. (2) These witnesses must have had the capacity and the means of forming a correct judgment. (3) They must be persons of unexceptionable moral character. (4) They must be disinterested. (5) Their testimony must be given In plain terms, and must be, on all essential points, a concurrent testimony. (6) It must be of such a nature that the witnesses, if they have falsified, are open to detection. (7) It must be, not contradicted, but (so far as might reasonably be expected) confirmed, by other evidence. (8) It must be followed up, on the part of the witnesses, by a correspondent, consistent course of action. Dr. Pond applies these laws to the Scriptures in an argument of peculiar insight and strength. "Christianity may yet be assailed," he says, "but it will come out of every new trial, as it has out of every previous one, strengthened in its evidences, and not weakened; victorious, and not vanquished." - POND,Christian Theology,pp. 97-105.

none can be furnished in the future. (2) There were strong motives for preserving the Old Testament on the part of the Jews. Besides the high veneration in which their sacred books were held, these books contained the articles of their religious faith and the laws of their land. The antagonism which existed between the Jews and the Samaritans would forbid any mutilation of the Pentateuch of which each nation possessed a copy. (3) The multiplication of copies and their wide diffusion by the Levites as early as the times of the Judges and Kings (Deuteronomy 31:11) tended to prevent the alteration of the text. The public reading of the Scriptures in the synagogues every Sabbath day also preserved their purity. In addition to this, the Jews were jealous of their Scriptures and enacted a law making one guilty of inexpiable sin who should presume to make the slightest alteration. (4) The exceeding care of the Jewish copyists would likewise reduce to a minimum any errors in transcribing. They used such further precautions against alterations as ascertaining the number of letters and the middle sections of the several books. (5) In the case of the New Testament there is the agreement of the ancient manuscripts. The chief collators of the New Testament were Erasmus, the editors of the Complutensian and London Polyglots and

individual biblical scholars such as Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthaei, Schols, Kennicott and De Rossi. Dr. Kennicott examined six hundred and fifteen manuscripts and De Rossi collated seven hundred and thirty-one more making thirteen hundred and forty-six in all. The testimony of Dr. Kennicott was that he had "found many variations, and some grammatical errors; but not one of which affected,

The Jewish copyists were at some periods, excessively, I had almost said superstitiously, exact. They noted the verses where something was supposed to be forgotten, the words which they believed to be changed, and the letters which they regarded as superfluous. They ascertained the middle letter of the Pentateuch, the middle clause and letter of each book, and how many times each letter of the alphabet occurs in all the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus Aleph, they tell us, occurs 42,377 times; Beth, 32,218 times. I mention these facts to show the excessive care and particularity of these ancient copyists, and how unlikely it is that any considerable change could occur under their hands. - POND,Christian Theology,p. 89.

in the smallest degree, any article of faith and practice." (6) The numerous quotations from the New Testament found in the writings of the Fathers, not only prove the authenticity of the Scriptures as previously mentioned, but the integrity of the text as well. (7) Closely allied with these are the various helps which have served to preserve the original text. For the Old Testament there are the Targums, the Talmud and the Septuagint. For the New Testament there are the various translations. Here we may mention thePeshito, or Syriac version (100: 150 A.D.); theItala, or old Latin version (100: 160 A.D.); theVulgateor Jerome’s translation (latter part of the fourth century; theCoptic(or old Egyptian), theEthiopicand theGothic, all of the fourth century and theArmeniantranslation of the fifth century. These translations and recensions confirm both the authenticity and the integrity of the New Testament. Dr. Philip Schaff says that "in the absence of the autographs, we must depend upon copies or secondary sources. But these are fortunately, far more numerous and trustworthy for the Greek New Testament than for any ancient classic."

The Targums are Hebrew paraphrases of the Old Testament, the wordTargummeaning "Interpretation." TheTalmudis a commentary on the Old Testament, the wordTalmudmeaning "instruction." The Talmud is composed of two parts, theMishnawhich is the text itself In either Babylonian or Palestinian, and theGemarawhich is the commentary on the text. These helps are an aid In understanding the text and preserving it. The Septuagint is the Greek translation of the Old Testament made in Egypt for the Alexandrian Jews about 287 B.C. though the date is sometimes placed at 280 B.C. and by others at 250 B.C.

08. Chapter 9 - THE EXISTENCE AND NATURE OF GOD

Chapter 9 - THE EXISTENCE AND NATURE OF GOD The first task of theology is to establish and unfold the doctrine of God. The existence of God is a fundamental concept in religion, and therefore a determinative factor in theological thought. The nature ascribed to God gives color to the entire system. To fail here is to fail in the whole compass of truth. Theology, however, can hardly be expected to furnish a demonstrative proof of God’s existence, for belief does not rise altogether from logical arguments. The existence of God is a first truth, and must logically precede and condition all observation and reasoning. Men reach a conviction on this subject apart from scientific discussion. To the great mass of men the theistic arguments are unknown, and to many others they do not carry the conviction of certainty. These arguments will therefore be presented as confirmatory proofs of the existence of God, and will be useful in showing the approach of the human mind in its attempt to grasp and explain its belief in the Divine Existence. It must also be borne in mind, that the best apologetic is a clear statement of the doctrines we would establish. Once the Christian position is clearly understood, many of the objections urged against it become irrelevant. We must, then, seek for other causes which have made belief in God a general and persistent idea among men

Definition of God.Since, the mind must define by limiting the object of its thought, it is evident that the human mind can never form an adequate conception of God or properly define His being. Only the infinite can comprehend the Infinite. This philosophical conclusion finds its support in the New Testament, which reveals Godas dwelling in the light that no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see(1 Timothy 6:16). The nearest approach to a definition is theI AM THAT IAMof the Old Testament (Exodus 3:14) which asserts His existence with no attempt at proof, and further implies that His essence can be known only to Himself. God, therefore, can be known to us only through a revelation of Himself, and while these manifestations are imperfect, due to our limited capacity, they are, in so far as comprehended by us, actual knowledge, which the mind attributes to God as possessed in an infinite degree. Since our conception of the attributes is likewise in a degree indefinite, they may not in this sense be regarded as a definition; but on the other hand, insofar as they furnish a comprehensive statement of the attributes as revealed in Scripture, they may very properly be considered a definition of God

God is a Spirit, holy in nature and attributes, absolute in personality, and thereby the ultimate ground, and adequate cause and sufficient reason for all finite existence. In the words of our own creed, "We believe in one eternally existent, infinite God, Sovereign of the universe. That He only is God, creative and administrative, holy in nature, attributes, and purpose. That He, as God, is Triune in essential being, revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (Manual,p. 25, Art. I). The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England define God as follows: "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" (Article I). John Wesley revised the Anglican Confession for the Methodist Episcopal

Church of America, reducing the Thirty-nine Articles to what is commonly known as the Twenty-five Articles. However, he made no change in Article I except to change the word "be" to "are" in the second part. But in 1786 the Bishops of the Conference omitted the word "passions," so that the Methodist statement reads, "without body or parts." The Anglican statement is one of the original articles of 1553 and its languageis very similar to that of the Augsburg Confession. The Westminster Catechism defines God as "A Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." The definitions of God given by the theologians of the Christian Church differ widely. Dr. Charles Hodge approves the Westminster statement, but Dr. John Miley holds that "personality is the deepest truth in the conception of God and with this should be combined the perfection of his personal attributes.'' Hence he defines God as "an eternal personal Being, of absolute knowledge, power and goodness." Dr. A. H. Strong's definition is the infinite and perfect Spirit in whom all things have their source, support and end." Calovius defines God asessentia spiritualis infinita; Ebrard as "the eternal source of all that is temporal," Kahnis as "the infinite Spirit"; while Andrew Fuller thinks of God as "the first cause and last end of all things." Martensen says, "God is a Person, that is, He is the self-centralized absolute, the eternal fundamental Being, which knows itself as center - as the I AM in the midst of its infinite glory, which is conscious of being the Lord of this glory." Calderwood defines God as "an infinite Being, who is subject to no restrictive conditions." Henry B. Smith says, "God is a Spirit, absolute, personal, holy, infinite and eternal in His being and attributes, the ground and cause of the universe." Hase defines God as "the absolute personality who out of free love is the cause of the universe"; while Van Oosterzee says, "We speak of Him, not simply as the totality of all being, but as the self-existent One, who unconditionally is and would be, though all beyond Himself should be altogether non-existent."

Philosophical Conception of God.The termGodhas a different meaning in philosophy from that which attaches to it in religion. In religion, the termGodas Absolute Personality is interpreted to mean that He possesses in infinite perfection all that constitutes personality in finite beings. In philosophy, the term is a synonym for the Absolute in the sense of ultimate reality,whether conceived as personal or impersonal. The termAbsoluteis not scriptural and not necessarily religious. It has come into current use in modern times only, and is used to express abstract thought concerning the ultimate nature of reality. Aristotle defines God as "the first ground of all being, the Divine Spirit, which unmoved, moves all." The conception of God here is static, an "Unmoved Mover." Perhaps the highest definition in pagan antiquity is that of Plato who says, "God is the eternal mind, the cause of good in nature." Kant defines God as "a Being who by His understanding and will is the cause of nature; a Being who has all rights and no duties; the supreme perfection in substance, the all-obligating Being, author of a universe under moral law; the moral author of the world; an intelligence infinite in every respect." Hegel, whose absolute idealism was the outgrowth of the Kantian philosophy, defines God as "the Absolute Spirit, the pure, essential Being that makes Himself Object to himself; absolute holiness; absolute power, wisdom, goodness, justice." To Spinoza, God is "the absolute universal Substance: the real Cause of all and every existence; the alone, actual, and unconditioned Being not only Cause of all being, but itself all being, of which every special existence is only a modification." This is a pantheistic definition. When Calvin defined God as "an infinite and spiritual essence," and Luther held to a similar definition, it must be borne in mind, that in the sixteenth century during which they wrote, the pantheistic discussion had not sprung up. Now it is necessary to qualify such abstract

statements by including the term personality, which is essential to the Christian conception of God In proportion as man's thought approaches maturity, the religious and philosophical conceptions of God tend to become more and more identified. The Spirit of Holiness and the Spirit of Truth are identical, and tend to lead to a rational statement of religious experience. This tendency toward the identification of thought and experience is not an arbitrary matter, but the consequence of a unity of life which combines both philosophicand religious interests in one person. It may be studied in religions and philosophies other than Christianity. With the broader and deeper insights of maturity, man comes to realize that God must be Master of the world, if He is to satisfy the religious needs of men; while the philosopher finds that the universe can have no explanation without accounting for the facts of ethical and religious life. Scripture makes this clear in the statement that Christ is not only the Head of the Church, but the Head of all things to the Church (Ephesians 1:22) In any comprehensive discussion of the doctrine of God, it is obvious that the subject must be considered in its two main branches,First,the more general idea of the existence of God as an object of human thought and knowledge; andSecond, the more specific revelation of His nature and attributes. The first is the idea of God in its philosophical aspects, and is commonly known as Theism; the second is the idea of God as found in religion, and commonly treated as Theology, in the narrower sense of the term. These two conceptions cannot be kept entirely apart, but they may be distinguished in a broad way, as God's revelation in man as to his constitution and nature; and His revelation to man as a free and responsible person. The first is metaphysical, the second is ethical The Christian Conception of God.Before taking up the discussion of these two aspects of the Supreme Being, it may be well to notice a third phase of the subject in a preliminary way-the unity of the philosophical and religious aspects of God as revealed in the historical Christ. The Christian conception of God is a conviction that the ultimate Personality of religion and the Absolute of philosophy find their highest expression in Jesus Christ; and that in His Person and work we have the deepest possible insight into the nature and purpose of God.He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, is Jesus enunciation of this great truth (John 14:9). Stated theocentrically, Christ does not only reveal God, God reveals Himself through Jesus Christ. When theology starts with any conception of God lower than that whichis revealed in and through Jesus Christ, says Dickie, it is always difficult to lift that conception to a standard which is fully and consistently Christian. Christian theology must therefore in a large measure be Christocentric, molding its conceptions in the fullness of Him who isthe effulgence of the Father's glory and the express image of his person(Hebrews 1:3). It is this conception which has expressed itself theologically in the great doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity, and which marks the fundamental distinction between the Christian view of God, and that found in other forms of theistic belief The Christian idea of God unites in itself historically three fundamental elements which may be traced to a greater or lesser extent in their processes of development. The first is the concept of personality, which forms the basis of the religion of Israel, and was revealed directly to the covenant people by the Spirit himself. The second is the concept of the absolute, indirectly revealed through the search of the human mind after truth. It reaches its noblest expression in the philosophy of the Greeks. Since the Greek language was ordained of the Spirit to be the medium through which the New Testament should be given to the world, its expression was determined largely by the philosophical concepts which characterized that language. This philosophical expression is given the sanction of Divine Revelation in the Logos doctrine as set forth in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. In these few verses (John 1:1-18) the inspired writer has lifted out

of the mazes of Greek thought, the true concept of Christ as the Logos, and in one of the most remarkable philosophical statements ever uttered, has given us divine insight into the relation existing between the revelation of God in nature and His revelation through the Spirit. The third constituent element is to be found in the interpretation of both personality and absoluteness in terms of the revelation of God in Christ. Christianity contends that in Christ is to be found at once, the explanation of the true nature of ultimate reality as sought by philosophy, andthe supreme revelation of the personal God in His character and attributes, as demanded by religion THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

Among the older theologians, the philosophical aspects of the doctrine of God were commonly treated under the head of Theism. By this is meant a belief in a personal God, Creator and Preserver of all things, who is at once immanent in creation, and transcendent, or above and separate from it. Opposed to this view may be mentionedDeismwhich maintains the personality of God, but denies His immanence in creation and His providential sovereignty of the universe. It is an overemphasis upon the separateness of God from His created works, and historically has denied the Scriptures as a divine revelation.Pantheismon the other hand is an overemphasis upon the relation of God to the universe, and stresses His immanence to the disparagement of His transcendence. In breaking down the distinction between God and creation, pantheism in contradistinction to Theism, denies the personality of God

Philosophical Theism, with its various theories concerning the nature and proofs of God’s existence, has in some sense been the most barren department of theological thought. And yet the Scriptures give us some ground for this philosophical approach by their emphasis upon the revelation of God in nature and the constitution of man. St. Paul asserts thatthe invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by’ the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse(Romans 1:20) The existence of God as we have shown, is a fundamental presupposition, not only of the Christian religion, but of all religion in its higher forms. It is not a conviction to be reached by discursive reason, and does not therefore depend upon demonstration. This conviction is real and potent, is innate in man and tends to become more and more explicit. The existence of God must therefore be regarded both as an innateidea in the limited sense of this term, and as a truth demonstrating itself to reason. According to the former, it is a necessary element in man’s consciousness. It is like the atmosphere. We cannot see it, and yet we cannot see without it. According to latter, it becomes necessary to arrange the elements of consciousness into a system of confirmatory arguments, such as shall justify the claims of reason. We shall therefore treat this subject of the Existence of God,first, as to the Origin of the Idea of God in Intuition; andsecond,as a Confirmatory Revelation of God ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF GOD IN INTUITION

God alone can reveal Himself to man. This He has done in a primary revelation found in the nature and constitution of man, and secondarily, by the direct revelation of Himself through the Spirit to the consciousness of men. The first finds its culmination in the Incarnation, or the Word made flesh; while the second has its source in the Glorified Christ, as the foundation for the revelation of God through the Spirit The term "innate" is therefore applied to our primary knowledge of God. Since this term has been the source of much speculation and debate in philosophy, it may be well to use instead, the term rational intuition. By intuition we mean that power which the mind has of immediate insight into truth. Intuitive truths are self-evident and are usually regarded as above

logical proof. There are some truths, however, which are intuitional in a portion of their content, and yet acquired in an experimental or logical manner. Such is that of the existence of God, which is intuitive as an immediate datum of the moral and religious consciousness, and yet a truth to be demonstrated to reason. When, therefore, we speak of the idea of God as being intuitive, we do not mean that it is a first truth written upon the soul prior to consciousness; this would be to make the soul a material substance; nor is it actual knowledge which the soul finds itself in possession of at

By intuition we mean that ability of the soul to receive knowledge independently of the five senses though not contrary to them.-PAUL HILL.

birth; nor is it an idea imprinted upon the mind which may be developed apart from the law of observation and experience . It does mean that in the constitution and nature of man there is a capacity for the knowledge of God which responds in an intuitive manner to revealed truth, comparable to that in which the mind of man responds to the outer world. The Word by whom all things were created, is not only the principle of intelligence and order in the universe, but the mediatory ground, also, of man's intuitive knowledge of God. Thus we bring together three important factors in the knowledge of God,first, intuitive reason as the power of immediate insight into truth, which as a consequence of creation through the Divine Word, endows men with a capacity for the knowledge of God;second

There are some faculties of mind which determine the modes of our ideas. Some we obtain through sense-perception. Sense-experience underlies all such perception. We cannot in this mode reach the idea of God. Many of our ideas are obtained through the logical reason. They are warranted inferences from verified facts or deductions from self-evident principles. Through the same faculty we receive many ideas, with a conviction of their truth, on the ground of human testimony. There are also intuitive truths, immediate cognitions of the primary reason. The conviction of truth in these ideas comes with their intuitive cognition. Through what mode may the idea of God be obtained? Not through sense-perception, as previously stated. Beyond this it is not necessarily limited to any one mental mode: not to the intuitive faculty, because it may be a product of the logical reason or a communication of revelation to the logical reason; nor to this mode, because it may be an immediate truth of the primary reason. . . . . The idea of God as a sense or conviction of this existence is a product of the intuitive faculty. There is an intuitive faculty of the mind, the faculty of immediate insight Into truth. Thorough analysis as surely finds such a faculty as it finds the other well-known faculties, such as the presentative, the representative and the logical. To surrender these distinctions of faculty is to abandon psychology. To hold others on the ground of such distinctions is to admit an intuitive faculty.-MILEY, Systematic Theology, I,pp. 60, 62

A. A. Hodge in speaking of the innateness of the idea of God says, "It is not innate in the sense either that man is born with a correct idea of God perfectly developed, or that, independently of instruction, any man can, in the development of his natural powers alone, arrive at a correct knowledge of God. . . . . On the other band, independently of all instruction, a sense of dependence and of moral accountability is natural to man. These logically involve the being of God, and when the intellectual and moral character of an individual or race is in any degree developed, these invariably suggest the idea and induce the belief of a God. Thus man is as

universally a religious as he is a rational being. And whenever the existence and character of God as providential and moral ruler is offered as fact, then every human soul responds to it as true, seen in its own self-evidencing light, in the absence of all formal demonstration."-A. A. HODGE,Outlines of Theology,pp. 12, 13.

or the Spirit's universal presentation of truth to intuitive reason, through the revealing activity of the Divine Word.This is the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world(John 1:9); andThird,as a consequence of the union of the two previous factors, the universal and necessary idea of God. Human nature, therefore, is such that it necessarily develops the idea of God, through the revelation of the truth by the Spirit, in much the same manner as it develops a knowledge of the world through the data of the senses. This consciousness may be perverted by moral unlikeness to God, even as that of the outward world may be perverted by a false philosophy. The fact that the idea of God assumes so many forms, is proof at once of its intuitive nature on the one hand, and of its perversion on the other-this perversion being due to the withdrawal of the Spirit of holiness occasioned by sin. In support of the intuitive nature of the idea of God as thus set forth, we offerfirst, the testimony of Scripture; andsecond, the universal experience of men

The existence of God, God alone can reveal. He has wrought this supreme truth into the constitution of human nature as its Creator. Scripture, which never proves the being of the Supreme, appeals to this consciousness; it also gives the reason for its disturbance, and thus by anticipation obviates the force of every argument against it. . . . . All processes of this argument rest finally on the analysis of that original consciousness of God which is the birthright of man as a creature: hence they are derived,First,from an appeal to the nature of the human spirit itself;Second,from a consideration of the relation of the human mind to the phenomena of the universe; andThird,from the universal Theism of the race as the result of both. . . . . The simplest form of the argument is to be sought in the moral constitution of man, which in reason or conscience proclaims the existence of a Supreme Lawgiver, and in its desires and aspirations the existence of a Supreme Object for communion with whom it was made. These are elements of our nature and not the result of education; they are primary, intuitive, and universal; refusing at the outset all argument upon their origin. If conscience is the moral consciousness-its only sound definition-it as much implies a spiritual world into which man is born as consciousness generally implies the natural world. If it is the reason or heart or central personality of man it gives testimony, supreme in the soul, to a Power who rules In righteousness and hates iniquity. The rational law of our nature is its moral law. It points to a Holy Governor, whom it suggests or to whom it appeals, above the visible world nothing in which is capable of exciting its emotions. And the universal feeling of dependence on a Being or a Person higher than ourselves reinforces this argument: the same heart in man which trembles before an Authority above him yearns to be able to trust in Him. This may be called the moral demonstration.-Pope,Compend. Christian Theology, I,pp. 234, 235, 236.

The Testimony of Scripture. The Scriptures everywhere assume that there is in man's nature the consciousness of a Supreme Being, upon whom he depends and to whom he is responsible. It makes an appeal to thelaw written in their hearts, and also to the sense of dependence upon God as the source and satisfaction of all their desires, if haply they might feel after him, and find him(Acts 17:27). It is in Godthat we live, and move, and have our being. . . . .For we are also his offspring(Acts 17:28). The prologue to the Fourth Gospel is explicit in its teachings upon this

subject, where the eternal Logos is declared to bethe true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world(John 1:1-18) The only atheism which is recognized in the Scriptures is a practical atheism which grows out of a reprobate mind. Sin has obscured the truth in human nature and the Scriptures charge men with not desiring to retain the knowledge of God. It is the fool who has said in his heart,There is no God-that is, there is no God for me (Cf. Romans 1:28, Psalms 14:1, Ephesians 2:12). Of great significance also is the fact that the written revelation begins with the words, In the beginning God, and assumes without attempt to prove the existence of God. The Christian scholar may, therefore, confidently rest in the fact that God has so laid this fundamental evidence in the nature and constitution of man, that He has nowhere left Himself without a witness. Even the Greek philosopher Plato could say that God holds the soul by its roots-he does not need to demonstrate to the soul the fact of His existence. He must therefore declare explicitly as does the Scripture, thatthe invisible

The Scripture "certainly declares this at least, that the very life of the dependent creature is bound up with the idea of its Independent Source, the very thought of God in man’s mind-to anticipate a future argument-assumes that God is. It goes higher still, if possible. It declares that the eternal Logos or Wordis the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.And this precedes, in order of time and thought, that higher revelation which follows:No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him(John 1:18). He is Himself the manifestation of the invisible God, but only as revealing Himself to a preparatory consciousness in mankind. EkeinoV exhgsato: He hath expounded in a final exegesis the original text implanted in the universal human nature."-Pope, Compend. Christian Theology, I,p. 235.

things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they’ are without excuse(Romans 1:20) The Universal Experience of Men.An intuitive or first truth must be characterized by universality and necessity. If then the idea of God is intuitive, it should be corroborated by an appeal to the universal experience of mankind, and this is the testimony of those whose investigations have enriched the fields of anthropology and comparative religions. In addition to the instances already cited in our discussion of the science of religion, we may mention also Max Mueller who after painstaking and discriminating research concerning the origin and growth of religion states, that "as soon as man becomes conscious of himself as distinct from all other things and persons, he at the same time becomes conscious of a higher self; a power without which he feels that neither he nor anything else would have any life or reality." This is the first sense of the Godhead, thesensus numinusas it has been called; for it is asensus, an immediate perception, not the result of reasoning or generalizing, but an intuition as irreversible as the impression of our senses. In receiving it we are passive, at least as passive as receiving from above the image of the sun or any other sensible impression. This sensus numinus is the source of all religion. It is that without which no religion true or false is possible (MAX MUELLER,Science of Language,p. 145). In his reference to the worship of the lower forms of religion he says, "Not the visible sun, moon and stars are invoked, but something else that cannot be seen." While there have been races which at first appeared to be without any form of religion, closer observation and a better understanding of the varying forms of religious practices, have shown that no tribe is without an object of worship. "The statement that there are nations or tribes which possess no religion," says Tiele, "rests either

upon inaccurate observations or on a confusion of ideas. No tribe or nation has yet been met with destitute of belief in any higher beings, antravelers who asserted their existence have been afterwards refuted by facts. It is legitimate, therefore, to call religion, in its most general sense, a universal phenomenon of humanity" (TIELE,Outlines of the History of Religion,p. 6). This agreement among individuals, tribes and nations, widely separated in time and place would appear to be sufficient evidence as to the universality of the idea of God. It may assume a thousand forms, but these diverse and imperfectly developed ideas can be accounted for only as perversion of an intuitive conviction common to all men. Washington Gladden once said, "A man may escape from his shadow by going into the dark; but if he comes under the light of the sun, the shadow is there." A man may be so mentally undisciplined that he does not recognize these ideas; but let him learn the use of his reason, let him reflect on his own mental processes and he will know that they are necessary ideas The universality of the idea of God leads immediately to its acceptance as a necessary idea. By a necessary idea we mean any intuition which springs directly and immediately from the constitution of the human mind, and which under proper conditions must of necessity so spring. This only can account for the persistence of the idea of God, without which it could never have been perpetuated. "Neither a primitive revelation, nor the logical reason, nor both together could account for the persistence and universality of the idea of God without a moral and religious nature in man to which the idea is native" (MILEY, Systematic Theology, I,p. 70). We may carry the argument one step farther, and insist that our intuitions give us objective truth. By a process of negative reason, we may argue that to deny this is to deny the validity of all mental processes. To distrust its intuitions is to lead immediately to a distrust in the interpretation of sense-perceptions through which our knowledge of the external world is mediated. To hold otherwise is to land in agnosticism. But man’s mental faculties are trustworthy. His rational intuitions are absolute truth, and the intuition of God, universal and necessaryin the experience of the race, finds its only sufficient explanation in the truth of His existence CONFIRMATORY REVELATIONS OF GOD

Since the time when English empiricism was led into thorough-going skepticism by Hume, and the famousCritiqueof Immanuel Kant played such an important part in the discussion, the historic arguments for the existence of God have been persistently attacked by both the opponents and the defenders of the theistic position. There are some theists who hold that the existence of God being a first truth, is the logicalpriusof all other knowledge, and must therefore be impossible of demonstration. God must be intuited, it is said, from the necessity of His relations; such as, the Infinite-as the correlative of the finite; Absolute Being in contradistinction to dependence; Overmaster or Lord in the nature of law; and Creative Reason as furnishing the guaranty

"The word intuition is a convenient term for stating the fact that the mind on certain occasions from its own inherent energy gives rise to certain thoughts." By an accommodation of language such thoughts are themselves called intuitions; the power the mind has of giving rise to such thoughts is called the intuitive faculty. The same idea is sometimes expressed by the terms, the nature, or the constitution of the mind, that is to say, the mind is conceived of as a somewhat whose nature is to give rise to thoughts when the proper occasion occurs. The same thing is intended when it is said of a class of ideas that they are innate, not that the ideas are in the minds of infants at birth, but that ideas are born in the mind when the conditions of their birth occur. Now, it must be manifest that an inquiry after the genesis of thought must in all cases in the last resort be referred to the

nature of the mind itself; for example, in any instance of perception, if we inquire, How came the mind to be in possession of the idea, suppose of color, as white or black? The usual answer is, By the sense of sight; but this answer is not complete, for it may still be inquired, How does sight give such ideas? and the answer must be, It is of the nature of the mind to be so impressed when the organs of sight are brought into exercise. . . . . The affirmation that the idea of God is intuitive, is an affirmation that the idea arises in the mind precisely in the same way as do ideas of time, space, substance, and all others of that class of thoughts. Again, man comes into being in a condition of absolute dependence, and some apprehensions of this dependence must, from the nature of the case, be among the earliest ideas in consciousness. Arising out of this sense of dependence inseparably connected with it, is a sense of obligation. Obligation is an apprehension not only of somewhat as due, but also of somewhat as due to Someone, and that One him upon whom we are dependent. In a word, it would seem evident from the obvious facts of the case, that the sense of dependence and obligation, of which all men are apprehensive from the earliest moments of conscious thought, are by them intuitively referred to an infinite intelligent first cause."-RAYMOND,Systematic Theology, I,pp. 248-252.

and basis of human reason. It is necessary, therefore, at the outset, to state in what sense the word proof is used in reference to the divine existence. Ulrici maintains that "the proofs for the existence of God coincide with the grounds for belief in God; they are simply the real grounds for belief, established and expounded in a scientific manner. If there be no such proofs, there are also no such grounds-if possible at all, can be no proper belief, but an arbitrary, self-made, subjective opinion. It must sink to the level of mere illusion." If this be true; then it follows that the proofs of God’s existence must be simply confirmatory revelations, the manifestations by which He makes Himself known in consciousness and the external world As confirmatory revelations, it is evident that the great theistic arguments must be something less than the full Christian view. There is a limit to their power

"Belief in God is by no means the necessary product of demonstration. As old as humanity itself, it was not at first produced by reasoning, but rather in its most primitive form preceded all reasoning. No one has ever begun to feel convinced of this truth merely because it had been demonstrated to him in a strictly logical manner. Men would hardly, indeed, have given themselves the trouble to seek for proofs for this conviction, had it not with irresistible power forced itself, as it were, on their innermost consciousness. Everywhere do we discover this belief, even where no proof has ever been yet heard of; and it will last even where the weak sides of all - known proofs are by no -means ignored. Belief in God is consequently no result, but, on the contrary, a starting-point for human thinking on invisible things-a postulate of our whole rational and moral nature, but no result of a universally recognized syllogism.-van Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm.,p. 239 But Christian dogmatics ought not from its standpoint to overlook the importance of other so-called proofs for the existence of God; much less to make common cause with those who speak with a certain contempt thereof, as a fruit of defective reasoning and foolish imagination. On the contrary, it must and will deplore the levity with which the assertion, in itself true, that God’s existence cannot be proved (demonstrated), is frequently repeated, understood, and applied in a way which as much as possible plays into the hands of unbelief and skepticism. "Modern theology, which so readily gives up the proofs for the existence of God, abandons thereby not only its own position as a science; but also, in principle, annihilates faith, and the religion of which it is the theology."-ULRICI. It is

true, there is not a single proof against which objections more or less serious might not be, and have been, adduced. All bear the unequivocal traces of the limitation of human thought. . . . . But yet they remain highly commendable, as more or less successful endeavors, not only to bring into satisfactory clearness the utterances of the innermost consciousness, but also to justify them to oneself and others as highly reasonable"-Cf. POPE,Compend. Christian Theology,pp. 233, 234, 236.

of demonstration, and indeed they are more properly regarded in this light, as probable rather than demonstrative arguments. But in either case they require the enforcement of the Holy Spirit's influence as divine credentials, and must in every case derive their strength from the further revelation of God as to His own essence and perfections

While the earliest objections to the arguments were urged on the basis of being formally invalid from the syllogistic point of view, involving the logical fallacy of assuming that which they profess to prove, later criticism points out that even when carried out to a logical conclusion, they yield a result that is not fully Christian. It should be kept in mind that the period of the Middle Ages in which the schoolmen developed the theistic arguments, was characterized by an emphasis upon the antithesis between reason and revelation. Reason or Natural Theology must be supplemented by Revelation. Originally the theistic arguments were designed to prove that the Christian idea of God was impossible to Natural Theology or Reason, and must be supplied by the Scripture or Revelation. Their function was to show that reason revealed some things about God, but not sufficient for the knowledge of salvation. The rational method was supplemented by authority. But with the changed attitude toward reason and revelation, and the tendency to regard life as a unity, experience becomes the dominant factor in the knowledge of God and must supply the distinctly Christian content The sharp distinction between reason and revelation made by the schoolmen, gave rise further, to the two great methods of approach which have played such an important part in this department of theological thought. The first is the method of philosophy, which seeks to establish the existence of God solely from the standpoint of human reason, and thus apart from divine revelation. The second is the method of authority and makes its appeal to the Scriptures, more especially to miracle and prophecy. Both have been historically important, and together they make up the traditional arguments fortheism. The method of the older theology, therefore, both Catholic and Protestant, began with the formal and abstract arguments of reason, and filled if in from revelation the distinctly Christian content. Dr. Dickie says, that in the first instance this scheme was superimposed upon Christian theology from Greek philosophy, and that it dominated all formal theology for at least seventeen hundred years The tendency, therefore, in theology has been to substitute a rationalistic conception of God for the personal revelation of God through the Spirit. The impression has been made that by examination of the evidences for the existence of God, as found in human consciousness and in the external world, man may attain to a spiritual and saving knowledge of God. In the Church of Rome this is heldde fido, that is, it is heresy not to hold it. But rightly understood there is both a spiritual and a historical value attaching to these arguments. While in some sense they may be regarded as invalid syllogistically, they are of profound significance otherwise.First,

As we come to the positive theistic argument, it will not be amiss to guard against certain errors respecting its functions. It will be rating the practical worth of the argument much too high to suppose that it affords the whole ground or incentive to theistic belief. Constitutional impulse is

prior to syllogisms. The needs of the emotional, the aesthetic, and the moral nature stimulate to thought and unite with intellectual needs to beget and to keep alive the idea of a supernatural and overruling power. The history of the race pays too large tribute to the force, persistency, and universality of this idea to allow the supposition of its adventitious origin. . . . . The function of formal argumentation, therefore, can be only supplementary. The basis of theistic faith is always at hand before philosophy or theology begins to set its proofs in order. SHELDON,Sys. Chr. Doct.,pp. 53, 54

It would be an overvaluation of theistic argumentation to suppose that it is competent, in the strict sense of the term, to demonstrate the existence of a Divine Person. Demonstration proper belongs to the sphere of ideal quantities and relations, where the data are thus and so by hypothesis, and no account needs to be taken of any uncertainties and imperfections of observation or experience. It cannot, therefore, apply to the sphere of objective reality. In this domain, an overwhelming preponderance of grounds in favor of a particular conclusion is the most that can be attained. This suffices for practical needs, and speculation becomes intemperate when it asks for more, whether in physical science or in theology.-SHELDON,Syst. Chr. Doct.,p. 54.

be found, rest ultimately, on the analysis of the original consciousness of God which is the birthright of every creature. We mention this in anticipation of a later discussion concerning the knowledge of God, 1:e., that there is a vast difference between knowing God and knowing about God. Secondary knowledge, such as is given in the arguments, can never lead to a direct knowledge of God; but once God is known through a spiritual revelation, "this secondary knowledge which comes to us indirectly fills out our mental picture, while our personal knowledge, however slight, gives life and actuality to the whole." The second value of the arguments, is found in the fact that they mark the various stages of knowledge, the lines along which in all ages man’s thoughts have risen to God. They are, according to John Caird, "the unconscious or implicit logic of religion."

"The manifold witnesses for God," says Bishop Martensen, "which man finds in and around himself are here reduced to general principles, and the various and intricate ways by which the human mind is brought to God are indicated by the summary results of thought." Both Bishop Martensen and Dr. Pope maintain that man’s thought rises to God in two ways, by the contemplation of himself, and by the contemplation of the world. The arguments are classified accordingly-the cosmological and teleological growing out of the nature of the external world, and the ontological and moral from the constitution of the human mind. The arguments which have so greatly influenced the thought of the past, cannot therefore be passed over lightly, even though regarded as confirmative rather than demonstrative proofs. Later it is our purpose to &nb

Though these several arguments do not necessarily conduct the unenlightened to the knowledge of God, yet, given even a hint of the divine existence, reason and nature afford abundant corroboration. It is one thing to make a synthesis of all the teachings of nature and reason and declare, God before unknown, to be the necessary result, and quite another thing, the existence of God being given as a proposition for proof, to gather together the evidences of it. There is no proof that the first feat has ever been accomplished by nation or individual. The discoverer of God, though a greater genius than Euclid or Newton, has not recorded his name in history.-SUMMERS,Syst. Th.,p. 69.

gather them up and present them in their modern and scientific form In the more elaborate treatises on Theism, it is the usual practice to divide the arguments into two classes-thea prioriand thea posteriori. This is a convenient arrangement but not accurate. It is difficult to draw a line and assign the arguments wholly to one class or the other. By a priori is meant the proof of fact or effect from the knowledge of existing causes; by a posteriori is meant the reasoning from effects to antecedent causes. For our purpose the simpler classification previously mentioned is more appropriate. We shall therefore treat the cosmological and teleological arguments as growing out of the nature of the external world, and the ontological and moral as related to the nature and constitution of the human mind. Dr. William Adams Brown defines these arguments and indicates their purpose in the following manner.First,the Cosmological Argument (from change to cause) is the

Revelation of God as Power.Second,the Teleological Argument (from adaptation to purpose) is the Revelation of God as Design.Third,the Ontological Argument (from necessary thought to being) is the Revelation of God as Reality; andFourth,the Moral Argument (from ideal to power adequate to realize it) is the Revelation of God as Right. (Cf. BROWN, Christian Theology in Outline,p. 124.) The Cosmological Argument. The term "cosmological" has been conventionally adopted for this argument because it attempts to account for, or endeavors to explain the cosmos or universe. It is more strictly the "etiological" or causal argument by which the mind reasons from the contingency of phenomena to a First Cause. The argument usually takes two forms - the physical which relies upon facts of the material universe, and the metaphysical which makes its appeal to causation or efficient force. The first or physical argument makes use of two indisputable facts of nature-matter and motion. It is certain that something has existed from eternity, but this cannot have been matter for matteris mutable. But since matter because it is mutable cannot be eternal, so the Creator because He is eternal cannot be either mutable or material. From the point of view of physics, we are therefore shut up to belief in a self-existent, spiritual Creator. The second or metaphysical form of the argument is stated by Johnson as follows: "Every change must have a cause; but the only real cause is a first cause; therefore the ever-changing universe must have had a First Cause. Furthermore, the idea of causation arises in the mind upon the exercise of will. We have a conception of cause only by virtue of the fact that in forming volitions, we ourselves are consciously causes. The First Cause must therefore be conceived by us as Will, that is, a Person." The Teleological Argument. The presence of design or purpose in the universe has been more or less clearly recognized by men from the beginning. The earliest statement is found in Genesis 1:1-31 :e., the stars are for light, fruit is for food, and like expressions. The Psalms are replete with arguments for design. The one hundred and fourth Psalm has been called the teleological or design Psalm. This argument has always held an important place among theists. Kant treated it with great respect, and Mill looked upon it as the only argument which had any strength. Christian apologetics has made much of it, often carrying it beyond the limits of sound reasoning. The evolutionists claimed for a time that the famous Watch Argument of Paley was invalid and had completely lost its point. But in LeConte, Drummond and others, the argument reappears in a new form-no longer particular design, but universal design. Kant made objection that "the design argument at best proves an architect only, not a Creator," but this objection loses its force when it is seen that origination and design go together The Ontological Argument.The germ of this argument is found in St. Augustine’s discussion of the Trinity (TrinityVII, iv) where he says, "God is more truly thought than He is described, and exists more truly than He is thought." Dr. Shedd in

commenting upon thissays, "This is one of those pregnant propositions so characteristic of the Latin Fathers, which compresses a theory into a nutshell. . . . . God’s existence is more real than even our conception of Him is for our own mind; and our conception confessedly is a reality in our own consciousness. . . . . The subjective idea of God instead of being more real than God is less real. The ’thing’ in this instance has more of existence than the ’thought’ of it has."

It remained, however, for Anselm to first give construction to the ontological argument in syllogistic. form, and with all the modifications to which it has been subjected, perhaps the original statement is still the clearest and strongest. "The idea of perfection includes existence, for that which does not exist will be less than perfect; therefore, since we have the idea of a perfect being, that being must exist for the idea includes his being or he would be less than perfect." The acute and powerful intellect of Anselm possessed that metaphysical intuition which saw both the heart of the atonement and the heart of divine existence. Gaunilon, a contemporary of Anselm, wrote a tract entitled "Liber pro Insipiento," or "Plea for the Fool," in which he raised an objection to the argument which has been repeated over and over again. He maintained that we have the idea of a tree, but it does not follow from this that there is an actual tree; or we have the idea of a winged lion, but this does not assure us that such a creature exists. But the reply to this argument, and all those of a similar nature is, that the vital point of the argument-that of necessary existence has been entirely overlooked. One idea is of a perfect and necessary

Knapp gives the Anselmic argument in this form: "The most perfect being is possible, and therefore, actually exists; for existence is a reality or perfection, and necessary existence is the highest perfection. Consequently necessary existence must be predicted of the most perfect being.-KNAPP,Christian Theology,p. 86

Miley, quoting from the Proslogium gives the following statement of the argument. "We have the idea of the most perfect Being, a Being than whom a greater or more perfect cannot be conceived. This idea includes and must include actual existence, because actual existence is the necessary content of the idea of the most perfect. An ideal being, however perfect in conception, cannot answer to the idea of the most perfect Being. This most perfect Being is God. Therefore God must exist."-MILEY,Systematic Theology, II,p. 74.

being-the other of an imperfect and contingent being. The idea of a tree is contingent, it may or may not be, and therefore from the idea of the tree it is impossible to prove its objective reality. But with the idea of God there is the element of necessity instead of contingency. If the idea is contingent and implies that a thing may or may not exist, then it does not necessarily follow that the object does exist; but if the idea of the things implies necessity, or that it must exist, then it does follow that the thing exists

Descartes apparently came to the same conclusion independently. Beginning by doubting all things possible, he came to the truth, "I think, therefore I am," thecogito ergo sumwhich he could not doubt. From this foundation he passed to a second statement, "I found that the existence of a perfect being was comprised in the idea in the same way in which the equality of the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles is comprised in the idea of a triangle, and that consequently it is at least as certain that God the perfect Being exists as any demonstration in geometry can be." (Cf. DESCARTES,Method,p. 240.) The English theologians made much use of this argument in their conflict with the atheism of Hobbes and others. Especially was this true of

those theologians who were deeply versed in the writings of Plato and Aristotle, such as Cudworth, Bates, Stillingfleet and Henry More

Kant objected to the ontological argument on the basis which we have before mentioned-that to think a perfect being by no means involves perfect existence. The modern objections, however, are at the opposite poles to the reasoning of Anselm. He held that objective reality is greater than the inward concept, while exactly the opposite is found in Kant and his followers, 1:e., that the object is not so real as the idea of it, and therefore must not be inferred from it. However, the argument may rest on another basis, that of absolute existence as necessary and implied in all existence. God is the substratum of all reality. We do not necessarily give up the argument by rejecting the Anselmic or Cartesianform of it. "The principle of absolute being," says Dr. Harris, "exists as a necessary law of thought, a constituent element of reasoning, and a necessary postulate in all things about Being" (HARRIS,Self-revelation of God,p. 164). Relative existence implies absolute existence; and a relative knowledge, absolute knowledge. God must be the end as well as the beginning of all things The Moral Argument. The highest revelation of God is the revelation of right. The tendency of speculative thought is to turn from nature to man. It is not that nature has no disclosures to make, but the deeper revelation is through man. Man is in the Divine image; nature is secondary. The argument, however, is but another application of the causal principle-one applied to-the moral instead of the natural world. This world is as orderly and full of purpose, as the physical, and can be explained only by a cause of the same nature as itself. The central fact of the moral realm is conscience; but conscience does not make moral law. The moral law is independent of man and unvarying from age to age. Its laws are inexorable, and its existence not only demands an Author, but the moral realm reveals His character as the friend of righteousness and the enemy of -unrighteousness

It was, therefore, the distinctive service of Immanuel Kant, to present this argument in its full extent and with great emphasis. He regarded it as the only sufficient argument for God. "Two things there are," said Kant, "which produce unceasing wonder the starry heavens above and the moral law within." Kant had three postulates, Freedom, Immortality, God. In the practical problem of pure reason and the necessary pursuance of the highest good, a connection is postulated between happiness and morality, proportionate to happiness. Man is to seek the highest good, and therefore the highest good must be possible. We must postulate then, the cause of nature as distinct from nature, and it is this cause which is able to connect morality with happiness. The highest good cannot exist except God exists-there must therefore be a highest good because ourmoral reason demands it. Some highest good exists, Therefore God exists. Duty is a great word with Kant. It implies that there is in the highest good a Being who is the supreme cause of nature, and who is the cause or Author of nature through His intelligence or will-that is, God. As the possibility of the highest good is inseparably connected with it, and it is morally necessary to hold the existence of God, one cannot help wondering why Kant did not find the existence of God in the moral law rather than as deduced from it. Duty is not something of itself apart from persons, but connected with them and recognized by them. It is because there is a Supreme Person that we recognize a supreme good, a supreme duty, a moral law

09. Chapter 10 - THE DIVINE NAMES AND PREDICATES

Chapter 10 - THE DIVINE NAMES AND PREDICATES The progressive revelation of God to man, as found in the Holy Scriptures, has its origin and development in the use of the Divine Names, through which God has communicated in varying degrees, something of the unsearchable mystery which surrounds His being. Two of these names, Elohim and Jehovah or Jahweh [Yahweh], when taken in their Old Testament unity, declare the being of God as absolute and necessary. There are many other names applied to Deity, but these two are supreme and run throughout the entire older period of revelation. Another name, El Shaddai, a combination of El and Shaddai; and Adonai, especially when used in the plural with Elohim and Jehovah, are of sufficient importance to demand special attention. All of these names are continued in the New Testament, and find their culmination in the revelation of God in Him, whose name is above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come (Ephesians 1:21) THE DIVINE NAMES AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

It is a significant fact, that while theology has not given to the Divine Names the important place they deserve in the historical unfolding of the idea of God, rationalistic thought has built upon them the "documentary hypothesis," which has occupied so prominent a place in the so-called "Higher Criticism." The beginnings of the rationalistic movement are to be found in Eichorn (1781-1854) and his study of the "fragments of Reimarus." He attempted to apply the principles of the so-called historical school to ecclesiastical law, and in the preface to his Introduction to the Old Testament uses the term "Higher Criticism" to distinguish his position from that of the older theology. In the formulationof the documentary hypothesis, however, it belonged to Jean Astruc (1684-1766), a French physician, to first introduce the terms Elohist and Jehovist or Elohistic and Jehovistic as applied to portions of the Old Testament. Reading the Book of Genesis, Astruc was arrested by the fact, which up to that time had been apparently unnoticed, that the first chapter of Genesis uses only the word Elohim for "God," while in other sections the word Jehovah is as persistently used. In the second and third chapters, the two names are combined, giving rise to a new conception of Deity as Elohim- Jehovah or the "Lord-God." With the thought in mind that possibly Moses had before him earlier documents, some perhaps dating back to Abraham, and that these had been combined into a single account, he sought to find whether there was a possibility of detecting and separating these documents and assigning them to their original sources. This he attempted to do on the basis that the varying use of terms indicated different writers. It was on this supposition that the modern critical attitude toward the Scriptures was founded In the development of the Higher Criticism, both Eichorn and DeWette accepted the theory of Astruc. DeWette (1780-1849) developed the theory further by asserting that the Book of Deuteronomy was not written by the author of the first four books of the Pentateuch; and hisIntroduction to the Old Testamentpublished in 1806 marks one of the epochs in the development of rationalistic criticism. Strauss (1806-1874), Bauer (1792-1860) and the Tübingen School directed their attacks against the New Testament. Vatke published a book in 1836, in which he applied the principles of Hegelian philosophy to the Scriptures. Graf in 1866, advanced the theory that the body of laws

found in the middle books of the Pentateuch was a late production, manufactured and placed in its present position after the Babylonian exile. This is commonly known as "the Graffian [Graf-Wellhausen or Documentary] Hypothesis," and was accepted by Kuenen who publishedThe Religion of Israelin 1869-1870, a further step in destructive criticism. It remained, however, for Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), by his popular gifts and intellectual acuteness, to secure for this position its wide acceptance in modern theological thought. We have given this brief account of the Higher Criticism, which in its radical and destructive form has so blighted the faith of the Church, in order to show more clearly the distinction between the development of rationalism in its concept of God and His Word, and God's own revelation of Himself through the Divine Names. When it is recalled that the historical perspective underlies the modern critical developments, new significance must be attached to God's appointed means for revealing Himself to His creatures

Elohim. The first name of God given to us in the Scriptures, and one which pervades all the earlier writings is that of Elohim. The derivation of the Word is uncertain, but it may be traced to the simple root word meaning power, or to the singular form which signifies the effect of power. In Genesis 31:29 Laban says, It is in the power [El] of my hand to do you hurt. Moses in predicting the judgments which should come upon Israel if they disobeyed God said, Thy sons and daughters shall be given to another people . . . . and there shall be no might [El] in thy hand (Deuteronomy 28:32). The wordElis translated "God" in about two hundred-twenty-five places in the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, and in every case assumes the power of God used in behalf of His people. It signifies, therefore, that God is the possessor of every form of power. The word is generally used in the plural form in order to express the fullness and glory of the divine powers, and the majesty of Him in whom these powers inhere; but since the name is used with a singular verb, it maintains the monotheistic position without interpreting this in such a rigid manner as to preclude the later Trinitarian conception

As to the English word God, Dr. Adam Clarke says, "It is pure Anglo-Saxon and among our ancestors signifies not only the Divine Being now commonly designated by the word, but alsogood; as in their apprehension it appeared thatGodandgoodwere correlative terms. When they thought or spoke of Him, they were doubtless led, from the word itself, to consider Him as theGood being, a fountain of infinite benevolence and beneficence toward His creatures."

of God. The nameElohimindicates the primary revelation of God as power, through the forces of nature and the constitution of man. As such it is a generic term, which may be and is applied in the Scriptures to the gods of paganism. There is in it also, the basis of the trinal energy as further developed in the revelation of His activity.In the beginning Elohim created the heaven and the earth.... and the Spirit of Elohim moved upon the face of the waters. And Elohim said, Let there be light. Here there are three distinct movements predicated of God, Elohim, the Spirit of

Elohim; and the Word which appears in the formula,Elohim said. All are alike active in creation, and mark with some degree of distinctness the beginnings of that which is to become the triune conception of the Godhead, as revealed through Christ. The distinctions have not come into clear view, but the faint streaks of the dawn are discernible, and later unfoldings of the divine revelation make it possible to read into these terms the fullness of the Godhead

JehovahorYahweh. The second name in the unfolding revelation of God isJehovahorYahweh, and lifts the concept of God from the mere plane of power to that of personal relationships. Elohim is a

generic term; Jehovah is a proper noun-name. It was interpreted by God himself to His servant Moses as I AM, or I AM THAT I AM, expressions which may be equally well rendered as HE WHO IS, or HE WHO IS WHAT HE IS. The name unites in a single concept, what to man is the past, present and future, and as such denotes Absolute Being conjoined with the process of continual becoming, through the historical revelation of Himself to His people. The name may be further interpretedas He shall cause to be, and signifies the personal faithfulness of Jehovah to His people. It thus reveals the spirituality of God's purpose for men, and the increased importance which attaches to individual and personal relationships. It brings into clearer light the transcendence of God, and lifts Him above the forces of nature out of which the ethnic religions develop. It brings God to the plane of spiritual relationships, made known only through supernatural revelation The emphasis upon the historical process of revelation, as found in the name of Jehovah, finds its warrant in both the Scriptures and the history of the human race especially in its relation to the Messianic promise. There can be no true conception of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, of the mission of Moses and of Christ, or of the relation between the written Word and the Personal Word, without a recognition of the divine method of a progressive revelation unfolding in the processes of history. Only from the genetic viewpoint will the revelation of God given atsundry times and in divers mannersbe found to form parts of a well-articulated whole. There is a false position oftentimes assumed, in regard to the relation existing between the Scriptures as the Word of God, and Christ as the Personal Word. The written Word is given a false autonomy by a failure to view it as a spiritual utterance. It thus becomes the letter which kills, rather than the spirit which gives life. This is the source of much which is little short of Bible worship, as over against the spiritual knowledge of Christ. The Bible is thus made the end instead of the means, the object of reverence in itself instead of the reverence which grows out of its use as a means of revealing the Personal Word. So also, this method of interpretation fails to discern the generic difference between Moses and Christ, and therefore to recognize the difference between the preliminary and the final revelation. Assuming that the Old and New Testaments move on the same plane of revelation, theologians have been tempted to set the one over against the other. When Christ said,the law saith, but I say unto you, He was not disparaging, much less contradicting the truths of the Old Testament, but He did admit that they contained but the lower stages of the divine revelation, and that they were to be carried to their perfection through a fuller and more perfect revelation. To fail to recognize the genetic processes of history, is to fail to see the Old and New Testaments in their relation to each other, or to understand the relation existing between the written and the Personal Word The Abrahamic Covenant introduced a new idea in the historical process of revelation, a truer and more satisfying fellowship between God and man, because effected by supernatural spiritual forces. Its inception is found in the protevangelium, spoken by God to man at the gates of Paradise, the initial promise of personal redemption. The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.This could come into the clearer light of the Abrahamic Covenant only through the name of Jehovah. Elohim signified the intuitive revelation of God through the forces of nature and the constitution of man, and reaches its height in what may be termed a knowledge about God. It is something short of personal fellowship. It signifies the immanence of God out of which pantheism grows, and which gives rise to the ethnic religions. But it is only through Jehovah or the revelation of God as a Person, that knowledge can deepen into fellowship and ethical relationships be established. This higher knowledge and fellowship initiated by the Abrahamic Covenant, takes the form of a promise

in which Jehovah becomes the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, and their seed after them from generation to generation. This covenant, however, is something more than a mere compact between two parties on the basis of certain stipulated agreements; it is rather of the nature of an institution, and Abraham with his posterity become mutually members. It differs from natural intuition in that it is a supernatural revelation, as the etymology of the word covenant would seem to indicate,con, with, andvenire, to come, a divine advent, a special coming of Jehovah to His people. It differs also from the more external teaching about God, in that it is a spiritual bestowment, a personal fellowship which necessitates the knowledge of God in individual experience. It emphasizes further the transcendence of God and man, and insofar constitutes the covenant an ethical and spiritual institution, a household of faith

El Shaddai.While the two supreme names applied to God in the Old Testament are Elohim and Jehovah, there are many variations and combinations of these, one of the more important beingEl ShaddaiorGod Almighty. Other names similar to this are theLiving God(Job 5:17) theMost High(Genesis 14:18), theLord, or theLord God of Hosts(Jeremiah 5:14). The literal meaning of the word Shaddai is "breasted" from the Hebrew nounShador "breast." It is so translated in the following Scriptures (Job 3:12, Psalms 22:9, Cant. 1:18, 4:5, 7:3, 7, 8, Isaiah 28:9). The wordShaddaiis generally derived from terms meaning "powerful," or "mighty."El Shaddaiis frequently found as a name for God in the patriarchal accounts and in Job. The passages in which it occurs are seen specially to reveal God as the Bountiful Giver. Parkhurst in his Lexicon defines the nameShaddaias "one of the divine titles, meaning the power or Shedder-forth, that is of blessings temporal and spiritual." It is also defined as "Nourisher" or "Strength-giver," or in a secondary sense, the Satisfier who pours Himself into believing lives. God therefore becomes the spiritual Nourisher or Satisfier of His people. It was first spoken to Abraham (Genesis 17:1), and is the figure which God has chosen to express the nature of His Almightiness-not of force or power, but that of never-failing love which freely gives itself for those whom He has redeemed. In the process of revelation, this aspect of God comes to its final expression in the Spirit of love-the Comforter, who is the promise of the Father and the gift of the risen and exalted Christ

Adonai. The nameAdonaiis in the plural form and when applied to God is used as apluralis excellentiaeto express possession and sovereign dominion. It means

Field in his Handbook of Christian Theology gives the following names and their uses (p.10):

1.Elohim, "adorable," "strong." This name is usually plural or used with plural adjuncts. The Christian Fathers held this to indicate a plurality of persons in the Godhead-a belief which appears to be well founded

2.Jehovah(or Yahveh [Yahweh]) translated "Lord" and printed in capitals in the Authorized Version, "Self-existent"; "the Being"; "I Am"; "I Am That I Am"' (Exodus 3:14). This name is never used except when applied to the Divine Being

3.El-ShaddaiorShaddai, "The strong"; "The Mighty One"; "Almighty"; "All-sufficient."

4.Adoni, orAdon, "Lord"; "Supporter"; "Judge"; "Master."

5.El-Elyon, "The Most High"; "The supreme."

6.Elyeh, "I Am"; "I Will Be."

Lord or Master and is translated in the Greek KurioV, a term very frequently applied to Christ. The wordAdonaiis frequently conjoined with the two original namesElohimandJehovah, since it denotes His dominion and lordship in a way which the word Jehovah does not. The word Jehovah is from the Hebrew word to be, and denotes self-existence and unchangeableness. Since it was regarded as the incommunicable name of God, the Jews held it in such superstitious reverence that they refused to pronounce it, always substituting in their reading the word Adonai or Lord. Adonai is used with Elohim in the Psalms and is found in such expressions as "my God and my Lord" (Psalms 35:23) and "O Lord my God" (Psalms 38:15). The testimony of Thomas, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28) represents the combined use of the terms in the New Testament

Elohim-Jehovah.The words Elohim and Jehovah are frequently united in the Scriptures, and when so used express both the generic idea and the personal nature of God. As united, these names are a protest against Polytheism on the one hand, and Pantheism on the other. Each denotes the soleness, the necessity and the infinity of the Divine Being, and each is connected with man and the creature in a manner which demands the most definite personality. Furthermore, there is contained in the divine names a revelation of the God of

This double name expresses clearly all that Pantheism has labored in vain to express during the course of its many evolutions; but forever precludes the error into which Pantheism has fallen. It avows an infinite fullness of life and possibility in the eternal essence; but assigns all to the controlling will of a Person. The scripture scarcely ever approaches the notion of an abstract entity; it invariably makes both Elohim and Jehovah the subjects of endless predicates and predicative ascriptions.In him we live, and move, and have our being(Acts 17:28); in Him, a Person to be sought unto and found. In fact, the personality of God, as a Spirit of self-conscious and self-determining and independent individuality, is as deeply stamped upon His revelation of Himself as is His existence. We are created in His image; our Archetype has in eternal reality the being which we possess as shadows of Him; He has in eternal truth the personality which we know to be our own characteristic, though we hold it in fealty from Him. Thy God is the Divine Word; my God, the human response, through the pages of revelation. No subtlety of modern philosophy has ever equaled the definition of the absolute I AM; the English words give the right meaning of the original only when it lays the stress upon the AM for the essential being, and I for the personality of that being."-POPE, Compend. Christian Theology, I,pp. 253, 254.

creation, and a revelation of the God of redemption; and when the nameEl Shaddaiis used, there is given also the nature of the relation of God to His redeemed people. In these names, therefore, is veiled the fuller revelation of the Triune name, which found expression in God as the Father, Jesus Christ the Son as the incarnate Word, and the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete or Comforter. It is significant that all the Greek representatives of the four Hebrew names,Elohim, Jehovah, ShaddaiandAdonaiare grouped together in our Lord’s introduction of Himself to the churches in His risen and exalted state.I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty(Revelation 1:8) In addition to the names of God which express His essence or essential nature, such as those above mentioned, there are also names which are used in an attributive and relative sense. Attributive names are those which express some attribute of God, such as the "Omnipotent," or the "Eternal." Relative terms are drawn from the relations which God bears to men, such as the "Kings of kings" or "Lord of lords." Our Lord in the prayer which He taught His disciples uses the term "Name" in a

comprehensive sense to express all that God is to men-theprayer Hallowed be thy namemeaning the hallowing or making holy of all that belongs to God in His relations with men. St. John especially, uses attributive names such asGod is lightandGod is love(1 John 1:5; 1 John 4:16), which combine the nature of God with His attributes, and form a natural transition to our study of the Divine Essence and Perfections THE DIVINE ESSENCE AND PERFECTIONS

God's revelation of Himself as declared in His Essential Names, gives us a conception of His being and nature. Some of these names refer especially to the Eternal Essence, some to the Divine Existence, and some to God as Substance clothed with attributes. But it must be remembered that there are other methods, also, by which God has presented Himself to the thought of His creatures, and to these we must now give attention. Of God the Scriptures predicate,First,that He is Spirit (John 4:24); Second, that He iaeJaeIJohn1:5; andThird,that He is love (1 John 4:8). These predicates may not be called definitions in the strict use of that term, but they are presentations of certain fundamental aspects of God

God isSpirit(Pneuma o QeoV, not a Spirit-John 4:24) and this indicates a self-moving, efficient, animating principle. It embraces the unity and life-motion of the creative activity, and is referred to asvita absoluta, 1:e.,underived, eternal life (John 5:26; John 11:25, 1 John 5:20). It includes, therefore, both the idea of substantiality and of personality

God isLight(FwV, the self-manifesting and intuitional principle-1 John 1:5). According to the Logos theory, this is the Eternal Reason, in which Spirit becomes objective to itself, and God is revealed to Himself (John 1:1, 1 Timothy 6:16, Hebrews 1:3)

God isLove(o QeoV agaph estin, 1 John 4:8; o QeoV agaph estin, 4:16). This refers to the self-completing, self-sufficing and self-satisfying principle, the to teloV or Perfect One referred to in Matthew's Gospel (Matthew 5:48)

Spirit, Reason, Love are thus the simplest and most fundamental elements in the Christian conception of God. And as in the human consciousness of the indivisibleEgo, is the unity and coherence of reason, feeling and power, is the exact arresting point of psychological science, beyond which it is impossible to go; so also in the Absolute Being, the identity of Reason, Power and Love is the arresting point of theological science, beyond which nothing can be known

It is evident, therefore, that God can be known only through His self-revelation, after the same manner that man may either reveal himself or hide his inmost thoughts and feelings within himself. But he has power to reveal himself to others, and this power lies in the fact that there is a common principle of intelligence in man, a reason with both intuitive and discursive powers. But we must not stop here. This intelligent principle of reason and order in man is also in the created universe, through which man is afforded a medium of communication-that of the bodily nexus-by which man understands and knows the world, and by means of which he understands and communicates with others. This principle must be carried into the divine nature itself, to the Eternal Logos or the Word through whom God not only created all things, but through whom also He constituted man a personal and intelligent being. It is for this reason, that John in his marvelous Prologue relates the Incarnate Christ to the Eternal Word of God. He first declares the deity of the Word in its eternal aspects-In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God(John 1:1). He then relates Christ to the Creative Word-All things were made by' him; and without him

was not any thing made that was made(John 1:3); and follows immediately with the statement, In him was life; and the life was the light of men(John 1:4). Here then it is evident that as the human Ego is related to both nature and man; the Divine Logos is related to both Creation and human personality. Both nature and man in some sense partake of the Logos, nature receiving its substantiality and order; man his personal consciousness. Thus there is established between man and God a means of communication as evident as that between man and man. It is evident, also, why the Apostle John felt it necessary not only to identify the Incarnate Christ with the Divine and Eternal Order, but to link Him likewise with creation as its principle of substantiality and order, and with man as his inner light and life. Christ therefore became the revealing power of God, and incarnate by the Holy Ghost in His infinite efficiency, became also the enabling power of redemption The doctrine of God is commonly treated under the three main divisions ofBeing, AttributesandTrinity. Before taking up the immediate study of this subject, however, it will be necessary to give some consideration to the technical terms which will be used in the discussion, such as Substance and Essence, Attribute and Predicate, Subsistence and Hypostasis

Substance and Essence.While the changed viewpoint of modern thought has rendered obsolete many of the positions worked out with such minuteness of detail by the schoolmen, their distinctions as to substance, essence, attribute and relation are not without value in a discussion of the essential nature of God; nor could the development of the trinitarian doctrine be understood without careful attention to such terms as person, hypostasis, property and subsistence. If for no other reason we may allow a pedagogical value to the discussion of these terms, which must be taken into account in any historical approach to these great doctrines. There is scriptural justification, also, for the application of the term substance to God, as found in the name which He applies to Himself-theI AM(Exodus 3:14), orHE WHO ISas applied to Him in the Apocalypse (Revelation 1:4). God is spoken of further as having a nature (Galatians 4:8; Galatians 4:11 Peter 1:4), and Godhead is attributed to Him (Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9). The Scriptures teach that God as the infinite and eternal Spirit has real and substantial existence, and is not a mere idea of the intellect. They assert that He has objective existence apart from man, and is not the result of a subjectivising tendency which would make God the creature of human experience, deny the existence of the self as an entity, and reduce theology to a mere branch of functional psychology The termessenceis derived fromesse, to be, and denotes energetic being.Substanceis fromsubstare, and signifies latent potentiality of being. The termessencewhen used of God denotes the sum total of His perfections; while the term substance refers to the underlying ground of His infinite activities. The first is active in form, the second passive; the one conveys the idea of spirituality, the other may be applied to material things. We do not speak of material essence but of material substance. In addition to these two terms the Latins used another,subsistence, in their discussions of the Trinity-a term which is the equivalent of hypostasis or person. This term more precisely denotes a distinctionwithin the ultimate substance, rather than the substance (substantia) itself

Essence and Attribute. The relation of substance or essence to attribute, has been the ground of much discussion in both philosophy and theology. Does substance underlie attributes, or are attributes simply the unfolding of the essence-that is, are the two things different or identical? This is merely a theological statement of the philosophical problem of noumena and phenomena, appearance and reality. It is evident, therefore, that the manner in which the term attribute is

defined, determines largely the manner in which it is used in its application to the doctrine of God. Dickie defines the attributes as those "qualities which belong to and constitute the Divine Essence or Nature." Cocker states that in every conception of an attribute, the Divine Essence is, in some mode or other, supposed. He therefore defines attribute as "a conception of the unconditioned Being under some relation to our consciousness." Shedd regards the attributes as "modes either of the relation, or of the operation of the Divine essence" which is entirely in harmony with his Platonic realism as unfolded in his Augustinian-Edwardean idea of God as the Absolute Being. At the other extreme is the definition of H. B. Smith who holds that an attribute is "any conception which is necessary to the explicit idea of God, any distinctive conception which cannot be resolved into any other." This definition is accepted by both William Adams Brown, and Albert C. Knudson. Similar to this is the position of Olin A. Curtis whose definition of an attribute is "any characteristic which we must ascribe to God to express what He really is."

Attribute and Predicate.It is necessary that a careful distinction be made between attributes and predicates.

The attributes of God are those distinguishing characteristics of the divine nature which are inseparable from the idea of God and which constitute the basis and ground for His various manifestations to His creatures. We call them attributes because we are compelled to attribute them to God as fundamental qualities or powers of His being, in order to give rational account of certain facts constant in God’s self-revelation.-A. H. STRONG,Systematic Theology, I,p. 244.

A predicate is anything that may be affirmed or predicated of God, such as sovereignty, creatorship or like affirmations which do not attribute to God essential qualities or distinguishing characteristics. Predicate is the wider term and includes all the attributes, but the converse is not true. Predicates may change, but attributes are unchangeable. Varying predicates are, therefore, based upon unvarying attributes In the application of philosophical terms to the idea of God, it is evident that He must be thought of by us as under the categories of Being, Attribute and Relation. Without these fundamental categories we cannot think at all. Dr. Cocker has pointed out, we think very truly, that we cannot think of God as the unconditioned Being, conditioning Himself, without conceiving of Him asReality, EfficiencyandPersonality. These constitute the conception of the Divine Essence whereby it is what it is When we think of the attributes of such a Being, we must think of them asAbsolute, InfiniteandPerfect. And when we think of the relations of God to finite existence and finite consciousness, we regard Him asGround, CauseandReasonof all dependent being. He combines these into one categorical scheme of thought and gives us this outline

BEING(Essential)

REALITY

EFFICIENCY

PERSONALITY

ATTRIBUTES (Related Essence)

ABSOLUTE

INFINITE

PERFECT

RELATION (Free Determination)

GROUND

CAUSE

REASON OR END

Thus in Absolute Reality we have the ultimate Ground; in the Infinite Efficiency we have the adequate cause; and in the Perfect Personality we have the sufficient reason or final cause of all existence (COCKER,Theistic Conception of the World,pp. 41ff.) In our discussion of God we shall then, consider Him in His threefold relation to the created universe as its Ground, its Cause and its End. This gives us a logical classification for our material and we shall, therefore, treat the subject under discussion as Absolute Reality, Infinite Efficiency and Perfect Personality

10. Chapter 11 - GOD AS ABSOLUTE REALITY

Chapter 11 - GOD AS ABSOLUTE REALITY In our introductory study of the theological and philosophical definitions of God, a preliminary statement was made to the effect that the ultimate Personality of religion and the Absolute of philosophy find together their highest expression in Jesus Christ; and that in His Person and work, we have the deepest possible insight into the nature and purpose of God. As indicated, also, the Christian concept, historically considered, is a blending of the Hebrew conception as expressed in the Old Testament prophets, with that held by the Greeks, as expressed in their language, through which in the providence of God, most if not all of the books of the New Testament were given to the Christian Church. This gave rise immediately to a conflict of ideas concerning the nature of God as Absolute, due to the attempt to express the higher concepts of divine revelation through the lower concepts of a language which fell short of the full Christian content. The Hebrew conception of God was that of a transcendent Being, powerful, holy, righteous and hence personal. He was regarded as the Creator of all things, was One and was Perfect. Judaism developed a true monotheism. In the Christian concept, the Jewish monotheistic element was carried over, with the added concept of a further revelation through Christ and the Holy Spirit. The Greek concept of God had a long period of development before it came into contact with Christianity, and was not at that time a unity. From nature-gods, through nature itself, it had developed toward a philosophical theism. The concept of Plato was dynamic; while that of Aristotle was static. To Plato, God was the Idea of the Good, or as expressed in modern terminology, the Ideal, this Ideal being the supreme Reality of the Universe. To Aristotle, God was the Prime Mover of the universe, but Himself the Unmoved Mover The Stoics regarded God in a pantheistic manner as a sort of quasi-material, the Soul of the Universe. To the Epicureans, the gods were transcendent and aloof from the affairs of men. The Neo-Platonists held to an agnostic idea, which has been the ground of much modern agnosticism. To them God was absolutely transcendent, and therefore impassible, beyond all predicates, but mediated through His Mind in a series of emanations. The mystery religions each had its ownKyriosor Lord, but these were regarded more in the sense of the Lord of a religion or cult, than the God of the universe. They were finite beings rather than Infinite

Christianity entered the world at a time when it was under the sway of Deism on the one hand and Pantheism on the other; and these necessitated a consideration of the problem of immanence and transcendence. In addition, there were the ethical questions of sin and grace which were vitally related to those of immanence and transcendence, whether considered in reference to creation or providence. The Greek and Roman philosophies clashed very early with the Christian conception. Certain philosophers of the Epicureans and Stoics encountered the Apostle Paul (Acts 17:18) in the market place at Athens, which garnished the occasion for his great address on Mars' Hill (Acts 17:22-31). From these false philosophies there arose the Colossian Heresy, a form of gnosticism against which St. Paul directed his Epistle to the Colossians. St; John, also, in his first epistle, attacks the same heresy. Perhaps Christian doctrine was never subjected to a severer test than in the early centuries of the Church, especially in the period immediately preceding the time of

Mithraism, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, and Neo-Platonism all combined to rob the Church of the simplicity of its conception of God, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It was for this reason that St. Paul warned the Colossians against philosophy and vain deceit (Colossians 2:8), and cautioned Timothy to beware of the oppositions of science falsely so called (1 Timothy 6:20). But the apologists of the church had a keen insight as to the fundamentals of the faith,and gave themselves to the propagation of a right idea of God, upon which, they saw, hinged all other doctrines. They took the position that God was related historically to the covenant people of the Old Testament, that He was related spiritually to the Church of the New Testament, and creatively to the world apart from the Church. Furthermore, they removed all the mythological elements which clung to the Aryan conceptions of God, maintained the Christian idea of God as pure spirituality, and denied reality to all heathen deities. The Christian concept of God, therefore, became one of unity, spirituality and absoluteness, which they consistently maintained against pagan philosophy from without, and heretical opinions from within THE ORIGIN OF THE ABSOLUTE The term absolute is the creation of modern philosophy, but the fact of absoluteness is an age old problem. No chapter in ancient philosophy carries with it more pathos than the sincere but blind groping after truth on the part of earnest but unenlightened men. The Ionians sought for a first principle, aprima materiawhich should explain the origin and unity of the created universe. Thales found it in water, Anaximenes in air, and Anaximander, reaching a somewhat loftier plane, found it in the Infinite. Then followed the "Being" of Parmenides, the "atoms" of Democritus, and a foregleam of that which was to follow in the "nous" or "reason" of Anaxagoras. Ancient thought on the plane of materialism could rise no higher, and was followed as a consequence by a period of skepticism. Out of this confusion Greek thought was led by Socrates to a higher level, that of the moral nature of the universe. On this new plane, Greek philosophy reached its supreme heights in the mysticism of Plato and the logic of Aristotle. It could advance no farther, and again sank into decline. At the time of Christ, Greek philosophy was groping about on the plane of primitive religion expressed in philosophical terms. St. Paul seems to have had this in mind, when after referring to the "unknown God" in his Athenian address,he declared that God in His sovereignty over the nations had appointed the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek the Lord, by which we are to understand an intellectual pursuit of truth;if haply they might feel after him, that is in the moral pressure upon the consciences of men;and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring(Acts 17:24-28). Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, he triumphantly exclaims, him declare I unto you(Acts 17:23). Thus to the intellectual gropings and of unenlightened men, and to the moral pressure upon conscience, St. Paul adds another factor-spiritual illumination-which comes through the redemptive religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and brings men’s gropings and pressures to full fruition in finding God. In one divinely inspired and illuminating grasp, therefore, St. Paul combines both thecreaturaandnaturaaspects of God-both personal transcendence of the Hebrews, and the immanence of the Greeks. In this authoritative address is given the Christian concept of God. The attempt to harmonize the diverse elements gave rise to great problems which in every age have perplexed theology, but even more so, science and philosophy. The apostle had a deep insight into the different tempers of mind exhibited by the Jew and the Greek when he wrote that we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews, with their scientific temper of mind, a stumblingblock; and

unto the Greeks, with their philosophical temper of mind, foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God (1 Corinthians 1:23-24)

It is a broadening and heartening thought that God who revealed Himself to the Jews in a more objective manner, revealed Himself in a measure also to the Gentiles, through their search after truth. The limit of this seeking seems to have been set by the Apostle Paul, as the knowledge of his eternal power and Godhead. Beyond this it cannot go, for the true knowledge of God is at once ethical and spiritual. The redemptive aspect isinvolved. There was, therefore, as we have indicated, a period of skepticism in Greek thought at the time of Christ. The fullness of time in which Jesus came, seems to have applied not only to the Jews but to the Gentile world as well. It is significant that a company of Greeks came to the disciples and said, Sir, we would see Jesus(John 12:21). Greek thought with its search after truth through intellectual acumen and moral pressure had broken down, and the vague, unsatisfied longings of their hearts, in connection with the providences of God, had brought them to Jesus. The answer which Jesus gave them is significant also, and will receive fuller treatment in our discussion of the knowledge of God.Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, He said, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit(John 12:24). The hindering cause does not lie in the failure of the intellectual grasp, or even in the lack of moral pressure, He said, but in the sense of sin which brings a moral and ethical unlikeness to God, and thereby destroys the true basis for personal and spiritual knowledge. There must, therefore, be a death to the sinful nature, and the infusion of a new life, before there can be spiritual comprehension. In the redemptive Christ all the seeming contradictions of life find their principle of unity. Here the Jewish idea of sin as transgression finds forgiveness, and the Jewish mission is thereby fulfilled. Here the Greek conception of sin as a "missing of the mark" or failure, finds its completion in Jesus. This then is the prophetic vision of Christ,a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel(Luke 2:32) In this brief historical sketch, we have reviewed the various philosophical concepts of God regarded as the Absolute. The Jews held to the idea of a transcendent God. Because of their belief in creation through the Divine Word, they never regarded God as apart from all relations, and were thereby preserved from an agnostic position. However, when brought into contact with Greek philosophy at Alexandria, Philo and the Neo-Platonists carried the idea of transcendence to such extremelengths that it issued in agnosticism. They were therefore, under the necessity of superseding the idea of creation, and consequently posited a series of emanations in order to account for the world. From this false philosophy there arose the several gnostic sects, which exerted an unwholesome influence in the church. But Greek philosophy on the whole was pantheistic. That is, it regarded God as the Absolute, not apart from all relations but inclusive of all such relations. The difficulty of the agnostic position concerning the Absolute, lay in its failure to relate God to the universe the weakness of pantheism lay in its failure to distinguish God from the universe. Christianity, and therefore Christian philosophy, took a mediating position. It maintained that God as Absolute is neither apart from relations on the one hand, nor inclusive of relations on the other. It maintains that the Absolute is independent Self-existence. As such it is capable of existing apart from all external relations, or of entering into free relations with created beings, either in an outward and transcendent manner, or an inward and immanent manner. Christian philosophy maintains that to hold less than this, is to limit and thereby destroy any true conception of the Absolute. We turn our attention now to an investigation from the Christian viewpoint, of the

various theories of the Absolute which have been current in modern philosophy The New Platonists taught that the original ground and source of all things was simple being, without life or consciousness; of which absolutely nothing could be known, beyond that it is. They assumed an unknown quantity, of which nothing can be predicated. The pseudo-Dionysius called this original ground of all things God, and taught that God was mere being without attributes of any kind, not only unknowable by man, but of whom there was nothing to be known, as absolute being is in the language of modern philosophy-Nothing; nothing in itself, yet nevertheless the dunamiV twn pantwn or (cause of all things). The universe proceeds from primal being, not by any exercise of conscious power or will, but by a process of emanation. . . . . The primary emanations from the ground of all being, which the heathen called gods; the New Platonists, spirits or intelligences; and the Gnostics, aeons; the pseudo-Dionysius called angels. These he divided into three triads: (1) thrones, cherubim, and seraphim; (2) powers, lordships, authorities; (3) angels, archangels, principalities."-HODGE,Systematic Theology, I,pp. 71, 72. (Cf. Colossians 1:16) MODERN PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS OF THE ABSOLUTE

Modern philosophy has interpreted the term "Absolute" in three different ways.First,it has interpreted it to mean that which is entirely unrelated. This position of necessity issues in Agnosticism which maintains that the Absolute is unknowable

Second,at the other extreme, it has been interpreted to mean the totality of all things, or that Being which embraces the universe as a whole. This is Pantheism. It was against these positions in their ancient forms that the Apostle Paul reasoned on Mars' Hill, and they are no less anti-Christian in their modern philosophical forms

Third,the Absolute has been interpreted as meaning that which is independent or self-existent. On this theory, the Absolute is not necessarily apart from all relations, but these relations are free and the existence of the absolute is not dependent upon them. This is the position of Theism. Christianity is theistic, and it is only within the third classification that the Christian viewpoint is to be found. The distinctive feature of the Christian system is, that its revelation is made through a Person and not through the barren abstractions of philosophy

While Christianity is based upon the theistic conception of the Absolute, it endeavors to guard the truth in the first and second classifications without allowing it to be perverted into Agnosticism on the one hand or Pantheism on the other. In theFirst,there is the thought of transcendence. Christianity has always maintained that God is incomprehensible as transcending the limits of human knowledge, but it denies Agnosticism in that it insists that its knowledge of God is true within the limits of finite conception. In theSecond,there is the thought of divine immanence, which if the idea of personality be persistently held can never become pantheistic. Both immanence and transcendence belong to the Christian conception of God, but it denies both Pantheism and Agnosticism. Since these forms of modern philosophy furnish nonbiblical conceptions of God, they must be given further consideration and refutation

Theism has also been attacked in modern times by the so-called "Anti-Theistical Theories," and of these we must later make brief mention

Agnosticism. This is the negative theory of the Unknowable, and while in the case of Herbert Spencer it was made to apply equally to the ultimate of science and that of religion, the theory has

assumed its most definite form in the denial of the possibility of any true knowledge of God. It is the outgrowth of phenomenalism and is closely connected with the skepticism of Hume, but has been accepted also in some instances by those who rest their doctrine of the Infinite and the Absolute on the limitation of human intelligence

Three stages may be noted in the development of agnosticism, preceding its fuller and perhaps final culmination in the theory of Naturalistic Evolution. The first stage is usually attributed to Kant, whose philosophy is admittedly due to that of Locke and Hume, for its inspiration if not it content. Kant’sCritical Philosophywas an attempt to ascertain to what extent knowledge is given in experience, and how much of it is due to the mind’s own contribution. This latter was understood not in the sense of actual knowledge, but as the necessary forms which determined the possibilities of knowledge. He therefore attributed all our knowledge to three cognitive faculties, the sensory, the understanding, and the reason. The sensory gives us the perceptions of the phenomena of understanding, a more elaborated knowledge grouped under the categories of quantity, quality, relation and modality; while the reason gives us those ideas which are regulative of the system of our knowledge the soul, the universe and God. When Kant speaks of knowledge ending with reason, he regards the reason as the faculty or principle which relates the understanding, and consequently as the highest reach of human intelligence. The matter of knowledge is phenomenal and comes through the senses; the form is supplied by the mind itself; and therefore the categories and the ideas, space and time, the soul, the universe and God are only regulative of mental procedure and do notfurnish the knowledge of real existences. The basis for agnosticism, however, is found only inhis Critique of Pure Reason. In hisCritique of Practical Reason, he stresses the categorical imperative of moral law and establishes his doctrine of the existence of God, as based upon faith rather than reason The second stage is found in the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton and that of Henry Longueville Mansel. Hamilton maintained that "the mind can conceive, and consequently can know, only the limited and conditionally limited. The unconditionally limited, whether the Infinite or the Absolute, cannot positively be construed to the mind; they can be conceived only by thinking away from, or abstractions of those very conditions under which thought itself is realized; consequently the notion of the unconditioned is only negative-the negative of the conceivable itself" (HAMILTON,Discussions on Philosophy,p. 13). Dean Mansel of St. Paul’s (1820-1871) accepted the philosophy of Hamilton and sought to apply it as an apologetic in theology. This he did in his famous Bampton Lectures, delivered at Oxford under the title ofThe Limits of Religious Thought. Instead, however, of appealing to the theologians, his lecture afforded a stimulus to agnosticism. His argument, borrowed from Hamilton, stated that to think is to condition, and therefore the unconditioned cannot be an object of thought, thus excluding the whole range of revealed truth concerning God, as beyond the pale of logic The third stage is found in the philosophy of John Stuart Mill, who in hisExamination of Hamilton’s Philosophyhas carried out the implications of Hamilton, and denied that we have "an intuitive knowledge of God." "Whatever relates to God," he says, "I hold to be a matter of inference; I would add, ofinference a posteriori." While accepting the philosophy of Hamilton, his criticism was, that Hamilton did not rigidly carry out his agnostic principles and treat the Absolute as an unmeaning abstraction. This brings us to a consideration of the agnosticism of Huxley and Spencer, the immediate precursors of the doctrine of evolution as advanced by Darwin

Thomas E. Huxley (1825-1895) based his agnostic philosophy upon Hume and Kant, while Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) starts from Hamilton’sPhilosophy of the Unconditioned, and Mansel’sLimits of Religious Thought. Huxley boasted that he invented the term "agnostic" in order to designate his mental attitude toward the many problems which remained for him unsolved. "It is an ill-omened invention," declares Dr. Harris, for the word etymologically denotes the negation of all knowledge, and is synonymous with universal skepticism. Perhaps he builded better than he knew; for the way of thinking to which he applied the name necessarily involves skepticism as its ultimate, logical issue."

Hume was the great protagonist of Huxley’s philosophy, and he makes it clear that his positions are but an application of Hume’s theory of knowledge. "In the business of life," says Huxley, "we constantly take the most serious action upon evidence of an utterly insufficient character. But it is surely plain that faith is not entitled to dispense with ratiocination, because ratiocination cannot dispense with faith as a starting point; and that because we are too often obliged by the pressure of events to act on very bad evidence, it does not follow that it is proper to act on such evidence when the pressure is absent." Here the agnostic principle is directed toward the destruction of all religious belief. Rishell points out that in the course of investigation this form of agnosticism undergoes a complete change. It quietly substitutes "I do not believe" for "I do not know." What right has agnosticism in the realm of belief? But it draws a practical conclusion from "I do not believe" and says, "I will not act." If it had remained agnosticism it might have acted in spite of its lack of knowledge. But its "I do not believe" is a complete annihilation of all impulse to action. The difference between agnosticism in this form, and atheism is almost, if not wholly, in name (RISHELL, Foundations of the Christian Faith,p. 62). Huxley’s agnosticism differs from that of Spencer, and is more in accord with the principles of Comte’s Positivism

Herbert Spencer as an Evolutionist carried the doctrine of Hamilton and Mansel one step farther, and professed belief in "an Absolute that transcends not only human knowledge, but human conception." He wrote hisFirst Principles of a New System of Philosophyin an attempt to discover a basis for the reconciliation of science and religion. He endeavors, therefore, to show that the ultimate ideas of both science and religion lie in a great mystery behind all things and are identical. "If religion and science are to be reconciled," he says, "the basis of reconciliation must be this deepest, widest and most certain of all facts; that the Power which the universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable" (Cf. First Principles, chapters 2, 3) The agnosticism of Spencer is not a thorough-going denial of all knowledge, for it recognizes not only knowledge of the universe, but an absolute Being, which as an omnipresent Power reveals itself through all the phenomena of the universe. The fallacy of this type of agnosticism comes out more clearly in its treatment of symbolic conceptions and the relativity of knowledge, and we may add, its antitheistic character as well. "When instead of things whose attributes can be tolerably united in a single state of consciousness, we have to deal with things whose attributes are too vast or numerous to be united, we must," he says, "either drop in thought part of their attributes, or else not think of them at all; either form a more or less symbolic conception or no conception." "We are led," he then continues, "to deal with our symbolic conceptions as though they are actual ones, not only because we cannot clearly separate the two, but also because in a majority of cases, the first serve our purposes nearly or quite as well as the last-are simply abbreviated signs we substitute for those more elaborate signs which are our equivalent for real objects. . . . . Thus we open the

door to some which profess to stand for known things, but which really stand for things which cannot be known in any way" (First Principles,pp. 28, 29). Then, without any ground in either science or religion, he proceeds to include all ultimate ideas ofboth science and religion in the class of the Unknown, and by analysis attempts to show that the Reality behind the appearances is and must ever be unknown. All knowledge with him is relative, that is, a knowledge of relations, but never reaching the finality of things. From this viewpoint there can be no knowledge of the world-ground upon which all finite things depend, nor can God as the Absolute, the Infinite, or the First Cause be known. Against this agnostic theory, theism maintains that while man’s knowledge of God is inadequate, it is yet positive and not merely a negative abstraction

Wherein does the fallacy of Agnosticism lie?First, it lies in the attempt to develop the Absolute from a merea prioriidea. From the presupposition that the Absolute is entirely unrelated, the unlimited, the unconditioned or the independent, nothing can be developed but a series of negations without positive content. This is the type of thought represented by Hamilton and Mansel

Second,not only is it impossible to unfold a doctrine of the Absolute from ana prioriidea, but in some types of agnosticism there is a false conception of thisa prioriidea. It is defined as that which is apart from all relations and hence "unknowable." The error here lies in assuming that the absolute is unrelated. The Absolute is not indeed conditioned by the universe as a necessary relation, but it does condition the universe, and is therefore not apart from all relation. This sometimes takes the form of Kant’s thing-in-itself, and sometimes is an attempt to resolve the universal into indeterminate qualities, but both lead immediately to agnosticism

Third,

Spencer objects to the position taken by Hamilton and Mansel, which he thinks calls in question the impossibility of affirming the positive existence of anything beyond phenomena, whereas for him there is what he defines as "a Power, the First Cause, absolute and infinite, and capable of manifesting itself," and insists that "its positive existence is a necessary datum of consciousness; that so long as consciousness continues we cannot for an instant rid it of this datum; and that thus the belief which this datum constitutes has a higher warrant than any other whatever-First Principles,p. 98.

and the Infinite become finite. The argument of Dr. Harris against this position so dominant in modern philosophy is, we think, unanswerable, and is thus stated: "The maxim that all definition limits is pertinent to a logical general notion or a mathematical sum total, not to a concrete being. The arguments of agnostics are conclusive as to the false ideas of the Absolute which they hold, but have no force against our knowledge of the real Absolute or unconditioned Being, whose existence the universe reveals. But the more powers it reveals, the more determined it is. There are fewer beings like it; fewer in the class designated by the general name. The increased determinateness, which restricts the logical general notion to fewer beings, greatens the beings. And when we come to the absolute Being, which is one and reveals itself in all the powers of the universe, it is the Being at once the most determinate and greatest of all. It is not necessary that the Absolute be everything to prevent its being limited by that which it is not. The existence of finite beings dependent on absolute Being is no limitation of the Absolute. On the contrary, if the absolute Being could not manifest itself in finite beings dependent on itself, that inability would be

a limitation of it" (HARRIS,Self-revelation of God,pp. 175, 176)

Pantheism. As a philosophical theory of the universe, Pantheism reduces all being to a single essence or substance. It derives its name from en kai pan, or the One and the All, and seems to have been first used by Xenophanes, the Greek philosopher, about the sixth century B.C. It has appeared in many forms. The common substance which composes the universe may be regarded as matter, and hence we have materialistic pantheism. Or, it may regard the universal substance or ground of the universe as thought, in which case we have idealistic pantheism, its most common form philosophically. Only, however, as pantheism makes God the sole substance, does it acquire the significance which the name implies. As such, the theory holds that God is not outside and beyond the universe, but that he is theuniverse. He exists only in it, and apart from it has no existence. He is the Soul, Reason and Spirit of the world. The natural world is his body in which he comes to expression. God is everything-the sum total of all being. It is evident that Pantheism occupies a middle ground between Materialism, which identifies God with Nature; and Theism which holds to a belief in God as a self-conscious Being, a Person, infinite and eternal who created the world and sustains it by His power

Pantheism is closely related to polytheism as found among the ethnic religions. The two seem so dissimilar that this relationship is often overlooked. Just as the Greek religion held that in addition to the Olympian gods, there were innumerable demigods, as nymphs and naiads peopling all nature; so the Greek philosopher saw in all nature a manifestation of Deity. Pantheism and polytheism are therefore but two forms of the same fundamental belief, the first seeking in a philosophical manner for unity amidst individual phenomena, and the latter stopping short with personifications of them. It is for this reason, that pantheism, both religious and philosophical, is always found closely associated with polytheistic forms of religion

Disregarding the religious fallacies of pantheism, which we reserve for a later paragraph, pantheism as a theory of the Absolute in relation to the world-ground is scientifically untenable. First it is built upon assumptions which are not only unproved but incapable of proof. As Materialism is built upon the supposition of the eternity of matter, so Spinoza who is the pattern for modern day pantheism, builds upon the supposition of a universal substance which he identifies with God. He does not investigate this idea of God. He substitutes, instead, a mere logical universal in which are embraced all individual notions; but he fails to see that this is merely a subjective idea, not a real existence. This confusion of thought with existence, this merely imagined unity of ideas in our consciousness with the actually existing objective order, is the fallacy which underlies most modern thought concerning the nature ofthe Absolute. "I have," says Spinoza, "opinions as to God and nature entirely different from those which modern Christians are wont to vindicate. To my mind God is the immanent, and not the transcendent Cause of all things; that is, the totality of finite objects is posited in the Essence of God, and not in His Will. Nature considered per se, is one with the essence of God."

Second,Pantheism fails to account for the origin of cosmical matter. Since the world dud God are regarded as of identical essence, it is inconceivable that He could call it into existence out of its former nothingness. Spinoza attempts an explanation on the basis of anatura naturans, or a "begetting nature" which from eternity is constantly begetting and bringing forth mundane phenomena (natura naturata). In order to account for this eternal fullness of life, Spinoza maintains

that begotten nature reacts upon the begetting nature, and thus a harmony is established. Against such absurdities, the biblical idea of creation as a miracle must appear far more reasonable

Third,

"If we demand the origin of the actual world, that is of 'begotten nature' we are told that 'begetting nature' is the ultimate cause; and if we demand the origin of the latter, we are again referred to 'begotten nature,' that is, to the very fact of which we seek an explanation." CHRISTLIEB,Mod. Doubt and Chr. Belief,p. 116 The utter erroneousness of pantheism is manifest in this, that the monism which it maintains determines all finite existences to be mere modes of the one infinite substance, mere phenomena without any reality of being in themselves. The physical universe becomes unsubstantial as in the extremist form of idealism. Mind becomes equally unreal. Neither can be thus dismissed from the realm of substantial existence. In the physical universe there is a very real being. Not all is mere appearance. And every personal mind has its own consciousness the absolute proof of being in itself. Personal mind is not a mere phenomenon. The monism of Pantheism is utterly false in doctrine.-MILEY,Systematic Theology, I,pp. 115, 116

Pantheism as surely as materialism would, if carried out to its logical results, destroy all thought. It begins with the contradiction of the fundamental facts of consciousness. If we do not know that we exist as personal and free agents we know nothing. For to deny this is to deny the ego, in contradistinction from which alone we know the non-ego. So that both the self and the not-self are struck down at a single blow. But if we are so grossly deceived in the primary facts of consciousness, in those things which are most accessible to thought, how can we trust our conclusions in matters more remote.-RISHELL,Foundations of the Christian Faith,p. 102.

absolute Substance into its various modes of existence, but never producing effectsad extra, outside of or beyond itself. It is therefore an eternal process of becoming, and the God which it would reveal is perpetually hidden

Fourth, Pantheism denies the personality of God. It is under the necessity, therefore, of explaining how personality can proceed from an impersonal Substance. Pantheism maintains that God is free in the sense that there are no external constraints. But freedom to choose is denied Him because He must unfold according to the nature of His essential being. What He does, He does because of what He is and not because He wills to do so. Intelligence is thus denied God in the only sense of the word which is known to us. Pantheism regards man and other finite beings as but a mode of God's existence, embracing the only two attributes known to us-thought and extension. The mind of man is essentially a portion of the divine thought, while the body is the object of the mind. These are related to each other, not because of their essential unity but because they are regarded as twofold aspects of the same substance. But while Spinoza denies self-determination and free will to man, he does not deny that he possesses self-consciousness. The question immediately arises, "How can this self-consciousness proceed from the Soul of the world, if God does not Himself possess it? How can God create or communicate that which He does not possess? Here pantheism must ever break down from its own inherent weakness. The Absolute of pantheism is not a true Absolute because it is deficient at the point of personality. It is this restriction which denies to pantheism on its own assumptions, the use of the term Absolute The relation of pantheism to religion has already been anticipated. Religion presupposes a personal God, &nb

There is even a form of Pantheism, or rather of semi-Pantheism, in which the personality of God is to some extent preserved, which looks upon the world as an efflux from Deity, and hence as being of His essence, but not co-extensive with Him. Thus, for instance, the doctrine of the emanations in the Indian Vedas. But here too, the personality of God is dangerously comprised by the necessity of the natural process in which these emanations take place. Cf. CHRISTLIEB,Modern Doubt and Christian Belief,p. 163.

who is not only endowed with intelligence and power, but with all moral excellence. Pantheism identifies God with the universe. It denies to Him personality, free will or moral attributes. He is the Soul or Reason of the world, and all nature His body which must unfold according to the law of necessity. The idea of creation then as a free act of will must be given up and emanation as a substituted in its place. Belief in miracles and a superintending providence must likewise be given up. Since pantheism makes man a phenomenon only, or a mere mode of the infinite, there can be in him no free will and hence no sense of responsibility. Sin and guilt become, therefore, mere figments of the imagination. Furthermore, since God is all, that which appears to be evil must be regarded as Good. The sinful acts and passions of men become, in this theory, as much the acts and states of God as those which are righteous and holy. Again, pantheism destroys belief in individual immortality by merging it with the life of the universe. Without a personal God there can be no object worthy of reverence or worship, no place for prayer and providence, no object of adoration and love. Pantheism by identifying God with the universe excludes all personal relations, and thereby destroys the foundations of both morality and religion

Theism

In conceiving of God, the choice before a pantheist lies between alternatives from which no genius has yet devised a real escape. God, the pantheist must assert, is literally everything; God is the whole material and spiritual universe; he is humanity in all its manifestations; he is by inclusion every moral and immoral agent; and every form and exaggeration of moral evil, no less than every variety of moral excellence and beauty, is part of the all-pervading, all-comprehending movement of his universal life. If this revolting blasphemy be declined, then the God of pantheism must be the barest abstraction of abstract being; he must, as with the Alexandrian thinkers, be so exaggerated an abstraction as to transcend existence itself; he must be conceived of as utterly unreal, lifeless, nonexistent; while the only real beings are these finite and determinate forms of existence whereof "nature" is composed. This dilemma haunts all the historical transformations of pantheism, in Europe as in the East, today as two thousand years ago. Pantheism must either assert that its God is the one only existing being whose existence absorbs and is identified with the universe and humanity; or else it must admit that He is the rarest and most unreal of conceivable abstractions; in plain terms, that he is no being at all.-LIDDON,Bampton Lectures.

and pantheistic positions. Here the Absolute is conceived, not as entirely unrelated, nor again as the sum total of all existence, but simply as independent or self-existent. Under this third class erroneous opinions have also arisen, such asMaterialismwhich regards matter as the ultimate ground of the world; orIdealismin some of its many forms which make thought ultimate, but these belong properly to the subject of "Antitheistic Theories." The feature of theism, as it concerns these theories, is its belief in the world ground as personal. But can the Absolute of philosophy be identified with the Christian conception of God? Christianity affirms that it can. It insists that the

philosophy which would prevent this is false; but it concedes, also, that theism has itself frequently misconstrued the Christian idea of God. To mature thought they must be identical. We are dealing. however, not primarily with the personality of God-this must be a later argument, but God as the Absolute in the sense of the world ground. Christianity maintains that the world ground is personal; that God is the ground of all finite being and rational intelligence. Reason is seen to be universal, and the Absolute becomes the ultimate in thought and relations. &nbs

By the term "world ground" we mean the basic reality of the world. Materialism regards this basic reality as "matter"; Idealism as "thought"; and the modern Personalistic philosophies as "personal."

Theism means the existence of a personal God, Creator, Preserver and Ruler of all things. Deism equally means the personality of God and also His creative work, but denies His providence in the sense of theism. These terms were formerly used in much the same sense, but since early in the last century deism has mostly been used in a sense opposed to the Scriptures as a divine revelation, and to a divine providence. Such is now its distinction from theism. Pantheism differs from theism in the denial of the divine personality. With this denial, pantheism can mean no proper work of creation or providence. The philosophic agnosticism which posits the Infinite as the ground of finite existence, but denies its personality, is in this denial quite at one with pantheism. The distinction of theism from these several opposing terms sets its own meaning in the clearer light.-MILEY,Systematic Theology, I,p. 57

Julius Kaftan favors the use of the term Absolute in theology. However, he maintains that it should be used, not merely in its etymological sense, but from the meaning it has acquired by its use in language. "We should never forget," he says, "that by the expression, 'God is the absolute,' we do not mean to make a fundamental affirmation as to the essence of God, but simply an expression of the significance the idea of God has for us."-KAFTAN,Dogmatics,p. 162.

All the ultimate realities such as the True, the Right, the Perfect and the Good center in the Absolute, where all relations have their ground and beyond which they cannot go. If viewed otherwise, Dr. Harris points out that "no rational conclusion would be possible, no scientific observation would be trustworthy, no scientific system could be verified, science would be disintegrated, and all knowledge crumbled into isolated and illusive impressions. Hence God is essential to the reality of all knowledge as well as all being. We cannot think Him away; for without the assumption explicit or implied of His existence, all ratiocinated thought becomes empty and cannot conclude in knowledge. If thought rests ultimately on zero all its creations and conclusions must be zero" (HARRIS,Self-revelation of God,p. 227) THE ABSOLUTE AND THE IDEA OF GOD

We have shown that theism must rest upon a conception of the Absolute as independent or self-existent, and that it is this position which distinguishes it from Agnosticism and Pantheism. But theism is also personal, as over against certain philosophical theories which in opposition to theism regard the world-ground as impersonal. Such is the philosophy of Materialism which regards matter as the ultimate reality, or some of the many forms of Monism or Idealism which conceive of the world-ground as of the nature of thought. These equally with Agnosticism and the older Pantheism must be regarded as antitheistic. Since, however, the same arguments may be urged against them as in the case of pantheism we need here only to make brief mention of these antitheistical theories

The teaching of Scripture concerning God is based on the theistic conception, that, namely, which holds fast at once His supramundane and His intramundane character; the one in virtue of His nature and essence, the other of His will and power. For while Theism, on the one hand, regards the Theos as a personal Being, and so as essentially distinct from the whole created universe and from man, it is no less careful, on the other hand, to present Him as the ever-living and working One in His immediate personal relationship to man and the universe by the doctrine of a universal Divine Providence.-CHRISTLIEB,Modern Doubt and Christian Belief,p. 210.

Antitheistical Theories.There are three theories which have been advanced in modern times in opposition to theism, and these have been peculiarly subversive of the Christian conception of God. (1)Atheism

"If atheism is true, then man is out of harmony with truth." This is an anomaly, and how are we to account for it? Atheism says there is no God-no supernatural first cause; but man has within him the intuitive conviction that there is a God, and this conviction is as universal as the family of man. If man is the offspring of chance, or if he is evolved from some lower order of being, it is strange indeed that he should be so completely "out of harmony with truth." It would seem most reasonable that whatever caused him to exist would impress upon his nature the truth. But if atheism is true, then that which caused man to be is untrustworthy, for it impressed upon his consciousness the conviction that there is a God-some being or beings superior to himself.-WEAVER, Christian Theology,p. 11.

simple and direct refutation of this false and unworthy position, says a modern apologist, is the fact that a direct certainty of God exists in our mind. "We do not merely believe that there is a God, but we know it in virtue of an ideal cognition consisting in an immediate act of faith in human consciousness."

(2)Materialism. This is a form of philosophy which gives priority to matter as the ground of the universe, and ignores the distinction between mind and matter. According to this theory all the phenomena of the universe, whether physical or mental are to be regarded as functions of matter. Materialism was first given systematic form by Epicurus (342-271 B.C.). In the history of modern philosophy, Materialism is represented by La Mettrie and Von Holback who are usually classed as materialistic atheists by Buchner, Voght, Mollschott, Strechner, Feuerbach and others. This theory asserts (1) that matter is eternal; (2) that matter and force have built up the universe apart from any personal Creator; (3) that the soul is material and mortal; (4) that a fixed code of morals is impossible, and (5) that religion as commonly understood is unessential. The weakness of Materialism is its inability to account for mind and its manifestations

(3)Idealism

Christlieb describes in the following graphic paragraph, the reign of terror during the French Revolution when atheism was in the ascendancy. "Encouraged by the abjuration of Christianity on the part of the Bishop of Paris and his priests, they came before the Convention with a petition for the abrogation of Christianity, and the institution of a worship of Reason, presenting the wife of one of their colleagues as the Goddess of Reason. Clad in white garments and a sky-blue mantle, with the red cap on her head and a pike in her hand, they placed her on a fantastically ornamented car, and conducted her, surrounded by crowds of bacchanalian dancers, to the "Temple of Reason," as

they were pleased to rename the Cathedral of Notre Dame. There she was seated on the high altar, and amidst profound obeisances, frantic speeches, and frivolous songs, divine honors were paid to her-a scandal which was immediately imitated in several thousand churches in the country. Who does not see from this what abysses are opened before a nation when atheism once gains ground in it!-CHRISTLIEB,Mod. Doubt and Chr. Belief,p. 139

Foster mentions three types of atheism:(1) dogmatic atheism, which denies that any God exists; (2) skeptical atheism, which doubts that any God exists; (3) critical atheism, which says that if a God exists there is no evidence of it. It is doubtful if there have ever been any thorough-going atheists of the first class. The third type is closely akin to agnosticism.

which have succeeded to the place formerly held by the older materialism, such as Idealistic Monism and Materialistic Monism. These regard matter as a product of force, rather than force as a property of matter

Materialistic Monism was advocated by August Florel and Ernst Haeckel. Florel taught that the brain and the soul were one, the soul having its material aspect and the brain its psychical aspect. Psychology and brain physiology therefore were but two aspects of the same thing. Haeckel in a similar manner maintained that what we call the soul is but the sum of the physiological process of the brain

Idealistic Monism as represented by Höffding holds that there is one substance which works in both spirit and matter but denies any interaction between them. It advocates rather a parallelism between the activity of consciousness and the functions of the nervous system. In addition to these theories there is an extreme idealism which holds that the sensitive and cognitive mind alone is real and that the phenomena of the material world are but modifications of mind. Whether Atheism, Materialism or Monism be advanced as an explanation of the universe, all equally fail before the intuitive and universal conviction of mankind that there is a God and that He alone is the Creator and Preserver of all things

Modern Disintegration of the Idea of God.From the time of Augustine to that of Descartes and Spinoza, there was but little change in the common concept of God. Beginning with Descartes, and especially with Spinoza, we have a new cycle of thought which gave emphasis to the philosophical concepts of God, and consequently affected religious beliefs. While each of the modern philosophical definitions contain some fundamental truth, none of them reach the sublime heights of the Christian conception of God. (1) Descartes held to the idea of God as supreme Substance; (2) Spinoza to an All-Substance; (3) Leibnitz to a Chief Monad in a universe of monads; (4) Kant to the idea of a Moral Governor; (5) Herbert Spencer to an Unknowable Ultimate Reality, sometimes mentioned as "The Infinite andEternal Energy from which all things proceed"; (6) Hegel, the Absolute Mind; (7) Fichte, the Social Ego; (8) H. G. Wells, the Veiled Being; (9) Höffding, the Principle of the Conservation of Value; (10) Bergson, the Life Force, his favorite term being Vital Impetus (11) A. N. Whitehead, the "Integral Impetus" or the Principle of Concretion while (12) William James, H. G. Wells and others advanced anew the idea of a Finite God. It will be seen that these philosophical conceptions are only partial, and can in nowise satisfy the religious nature of man, which demands an object of worship as explanation of the universe

Basic Ideas of God.The numerous ideas of God advanced by modern philosophers maybe classified in three main groups, insofar as they stress one of the following basic elements in the definition of God:First, God is regarded as the source of all Reality, generally expressed in terms of creatorship. This may be called the cosmic idea of God

Second, the conception of God as the Ideal, or the sum of all Values, all goodness and all Perfection. Murray calls this theory the "focus of all hypostatized values," while Galsworthy regards it as "the sum of altruism in man." This is the idealistic aspect of God

Third,there is that which conceives of God as a Supreme Being or an Independent Entity. This is primarily the religious conception as over against the philosophical concepts mentioned above. In its scope it may reach from the lowest conception of God held by the primitive religions, to the highest Christian concept of the Triune God The first or cosmic aspect affirms that God must be to us at least as real as physical things or human persons. This argument is based upon the nature of consciousness, in which is to be found the idea of dependence. However free we may be as moral persons, we are aware in consciousness that this freedom is limited. We are therefore ultimately dependent upon an independent Being, and this Being the cosmic philosophers call God. The idea, however, is one of bare existence only, and tells us nothing of the content of this Being. Hoffdingsaw that not only must the sense of dependence be included in religion, but the sense of values also. These values we may believe are to be found in moral personality. God, therefore, is the conservator of values and consequently of persons The second or idealistic aspect of God is that which views the supreme Being as the Ideal, or that which comprises truth, beauty and goodness. These ideals are regarded as having absolute or divine authority, so that truth is the divine word and duty the divine law. When religion is regarded as aspiration, the Ideal takes on new significance. The Idealistic philosophers maintain that this ideal does not exist as a necessity, but subsists in a transcendent manner as a progressively permanent Reality. But it has been found difficult to harmonize Absolute Reality with a transcendent Idea which is eternally becoming, without a unifying concept of moral will This leads directly to the third aspect of God as an independent Entity, a Personal Being. If God be characterized by personality, He may be absolutely Ideal in character and yet His perfect will may still be unrealized in the objective world. As a Personal Being, He may be trusted and worshiped, while leaving at the same time a place for the moral imperative, which calls upon man to share in the task and the prayer which our Lord taught His disciples, Thy kingdom come.Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven(Matthew 6:10)

11. Chapter 12 - GOD AS INFINITE EFFICIENCY

Chapter 12 - GOD AS INFINITE EFFICIENCY

We have pointed out that the Absolute as the world ground must be identical with the God of religion. But in viewing God as the Absolute, we have seen that the finite, whether in Being or knowledge, must rest in Him. What, then, is the character of the relations which He bears to the universe of finite things? Are they dependent upon him in a merely logical order, or do they emanate from his being as the Neo-Platonist would maintain? The theistic conception of God as personal, necessitates a belief in will as in intellect, and must therefore account for efficiency as well as absoluteness. It must regard God as the source as well as the ground of reality. While it is generally assumed that God stands in relation to the world as Creator, this truth needs to be given proper emphasis, as being a necessary and characteristic feature of the Christian idea of the universe. Unless the universe depends upon God as a world-ground, it cannot be the pliant instrument of his infinite efficiency

Modern Speculative Theism. The necessity of the causal relations of God to the universe, is shown by the various theories of modern theistic speculation. This type of theism differs from the older deism in its conception of the relation of God to the world, mainly in its emphasis upon immanence rather than transcendence. It developed as a reaction to the barrenness of the speculations concerning the Absolute as transcendent and unknowable, and is represented by such writers as Theodore Parker and James Martineau. Specificallv stated, God is not to be identified with the world as in pantheism, but yet is so far one with it that His activity is rigidly confined within it and limited to the course of nature. The energy displayed in the world is the divine immanence revealing itself in the realm of both matter and mind, but in each according to its own laws. The theory has all the effect, therefore, in its consequences, as that of ancient Stoicism. It denies creative activity to God in the sense of a volitional act, and limits human freedom to a mere expression of the inner divine activity. These theists, however, guard carefully against pantheism in their insistence upon the distinctness of God from the world. Theodore Parker says, "If God be infinite, then He must be immanent, perfectly and totally present in nature and in spirit. Thus there is no point, no atom of matter, but God is there; no point of spirit, and no atom of soul, but God is there. And yet finite matter and finite spirit do not exhaust God. He transcends the world of matter and of spirit, and in virtue of that transcendence continually makes the world of matter fairer, and the world of spirit wiser. So there is really a progress in the manifestation of God, not a progress in God the manifesting. In thought you may annihilate the world of matter and of man; but you do not thereby in thought annihilate the Infinite God, or subtract anything from the existence of God. In thought you may double the world of matter and of man; but in so doing you do not in thought double the Being of the Infinite God; that remains the same as before. That is what I mean when I say that God is infinite, and transcends matter and spirit, and is different in kind from the finite universe (PARKER, Works, XI, p. 108). This form of theism, while closely related to pantheism must be classed with the older Deism. Delitzsch sums up the two positions in this statement, "While speculative theism in a one-sided manner emphasizes the immanence of God,

the older deism emphasized with equal one-sidedness His transcendence. The former makes God the active ground of the world development according to natural law, which is dependent on Him, He in turn being dependent on it; the latter placed Him above the perpetunm mobile of the universe, and made Him a mere spectator of human history; both agreeing in the opinion that there is no need or room for a supernatural incursion of God into the natural course of development, and refusing to recognize in Christ a new creative beginning and all that goes along with that" (DELITZSCH, Christian Apologetics, p. 157) . Bruce says that the distinction may be made more vivid to the imagination by representing the immanent Deity as imprisoned within the world, and the transcendent Deity as banished to the outside of the world (Cf. BRUCE, Apologetics, p. 135). Hence, in carrying out the above statement in a truly Christian sense, Dr. Parker carries out the implications of his theory by a denial of the miraculous. "No whim in God, therefore no miracle in nature. The law of nature represents the modes of God himself, who is the only true cause and the only true power, and as He is infinite, unchangeably perfect, and perfectly unchangeable, His mode of action is therefore constant and universal, so that there can be no such thing as a violation of God’s constant mode of action" (PARKER, Works, XI, p. 114) . It may readily be seen, therefore, that it is possible to regard the personal God as the Absolute in the sense of the world-ground, and deny to Him the Christian conception of volitional activity in the world, as it affects both creation and providence. It is for this reason that we must stress the infinite efficiency of the Spirit, if we are to maintain the Christian conception of the personality of God

[If "God were simply living Nature," says Dorner, "not being Master of Himself, and therefore not being truly Almighty, because He is not another than Himself, He might create, but He could only work Himself out and produce Himself by physical necessity. All Cosmogony would thus be Theogony. On the contrary, if His Nature is the servant of His Will, then without prejudice to His original power or His Omnipotence, there will remain a place for the world and that a free world, by virtue of which alone is reciprocal action possible between God and it, and in which the Law of Causality finds its perfection anew. God cannot, it is true, be limited from without but can be conditioned only by Himself; but if He is Almighty, by virtue of His Omnipotence, and without limitation of it, He can freely determine to condition His action by causalities in the world He has formed upon whom He bestows the possibility of free determination. A more’ thorough statement can be admitted only in the higher categories of the divine idea, and especially of the ethical attributes of God." - DORNER, System of Christian Doctrine, p. 261.] THE IDEA OF A FINITE GOD The attempt to harmonize the Absolute of philosophy with the God of religion, has given rise to various theories which have as their basis the idea of a finite God. It is frequently assumed that such a reconciliation of thought is impossible, and that religious belief must rest upon the basis of the ethical and religious feelings. Master Eckhart (1260-1329), the noted German mystic, made a distinction between the Godhead and God; and Dean Inge, who follows him in this particular, asserts that "the God of religion is not the Absolute, but the highest form under which the Absolute can manifest Himself to finite creatures" (INGE, Personal Idealism and Mysticism, pp.13, 14). The theory of a finite God is not a product of modern thought, but strikes its roots deep in both Greek philosophy and Greek religion. The Greeks had their pantheon in which one god while supreme was yet but one. among many. Plato identified God with the Idea of the Good, but at the same time admitted other ideas equally self-existent and eternal. To Aristotle, God was the "unmoved Mover" absolutely independent of the world, but to him the world was equally self-existent and eternal. In modern times. the idea of a finite God is closely associated with the skepticism of David Hume, but

was given more definite form in the philosophy of John Stuart Mill. Here the motive is not so much ontological as ethical, and arises from the attempt to harmonize belief in the infinite goodness of God with the problem of existent evil. Hume held that it is impossible "to reconcile any mixture of evil in the universe with infinite attributes." He adopts, therefore, the idea of a finite God in order to account for evil, which he thinks lies outside and beyond the God of religion as we know Him. On this theory, infinity is not necessary to creatorship, but "benevolence regulated by wisdom, and limited by necessity, may produce just such a world as at present." Mill is equally specific in denying the possibility of "reconciling infinite benevolence and justice

[That God is finite rather than infinite roots back into Greek philosophy. To Plato God was the supreme Idea or Good, but there were other ideas equally self-existent, like the heavenly bodies in relation to the sun; and besides, He is not the author of all things; God is not the author of evil but of good only (Republic, Bk. II, p. 380). Aristotle conceived of God as a perfect self-consciousness, whose being was absolutely independent of the world which was, equally with God, self-existent and eternal. Windelband, History of Philosophy, p. 689.] with infinite power in the Creator of such a world as this." The idea of finiteness has assumed different forms. First, there is the agnostic idea represented in modern times by Samuel Butler and H. G. Wells, which maintains that there is an unrevealed Reality back of the God of religion and which called the latter into existence. This theory is closely related to the Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism of the first Christian century, against which St. Paul warned the Colossians, and St. John wrote his First Epistle. Second, there is the idea of a finite God which is embraced in the community theory of the Absolute. Both Dr. Rashdall and Dr. A. E. Taylor hold that the Absolute is not to be identified with God, but must include God in a wider community of other consciousness. "The Ultimate Being is a single power," says Dr. Rashdall, "manifested in a plurality of consciousness, one consciousness which is omniscient and eternal, and many consciousnesses which are of limited knowledge, which having a beginning, and some of which, it is possible, or probable, have an end." Third, and closely related to the preceding is the idea of a growing or developing God. This is represented in the philosophy of Henri Bergson and his followers, and also by William James in his Pluralistic Universe and his Varieties of Religious Experience. With Bergson, philosophers appear to be undecided as to whether he believes in the growth of the totality of the universe, or whether he restricts it to that portion known as the phenomenal realm. William James, however, makes it very clear that he regards the growth of the universe as a whole, which to him, with his pluralistic conception, is an aggregate rather than an organism. Since finite individuals grow by drawing upon their environment, he regards God as "having an environment, being in time and working out a history just like ourselves." Fourth, we may mention the theory of Horace Bushnell which is set forth in his work entitled, "God in Christ," and is usuallv regarded as one of the earliest attempts in this country to prove the finiteness of God. The theory is directly related to the agnosticism of Hume, and is an attempt to bridge the chasm between an Absolute, inconceivable and unrevealed, and the God of religion, not by reasoned argument, but by the sense of religious need. "My heart wants the Father," he says, "my heart wants the Son, my heart wants the Holy Ghost!" Hence he conceives of the philosophical Absolute by an inner generative power, coming forth in a dramatic impersonation, giving us the God of religion and presenting Himself under a threefold aspect, that of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, each of which is finite. Dr. Bushnell maintained that in so far as the Absolute is unrevealed, it is wholly negligible and has the value only of Zero. Fifth, we may mention what is usually classed as a theory of a finite God, but which in reality amounts to a

redefinition of the Absolute to conform to the theistic doctrine of God. Bishop Francis J. McConnell argues that the so-called "unlimited" idea of God as expressed in the Absolute of philosophy is in reality more limited than the Christian idea of God. He charges the abstract theologians as limiting God in that they tend to empty the idea of all concrete content, and so impoverish the idea of God by limiting Him to bare abstractions. In much the same strain, Dr. E. S. Brightman suggests that there is in God what he calls a "Given" which as a retarding factor needs to be overcome. This "Given" is something akin to sensation in man, and accounts for the irrational elements in creation and their consequences in suffering GOD AND THE UNIVERSE

Having indicated the positions of modern speculative theism concerning God's causal relation to the world, and having pointed out also, some of the attempts to harmonize the absolute of philosophy with the God of religion, we must now treat more directly of God's volitional relation to the world, reserving for a later chapter the various theories advanced to account for the nature of creation The church was forced very early to attempt an explanation of the universe in its relation to God. The current philosophy of the Stoics and Neo-Platonists made it necessary for the Church to present a Christian view of God and the world. The immediate occasion for this was the development of the heretical sects commonly known as gnostics. These varied widely, but their theories are generally classified as Eastern or Syrian Gnosticism, and Western or Alexandrian Gnosticism. Representatives of the former were Saturninus of Antioch, Bardesanes of Edessa, Marcion of Sinope and Tatian of Assyria. These were all of the second century and are sometimes known as Anti-Judaistic Gnostics. Representatives of the latter were Basilides and Valentinus, frequently known as Judaizing Gnostics. The various sects of Gnosticism had these things in common: (1) They all agreed that the world did not proceed imme~ately from the Supreme Being. In this they were agnostic despite their name. Valentinus regarded the Supreme being as the unfathomable Abyss, and Basilides as the Unnamable. (2) They related the world to God by the process of emanation. (3) The world proceeding from the essence of God was therefore of like essence with Him. In this they were pantheists. They believed in the eternity of both spirit and matter, good and evil, light and darkness, and were therefore dualists. The distinction between pantheism and dualism may be stated thus: Pantheism holds that God is in all things in the sense that God is all; Dualism holds that God moves in all things either as its soul, or the harmonizer of its discords. Agnosticism and Pantheism have been previously considered in connection with the idea of God as the absolute; attention must now be given to the dualistic theories which have been advanced in opposition to God's Infinite Efficiency

Syrian Gnosticism was characterized by its emphasis upon emanation, and was in general more dualistic than that of Alexandria. It was a theory of the universe which maintained that the world was not created by a divine fiat, but was the consequence of the flowing forth of the divine essence, which with each succeeding aeon gradually deteriorated until it became matter. Their favorite illustration was that of the light, which proceeding from the sun is the most intense when nearest its source but decreases in intensity as it recedes until it is lost in darkness. The dual principles of light and darkness were eternal. The emanating aeons bridged the chasm between the Infinite and the finite, between good and evil. Gnosticism under the guise of a Christian philosophy made its influence felt in the churches of Asia, especially at Colosse, and for this reason is sometimes known as the Colossian Heresy. When, therefore, St. Paul in his Epistle to this church declares that 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 (Colossians 1:16) he is using similar if not the exact terminology which the Gnostics applied to the emanating aeons

Alexandrian Gnosticism was more philosophical in its character, and its dualism more deeply veiled. In Valentinus and Basilides efforts were made to transcend dualism, and motives from both emanation and evolution are often strangely mingled. Gnosticism was the rationalism of the early church and closely related to Neo-Platonism. God is the unknown, the unfathomable, the Abyss (Buqov"). With him there is a pleroma (plhrwma) or spiritual world (kovsmo" nohvmato"), composed of a system of aeons which unfold the dark and mysterious Depth. Besides this spiritual world, matter as an eternal principle exists in the form of the kevnwma, or empty void, which appears to be a logical otherness, or a nonexistent existence. This unintelligent force God endowed with a portion of His own intelligence (nou'"), so that it becomes the Demiurgus or world-soul. The bridge between the pleroma (plhvrwma) and kenoma (kevnwma) is made by the last emanation, or wisdom (sofiva). Thus God is not Himself even the framer of the world. This is the work of the Demiurgus or world-soul, which pervades the visible universe and constitutes it one living animated whole

Against Gnosticism in all forms, the Church reacted, and sought to employ instead, the ethical view of free, creative action. It held fast to the idea of personality as belonging to the Original Being, and consequently conceived of the world as proceeding from God, not by the physical or logical necessity of His unfolding essence, but as an act of will. It regarded it, therefore, not as an eternal process, but as a fact that had occurred once for all. It conceived also of the world as mediated through the Divine Word (logo"), in whom the transcendence and immanence of God as separate potencies remain united, the Logos or God within the world, furnishing a resting-place for the God without the world. Hence St. John sweeps away with a single stroke all thought of emanations and declares that In the beginning was the Word, [ejn ajrch/' hj'n oJ lovgo"] and the Word was with God, and the Word was God (John 1:1). It was the Word that bridged the chasm between the Infinite and the finite, between God and the world. This Word was creative. All things were made by him. This statement is in the emphatic form - (oujde eJVn oJV gevgonen) "without it was done not even one, that has been done." Furthermore, this Word is the pleroma (plhrwvmato" aujtou'). Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace (cavrin ajntiV cavrito" or favor upon favor) (John 1:16). Thus the Logos is both creative and redemptive, and Christ is the Mediator in both nature and grace. St. Paul likewise warns us against vain philosophy (Colossians 2:8) and science falsely so-called (1 Timothy 6:20), having in mind, doubtless, the gnostic tendencies which were pressing for

[Reason demands for the universe unity of dependence on some common original ground or cause, unity of order and law, of common intelligibility and significance, and of rational end; and theism meets and satisfies these demands. It presents, as the absolute ground or cause from which all things originate, the absolute Reason, self-exerting and self-directing. In the last analysis of physical force, science always finds a power transcending it and suggestive of will-power. In all its explorations of nature and its explanations of it by natural laws, it carries us into sight of the mystery of the infinite which no natural law can explain. The constitution of the physical system is the archetypal thought of God expressed in it. Its invariable factual sequences which are called the laws of nature and constitute its uniformity and continuity, are accordant with the truths, laws,

ideals and ends which are eternal in the absolute Reason. - Harris, Self-revelation of God, pp. 288ff.] recognition in the Church. To him, Christ is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist, or "He precedes all things and in him all things have been permanently placed" (Colossians 1:15; Colossians 1:17). St. Paul also has his pleroma doctrine, and we might add, his avatar doctrine also. The pleroma finds expression in the words, For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, (pa'n toV plhvrwma katoikh'sai or the whole fullness should dwell). To the Gnostic teaching concerning light and darkness as eternal principles of good and evil, and the whole bewildering attempt to bridge the chasm between them, both philosophically and religiously, St. Paul gives answer in a hymn of praise, Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins (Colossians 1:12-14)

We have considered this subject at some length, in order to present the Christian idea of God in His creative aspect. We need not give attention to those philosophies, which from the time of Gnosticism to the present have sought to explain God's relation to the world without a Mediator; nor to those which, ignoring the Divine Word, have substituted in His stead a series of impersonal emanations. Pantheism without the mediation of the Logos or Word resolves the world into God; materialism on the other hand confines God to the realm of matter or falls into atheism. The more modern monistic philosophies are usually but thinly veiled pantheism, and rightly deserve the name of "facile monism." Pluralism apparently gives up any attempt at unity. Against all these theories Christianity posits the Infinite Efficiency of Absolute Personality. It sees creation as the result of a creative fiat, and finds its unity in the Logos as the Eternal Word. The will, however, as here used is something more than mere choice or volition, it is thought or purpose, it is reason or end This St. Paul states specifically in his Epistle to the Ephesians. He speaks first of the good pleasure of his will (thVn eujdokivan tou' qelhvmato" aujtou') or benevolent affection of His will (Ephesians 1:5); then of the mystery of his will according to the good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, (proevqeto ejn aujtw'/ or according to his own benevolent design, which He had previously purposed in Himself) (Ephesians 1:9); and lastly of the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will (boulhVn tou' qelhvmato" aujtou' or who effectuates or is operating according to the counsel, purpose or design, of His own will) (Ephesians 1:11). Here, then, according to the Christian view; the world is created by the Infinite Efficiency of God, divine love being the originating cause, the divine will the efficient cause. and the divine Word the instrumental cause

[The sublime doctrine of the relation of the Eternal Son to the creature is the only secret of the continuity which is taught, the only bridge between the Creator and the creature. He is the Mediator-if such a use of the term may be allowed - between the infinite and the finite, between God and the creature. . . . St. Paul contradicts the Gnostic speculations as to the Demiurgus; the entire pleroma of the Godhead, and not an emanation, dwelt in Him and did not descend upon Him bodily, and not in semblance. And He who was the First begotten before every creature, was such as the jArchv or Beginnlng, in Whom and through whom creation began. By him were a1l things created: as if in Him the Absolute God, or the Father, originated creaturely existence, upholds it and administers it; by an incarnation before the Incarnation. We cannot conceive how the

creaturely universe should have this specific relation to the Son, and how in Him the Infinite became finite, before God became flesh; but we must receive the mystery and adore it. Our Lord was the Firstborn of the new creation when He began its life in Himself; and He is the First begotten, or beginning of the creation of God which had its origin in Him. - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, pp. 384, 385.]

12. Chapter 13 - GOD AS PERFECT PERSONALITY

Chapter 13 - GOD AS PERFECT PERSONALITY

We have considered God as the Absolute in the sense of the ground of all reality, and as the Infinite in the sense of efficiency; it remains now for us to consider God as Perfect Personality, first, in the sense of a completion or perfecting of the two previous aspects; and second, as furnishing the reason or purpose of all things. The Christian conception of God must therefore include the idea of Absolute Reality as the ground of existence, His Infinite Efficiency as its cause, and His Perfect Personality as the reason or end of all things

We have seen that false conceptions of the Absolute and the Infinite have led to grievous errors respecting the true nature of God, so also a false conception of personality has led many to maintain that there is an inconsistency in ascribing personality and personal attributes to the Absolute and the Infinite. One of the outstanding problems of modern philosophy and theology, therefore, is this question of personality. At no point perhaps have philosophy and theology had such a direct contact, nor has philosophy done more to shape the theological conceptions of God, than in these conflicts which have arisen over the being and nature of God

Origin and Meaning of the Term. The idea of personality has been dominant in thought from the earliest times, but by a strange coincidence the word itself came into use only in modern times. The earliest Greek conceptions of the Deity were personal even if polytheistic, but the attributes of goodness and truth were not applied to them. Far earlier than this was the Hebrew conception of a personal God, with all the attributes which we ascribe to human personality. It was Boethius, however, in the earlier part of the sixth century who gave the current in the church until modern times. This definition is, Persona est naturce rationalis imdividua substantia, or a "person is the individual subsistence of a rational nature." A person, then, was characterized in a twofold way-an individual as being separate and distinct from others; and a common rational nature of which each individual was a partaker

Thomas Aquinas in his Summa Theologica defines a person as "that which is mast perfect in all nature, as subsisting in rational nature." He argues then, "that the term person may be applied to God, since His essence contains in itself all perfection, but not in the same way it is given to His creatures, but in a more excellent way, as other names that are given to creatures are ascribed via eminentice to God." It is evident that St. Thomas is thinking more of personality as being in God than as applied to God. The Trinitarian controversies had been carried on under the prevailing influence of Platonic Realism, and the tendency was to subordinate the individual to the universal. This was noticeable in the earlier Greek concepts of religion. The gods of the polytheistic pantheon were too personal, in the sense that their finiteness was subversive of their universality. The word "person," therefore, was thought of in the sense in which we commonly use it in its application to the Trinity, while the unity of God was expressed by the word "substance" or "essence." Thus we have the Greek word hypostasis and the Latin word substantia which as the equivalent of hypostasis should, to be more exact, have been translated subsistence, instead of substance, the

former denoting a distinction within the ultimate substance, rather than the substance itself. Thus God was personal in the sense of the Trinitarian distinctions, but to the ultimate and unitary being of God the more abstract term of essence or substance was applied. This failure to apply the term "person" to the whole being of God gave rise to the modern controversies between philosophy and theology concerning the nature of personality; and further, to controversies within theology itself respecting the nature of the Trinity. Out of these has come a firmer and wider grasp of the meaning of personality. It is seen to apply now, not only to the hypostatic distinctions of the Trinity, but to the whole conception of God as both Unity and Trinity. It has proved to be the ultimate reality, through which alone the Absolute can be understood. The world-ground is therefore personal, and the infinite efficiency of the first cause is likewise personal. Reserving the trinal nature of God for a later discussion, we shall trace the development of this wider concept of personality, presenting first, the Psychological Argument from the nature of self-consciousness, and second, the Metaphysical Argument from the nature of personality itself. The first argument is stated in the most able manner by Dr. William G. Shedd in his Dogmatic Theology; the second is best represented by Lotze in his discussion of the nature of personality The Psychological Argument for Personality. Personality is marked by self-consciousness and self-decision. Dr. Olin A. Curtis in his Christian Faith defines it as "the power of self-grasp, self-estimate, and self-decision," or more concisely "the power of self-conscious decision." Consciousness implies the duality of subject and object-a subject to know and an object to be known. Without this, consciousness is impossible. Self-consciousness is a higher form of consciousness, in which the subject and object are identified. The duality remains but the human spirit, in the act of self-cognition furnishes both subject and object in one being or substance. It has the power of setting itself over against itself, and thereby duplicating its own unity as subject and object. Man, therefore, not only thinks, feels and wills, but he knows that he thinks, feels and wills. It is this power of self-consciousness and determination that constitutes him a personal being. Dr. Shedd states the position as follows: Self-consciousness is (1) the power which a rational spirit or mind has of making itself its own object; and (2) of knowing that it has done so. If the first step is taken, and not the second, there is consciousness but not self-consciousness; because the subject would not, in this case, know that the object is the self. And the second step cannot be taken, if the first has not been. These two acts of a rational spirit, or mind, involve three distinctions in it, or modes of it. The whole mind as a subject contemplates the very same whole mind as an object. Here are two distinctions or modes of mind. And the very same whole mind also perceives that the contemplating subject and the contemplating object are one and the same essence or being. Here are three modes of one mind, each distinct from the others, yet all three going to make up the one self-conscious spirit. Unless there were these two acts and the three resulting distinctions, there would be no self-knowledge. Mere singleness, a mere subject without an object, is incompatible with self-consciousness. And mere duality would yield only consciousness, not self-consciousness. Consciousness is dual; self-consciousness is trinal (Cf. SHEDD, Dogmatic Theology, I, p. 183ff). Self-consciousness, being the most perfect form of consciousness, is applicable to God as the Supreme Being or Perfect Personality. But we must make a distinction here. Man has both consciousness and self-consciousness. By consciousness he is related to the objective world through sentiency. There is in him the sensuous consciousness of the animal and the blind agencies of physical appetite. The animal is impressed by external objects which are no part of itself, but apparently is never impressed by itself. It experiences heat and cold, pleasure

and pain, but cannot duplicate its own unity and thus become aware of the subject which experiences them. An animal is not a person and cannot have self-consciousness. Man has this sentient consciousness also, but it differs in this respect, that it is capable of being scrutinized and converted into self-consciousness. On this lower plane, man may think, but he does not think of what he thinks; or he may feel, and not direct his attention to the character and quality of those feelings. It is one of the effects of conviction by the Holy Spirit," says Dr. Shedd, "to convert consciousness into self-consciousness. Conviction of sin is the consciousness of self as the guilty author of sin. It is forcing the man to say, 'I know that I have thus felt, and thus thought, and thus acted.' The truth and the Spirit of God bring sinners to self-knowledge and self-consciousness, from out of a state of mere consciousness" (SHEDD, Christian Dogmatics, I, p. 180). Dr. Olin A. Curtis emphasizes this same fact but gives more attention to the volitional than to the intellectual and affectional aspects of personality. He regards self-decision as the most important feature of the entire personal process because it is the culmination. "Whenever we will anything, supremely conscious of self, that volition is self-decision." "Whenever a man sees himself out there," he says, "as an existing, isolated, peculiar individual, and then in the flash of that vision of self, wills anything, that volition is self-decision. The person first makes himself the clear, full objective of his own thought, and then makes that definite point of his person the original initiative of his choice. And so the significance of self-decision becomes tremendous because the decision is charged with the conception, with the entire valuation, which the man has of himself" (CURTIS, Christian Faith, pp. 23, 24)

Self-consciousness belongs to God. It is evident, however, that God, like man, cannot have consciousness apart from self-consciousness. First, sentiency cannot be attributed to God. God is Spirit (John 4:24). According to the creedal statement He is "without body, parts, or passions." Here a sharp distinction is made between spirit and matter. Matter has bodily form, and must have parts and passions. A body is divisible and therefore capable of being destroyed. A body is capable of passions in the etymological sense of the term, that is, it can be wrought upon from without by material substances. Spirit being a unity can have no parts and is therefore indestructible. God as the Absolute Spirit is a unity and therefore can stand in no passive and organic relations to that which is not Himself. When the creed states that He is without "passions" it means that He is not operated upon or moved from the outside, but that all His activity is self-determined. The divine movement is all from within, that is, ab intra as over against ab extra. His personal decisions are always self-decisions of the highest possible type. His knowledge and affections are always the expression of His infinite and eternal worth. Second, there can be no growth or development of consciousness in God. Man comes to self-consciousness gradually through the increasing complexity of the relationships existing between the self and the objective world. As he develops physically from infancy to manhood, so he must develop in his mental and moral life. Like the Word incarnate, he increases in wisdom and stature, and like Him he should increase in favor with God and man. We cannot think of God as having blind and unreflecting mental processes. His reason is not discursive but intuitive. His is ever "self-conscious, self-contemplating, self-knowing and self-communing." He is indeed cognizant of the universe which He created, but this knowledge is not mediated through the senses as in man, and consequently is never partial or imperfect. Here we hear the breaking of the great deep on the infinite and eternal shores of God's omnipresence, His omniscience and His omnipotence The Metaphysical Nature of Personality. We have presented some of the psychological aspects of

personality as found in the nature of self-consciousness; we must now consider more carefully its metaphysical characteristics. Pantheistic thought asserts that personality cannot be conceived without finite limitations. For this reason it has always objected to the application of the term personality to God. Personality according to the Hegelians and Neo-Hegelians consists in the contraposition of self to another object, a non-ego by which it is limited. This limitation of the self by the cosmical ego is the cause of consciousness reflecting upon itself, thus giving rise to self-consciousness or personality. Infinite personality, then, according to this type of thought would be a contradiction in terms. But does personality depend upon this limitation? Theists reply in the negative. They maintain that this limitation may be the occasion but not the cause of personality. The root of personality lies in its nature before there is any contraposition to other subjects, and consists in the peculiar constitution of the subject as a finite spirit. The contraposition, therefore, is not the essence of personality, but only an inherent consequence of its nature The philosophical argument of the Hegelians against the Personality of God has been ably met on philosophical grounds by Hermann Lotze (1817-1881), whose writings have profoundly influenced theology. His chief works bearing upon this are the Microcosmos and his class lectures on the Philosophy of Religion. Lotze approaches the subject of personality from the opposite angle, affirming that perfect personality belongs to God only, and that the necessity finite personality has of thinking itself over against a not-self is due to the limitation of finiteness rather than personality. He begins his argument by an analysis of personality which he finds yields two features, first, that the subject possesses an image of cognition or representation of what it is, by which it distinguishes itself from others; and second, that this image is unique, in that it cannot be contrasted with any other image in the same sense, that the other image may be contrasted with a third. The uniqueness and distinctness of this image he holds to be fundamental to personality. While our knowledge of personality may come from experience in the sense of mental development, it is not merely the orderly arrangement of ideas according to some system, but the ego standing in direct opposition to every non-ego. Thus he finds that self-consciousness always implies the existence of a fundamental self-feeling which is its most essential element. Lotze also denies that personality is occasioned by the ego’s activity being "reflected" back from a non-ego. This he asserts is a "mere supplement of thought devoid of all basis." Such a process he says, would not distinguish the "I" from "thou" or "he," our own personality from that of others. This distinction, he maintains, is not affected by means of pure ideation, but by the power of the self to combine its experiencing of feeling with its ideas. It is this combination that enables us to distinguish a personal state as our own. "The smallest capability for the experience of feeling," he says, "is sufficient to distinguish the one who experiences it from the external world, but the highest intellectuality apart from this capability, will not be able to apprehend itself as an ego over against a non-ego. This is to say, once again, that personality presupposes feeling or self-feeling and cannot be subsequent intellectual construction only."

Lotze, in denying limitation as the essence of personality, lays a firm foundation for belief in the personality of God. "What justification is there," he asks, "for attributing the term personality to its incomplete form in man, and grudging it to the Deity completely endowed with it?" Finiteness, then, according to Lotze, is the limitation rather than the expression of personality, and only in the infinite is there the truest and highest personality. "So little, therefore, is the idea of God’s personality contradicted by His infinite greatness and perfection," says Christlieb, "that, on the contrary, it is precisely by reason of them that He must be personal." (CHRISTLIEB, Modern

Doubt and Christian Belief, p. 170)

We must draw our argument for the personality of God to a close. We have seen that the infinity of God, instead of placing Him outside the reach of human knowledge as agnosticism declares; or denying to Him personality as pantheism maintains, is instead, the very presupposition of His personality. And further, the idea of the Absolute can be maintained only as it posits an absolute Subject, that is, the absolute Personality. Thus the Absolute instead of being a contradiction of personality, can be explained only in the light of personality. The self-consciousness of the Absolute Personality does not need to limit itself by a not-self outside. God created the universe and gave it the position it holds, so that if we consider it a limitation in any sense of the word, it must be a self-limitation. This necessarily involves a belief in freedom. If we deny to God the freedom to create a world of finite existence apart from Himself, this very limitation would be a denial of His absoluteness. Thus the Christian concept of God preserves it from pantheism. On the other hand, it is maintained that one person can be distinguished from another, only by the multiplicity of powers which characterize him. Thus agnosticism holds that the Absolute, being by abstraction outside the realm of attributes, cannot be known. The Christian concept of God is that these powers are not abstracted from personality, but function in it as a unity instead of a multiplicity. Knowledge, feeling and will may be distinguished in finite personality, and exercised in some degree of independence, but this is not true of the Absolute Personality. Personal powers may correspond to certain objective distinctions in God, but it is His whole being that knows and feels and wills, and this in such a manner that their exercise does not break the absolute unity of His being. But apart from the philosophical significance of the term personality as applied to God, there is a religious significance to the term. As a personal Being, self-conscious and free, God stands in ethical and spiritual relations to mankind. As personal, God is Absolute reality in relation to the ground of all existence; as Infinite Efficiency, He is the Cause of all existence; so also as Perfect Personality, He is the reason or purpose of all existence.

There are two factors in human self-knowledge: (1) a direct feeling of self; and (2) a conception of self or of the powers and properties of self. This conception of self is developed, but the feeling of self is present from the beginning. The child has little or no conception of itself, but it has the liveliest experience of itself. This experience of self is quite independent of all antithesis of subject and object, and is underived. But allowing all that can be claimed for the development of our self-consciousness, it docs not lie in the notion of self-consciousness that it must be developed. An eternal self is metaphysically as possible as an eternal not-self. To say that because our self-consciousness is developed all self-consciousness must be developed, is just as rational as to say that all being must have a beginning because we have. It is to transfer to the independent all the limitations of the finite, which is the very thing the pantheist claims to abhor.-BOWNE, Studies in Theism, p. 274 Not a few hints are given us in the human range that mind is intrinsically the power of initiation, the original spring of energy. Accordingly it is no speculative rashness to conceive that the infinite mind, notwithstanding the absence of external stimulus, may be alive, energetic, inclusive of all loftiest feelings and purposes, and thus have abundant means of self-consciousness. Indeed, there is good reason for concluding with Lotze that complete self-consciousness, or personality in the highest sense, can be predicated of the infinite alone.-SHELDON, System of Christian Doctrine, p. 37

Lotze gathers up the results of this investigation in the following propositions: (1) Selfhood, the essence of all personality, does not depend upon any opposition that either has happened or is happening of the Ego to the Non-Ego, but it consists in an immediate self-existence which constitutes the basis of the possibility of that contrast wherever it appears, Self-consciousness is the elucidation of this self-existence which is brought about by means of knowledge, and even this is by no means necessarily bound up with the distinction of the Ego from the Non-Ego, which is substantially opposed to it. (2) In the nature of the finite mind as such, is to be found the reason why the development of its personal consciousness can take place only through the influences of that cosmic whole which the finite being itself is not, that is, through stimulation coming from the Non-Ego, not because it needs the contrast with something alien in order to have self-existence, but because in this respect, as in every other, it does not contain in itself the conditions of its existence. We do not find this limitation in the going of the Infinite: hence for it alone is there possible a self-existence, which needs neither to be initiated nor to be continuously developed by something not itself, but which maintains itself within itself with spontaneous action that is eternal and had no beginning. (3) Perfect Personality is in God only, to all finite minds there is allotted but a pale copy thereof: the finiteness of the finite is not a producing condition of this Personality, but a limit and a hindrance of its development. (For further study cf. RELTON, Christotogy, pp. 166, 167.)

If I do not mistake, the whole system of this reasoning rests upon an error common to skepticism and pantheism, which formerly misled, and still deceives, many a superior mind. This error consists in maintaining that every determination is a negation. Omnis detenninatio negatio est, says Hamilton after Spinoza. Nothing can be falser or more arbitrary than this principle. It arises from the confusion of two things essentially different, namely, the limits of a being, and its determinate and constitutive characteristics. I am an intelligent being, and my intelligence is limited; these are two facts equally certain. The possession of intelligence is the constitutive characteristic of my being, which distinguishes me from the brute being. The limitation imposed on my intellect, which can see only a small number of truths at a time, is my limit, and this is what distinguishes me from the Absolute Being, from the Perfect Intelligence which sees all truth at a single glance. That which constitutes my imperfection is not, certainly, my being intelligent; therein, on the contrary, lies the strength, the richness, and the dignity of my being. What constitutes my weakness and my nothingness is that this intelligence is enclosed in a narrow circle. Thus, inasmuch as I am intelligent, I participate in being and perfection; inasmuch as I am intelligent only within certain limits, I am imperfect. - SAISSET, Modern Pantheism, vol. II, pp. 69-72.

PERSONALITY AS THE FINAL CAUSE OF FINITE EXISTENCE

We have shown that Perfect Personality is the completion of the process, which includes the concept of the Absolute as the ground of all reality, and the Infinite as the cause of all finite existence. We must now show that there is a sufficient reason or final cause of the universe, and this we find in Perfect Personality also. So far we have dealt mainly with the philosophical aspects of absoluteness, infinity and personality. But the term personality has a richer content than that given to it by metaphysics alone. To self-consciousness must be added self-determination. Perfect Personality involves perfection of intellect, feeling and will. There is therefore within the cosmos itself, a teleology or purpose which is derived from its Author. Dr. Dorner has shown that Spirit expresses something positive, a peculiar Being transcending Nature and its categories, which is

not merely in degree of higher worth than all finite good things, but which is also the absolute final end. In this higher something, or in God as Spirit, the principles will be found of all those ideas of which the world forms the mere finite manifestation or type, the principles of Measure, Design and Order, of Beauty and Harmony. God, as Spirit is the original seat of the "eternal truths"; they have in Him their absolute being For how can absolute Being, which is to be necessarily thought of as the real and original possibility, both of existing things and of knowledge, be such a possibility if it is not essentially spiritual? (Cf. DORNER, System of Christian Doctrine, p. 284). God as Perfect Personality satisfies, therefore, the religious nature of man, not only in its intellectual aspects, but in its moral and ethical demands as well

Nature and the Personal Spirit. Perfect Personality lies only in the realm of spirit. Spirit, therefore, must give meaning to nature. The spiritual sphere is the only sufficient explanation of nature, without which its contradictions for rational thought must ever remain an unsolved riddle. "It is no tragic accident," says Dorner, "that without exception, every individual thing or every natural good passes away. It lies in the nature of the case." Nature must be permeated by the spiritual sphere, so that all its processes are taken up and made subservient to higher ends. This is the argument of St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. There is, he says, a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. Andso it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly (1 Corinthians 15:44-49). Here it is clearly declared that the end of nature is the spiritual, and that it is inherent in Christianity as a philosophy of life, that the natural must be spiritualized, that nature must be made to serve spiritual ends. The transient nature of finite existence, or the consumption of nature, is not therefore irrational, since it serves a permanent purpose and comes to fuller expression in something higher than the finite, thus serving an infinite end

Personality and Its Positive Spiritual Content. But the spiritual realm not only transcends nature and becomes its end in a general way; there is a positive content to the term Spirit. It signifies not merely a higher degree of worth than nature, but a unique, personal being, transcending nature and its categories, and is in itself the Sufficient Reason of nature, its absolute and final end. It was Athanasius (296-373), the great champion of the Trinitarian conception of God who declared that "he who contemplates Creation rightly is contemplating also the Word who framed it, and through him begins to apprehend the Father" (ATHANASIUS, Discourse Against the Arians, I, p. 12). Here we approach the deep and unfathomable mystery of the adorable Trinity. But it is impossible to discuss the question of Perfect Personality without anticipating the distinctly Christian conception of God as Trinal Spirit or Triune Being. Why are the principles of truth, right, beauty and harmony in the world? Do they not force us immediately to the belief that there is a principle of order in the world? And can there be order without wisdom? And can wisdom be less~ than personal? Here we have reached the inspired declaration of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made (John 1:1-3). Here it is specifically stated that the world was created by the Word, that

is, according to a rational order, and after principles absolute in the personal Word which later became incarnate in Christ. It was just because the Logos was personal and creative, that Christ became the Redemptive Person. In Him was manifested the fullness of grace and truth. It is then in God as Spirit, that we must find the original seat of mercy and truth, strength and beauty (Psalms 96:6). It is in the Logos as the Eternal Word that they have their absolute and un-originated being. These principles did not originate in will; they are true in themselves and are therefore eternal within His essence as Spirit. They are the categories which presuppose Divine Intelligence. Whether finite or absolute, there can be no true end apart from intelligence, nor can there be either beauty or harmony without it. Only as there is a synthesis of the mind within nature and the mind within man can there be any understanding of nature by man, or any communication of man with man. It is because of the eternal Logos which precedes and underlies the very structure of creation, constituting it a cosmos and not a chaos, that we have our world of order and beauty. And further still, it is because the Christian conception of the Logos given us by St. John is both personal and creative, that we are preserved from pantheism, which on the one hand would merge everything into God, or on the other, regard the world as an emergence or emanation from God. St. Paul in his address on Mars' Hill declared to the Athenians that God is not worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and passing directly from the creative aspect, he presents the ethical as the great goal of human personality, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him,though he be not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being (Acts 17:25-28). A firm grasp upon the fact of personality forever prevents thought from becoming pantheistic THE PRINCIPLES OF RATIONAL INTUITION

What are these absolute principles, eternal in the Godhead and peculiarly the property of the Divine Logos, which form the archetypal ideas of the world, the rational principles of order in the universe? The ancient philosophers expressed these norms in the familiar classification of the true, the beautiful and the good. Dr. Samuel Harris in his Philosophical Basis of Theism (p. 180ff) thinks this classification inadequate. Starting with Kant's questions, "What can I know? What shall I do? What may I hope?" he divides the last into two; which he finds to be "What may I become?" and "What may I acquire and enjoy?" He thus finds four norms instead of three, which he regards as ultimate realities, known through rational intuition. These are (1) the true, which is the rational standard or norm of what a man may know; (2) the right, which is the norm of human activity; (3) the perfect, which is the norm of what a man may become; and (4) the good, which is the norm of what a man may acquire and enjoy. A brief discussion of these will give us some idea of the richness of Perfect Personality, which forms the spiritual goal of finite human beings and the supreme end of all things The First Ultimate Is the True. By the "true" we mean those universal truths or primitive principles of the mind which regulate all knowing. These truths of the reason have objective reality as principles or laws of things, in that they are the constituent elements in absolute reason. There can be no truth apart from the reality of the world-ground, just as there can be no laws of nature apart from the Author or Creator. "By truth," says Dr. Strong, "we mean that attribute of the divine nature in virtue of which God's being and God's knowledge eternally conform to each other" (STRONG, Systematic Theology, I, p. 260). Thus as a Divine Perfection we must regard truth as an absolute correspondence of revelation with reality. Dr. Samuel Harris approves of Plato's position in regard to archetypal ideas, when touched, as he says by Christian theism. These archetypal ideas of the true, the right, the perfect and the good exist eternally and

archetypal in God the Supreme Reason. These and all other forms and ideals compatible with them were in the mind of God as an ideal universe before they came to existence in the physical universe as we now perceive it. To these He gives expression in time and space, and under other limitations of finite beings. He also created men as finite rational beings which in their normal development come not only to know themselves, but to know themselves in the light of Another, and thus arises the moral and ethical system in which God gives expression to even higher archetypal thoughts

Truth as it is applicable to God is usually classified as verity, veracity and faithfulness or fidelity. The two latter may be considered attributes in that they represent transitive truth manifested to His creatures. The former must be regarded as immanent truth, and not merely an active attribute. It is the exact correspondence of the Divine Nature with the ideal of absolute perfection. While this ideal can be only partially comprehended by finite beings, it is fully known to God in all its excellence, and to this supreme excellence His whole nature corresponds. It is in this aspect that the Scriptures call Him the true God, as indicated in the following references: And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent (John 17:3). Since truth is reality revealed, Jesus is the Truth because in Him are revealed the hidden qualities of God. This is given further statement in 1 John 5:20 where the writer declares that We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. In both of these passages the word alhqinon is used which describes God as genuine or real as distinguished from alhqhs, a term used to express the veracity or truthfulness of God. When, therefore, our Lord speaks of himself as the Truth, He means not merely that He is the truthful One, but that He is the Truth and the source of truth. His truth is that of being and not merely that of expression (Cf. also 2 Chronicles 15:3, Jeremiah 10:10 , 1 Thessalonians 1:9, Revelation 3:7) As to the veracity and faithfulness of God, the Scriptures abound in both references and illustrations. Since God’s knowledge is perfect He cannot be mistaken; since He is holy there can be no disposition to deceive; and since His resources are infinite He is under no necessity of failure. His law being a transcript of His nature is unchangeable and exactly adapted to the character and condition of His people. It becomes, therefore, the ground of adoration and praise. Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth. Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever (Psalms 119:142; Psalms 119:160). The Scripture writers delight in meditating upon the faithfulness of God as the foundation for faith and hope and love. If God were not true in all His promises and faithful in all His engagements, religion would be impossible. Hence we have such references as the following: God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? Or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good? (Numbers 23:19). He is a Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he (Deuteronomy 32:4). Thy truth reacheth unto the clouds (Psalms 108:4). The truth of the Lord endureth forever (Psalms 117:2). Thy faithfulness is unto all generations (Psalms 119:90). In the New Testament we have such references as the following: God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord (1 Corinthians 1:9). If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself (2 Timothy 2:13). Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning (James 1:17). Other references must be

reserved for treatment in relation to the specific attributes of God The Second Ultimate Is the Right. Here the principles of rational intuition are known as laws, in that they are regulative of energy or power. These apply in every realm-the physical, the moral and the spiritual. The term right is used to express conformity of action to the principles of reason regarded as law. This is applicable to both intellect and will. By the term "ought" is meant the action of a free rational being in response to the demands of reason. Law in its bare intellectual form is merely observed sequences, and as it concerns physical power is conformity of action to the laws of the physical realm. In duty, however, a new reality arises which must be considered in relation to free will and thus becomes moral law. Like the other intuitions of reason this law is operative in a practical way before it is formulated in thought. As man reflects, he comes to see that whatever he knows as true in the reason becomes a law of action. Hence there develops a sense of oughtness, and duty takes on a new and intense meaning. He sees himself under an overmaster or Lord, and in conscience he knows himself along with, or in the light of, Another. Kant in his Metaphysics represents conscience as conducting a case before a court and gives his conclusion in these words: "Now that he who is accused by conscience should be figured to be just the same person as the judge, is an absurd representation of a tribunal; since in such an event the accuser would always lose his suit. Conscience must, therefore, represent itself always some one other than itself as Judge, unless it is to arrive at a contradiction with itself." He finds, also, that conformity or lack of conformity to the law as right results in two conflicting types of character. To the one he applies the term virtue and to the other vice. More remotely, however, he finds the one to be holy and the other sinful, and this in direct relation to the Overmaster, known and felt in conscience. God as Perfect Personality must, therefore, be both holy and righteous, and as such demands both holiness and righteousness in His subjects. "Holiness," says William Newton Clarke, "is the glorious fullness of God’s moral excellence, held as a principle of His own action and the standard for His creatures" (CLARKE, Outline of Christian Theology, p. 89) The Third Ultimate is the Perfect. By perfection is meant the correspondence of outward action with the inner rational standard. When the mind imagines a perfect object, that creation of the imagination is called an ideal. Ideals, therefore, are not obtained by imitation, or the copying of observed objects, but are creations of the mind itself. Beauty and harmony are not dependent upon material altogether, but may be pure spiritual images. Beauty is primarily and originally pure form. It does not arise from matter, but is a form impressed upon matter. Material things as we find them in nature become beautiful through the interlocking of these forms. Furthermore, this formative principle must be capable of being fixed in thought, not merely as outward law of beauty or harmony, but as a principle of the Essence itself. The law of the beautiful, of harmony and order, of perfection must therefore belong to the nature of God and be a part of the absolute Essence. As God is the Supreme Being, or the Being of beings, so His perfection is a supreme perfection, or a perfection of all perfections. It belongs therefore to God to impress the stamp of His own being upon all the divine works, and consequently His works are perfect. It was for this reason that Augustine loved to think of God as primary beauty and harmony. "God," he says, "is lovely as the beautiful, for we can only love the beautiful; but the truly beautiful is the super sensuous, is immutable truth." As applied to God, perfection is usually regarded in theology as the principle of harmony which unifies and consummates all the divine attributes, thus preventing the sacrifice of one attribute to another, and bringing each one to its supreme manifestation. Perfection in God is not the combination of many qualities, but only, "the undivided glory of the several rays of the divine character." It is the

harmony of absolute freedom from inner contradictions. Beauty is therefore directly connected with holiness, and we are commanded to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness (Psalms 96:9. Cf. 1 Chronicles 16:29, Psalms 29:2, 2 Chronicles 20:21, Psalms 110:3) But the Divine Life as perfect, is not merely one of freedom from inner contradictions, it is also one of positive content. It is filled with inner divine potentialities, and all these potencies are in harmonious equilibrium. It becomes, therefore, essentially a Self-purpose. The Scriptures recognize this beauty and harmony which characterize the Divine Perfection, as it recognizes truth and righteousness as belonging to the Divine Nature. The psalmist declared that Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined (Psalms 50:2); and again, Thou art clothed with honour and majesty. Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment: who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain (Psalms 104:1-3). When Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount enjoined upon His disciples the principles of perfection, saying, Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is. in heaven isperfect (Matthew 5:48), He could have referred to nothing short of that freedom from inner contradictions which constitutes a holy being, and the possession of those positive potencies which in harmony with the divine nature stamped themselves in beauty upon all His works. The perfection He enjoins upon His disciples is not the absolute perfection of the Divine Being, but that in human personality 'which corresponds to the divine nature. It is the deliverance of the soul from the inner contradictions brought about by sin, or inherited depravity, and its restoration to purity of heart and simplicity of purpose. And, furthermore, this perfection implies in man as it does in God, a correspondence between the outer activities of life and the inner harmony of being. Perfection in this sense is intensely ethical, in that it includes both inner holiness and outward righteousness. It is the fulfillment of the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life (Luke 1:73-75) The Fourth Ultimate Is the Good. The good is the last and highest in the series of ultimate which constitute the norms of finite human existence. In its ultimate and absolute sense, our Lord applies the term to God only, there is none good but one, that is God (Matthew 19:17). In this sense it is to be interpreted as the divine sentiment which wills the good of all creatures as such. Thus there is seen to be a distinction between the perfect in the sense of conformity to the norms of truth and right, and the good in the sense of the useful. A thing may be either a means to something else, or it may be an end in itself. In the former sense, its value is estimated only in relation to that other thing and not for its own sake. This determines it as useful. 'The fitting, the useful, the convenient, depend on something else," says Augustine, and "cannot be judged by themselves, but only according to that relation to something else." On the other hand, a thing may be willed for its own sake instead of another, and through its own inner harmony and beauty become an end in itself or a good. It should be observed that the good as the highest in the series of norms involves each of the others in an order of precedence and dependence. Truth in itself appears to be foundational and presupposes no truth, and right is such, only by conformity to truth as a law of action. The perfect presupposes both the ideas of truth and right; while the good not only involves the experiences of joy and sorrow, but presupposes the true, the right and the perfect as the norm or standard by which to discriminate the sources of joy and the pursuit of pleasures worthy of a rational being. The good is then the rational The good, therefore, is the rational end or object of acquisition, possession and enjoyment. It presupposes the true, the right and the perfect; it is that in which they culminate. Here we come to the province of ethics, and the necessary investigation of the realm of ends, which shall constitute a full and sufficient reason

for life itself. It is this reality known by reason, which opens to knowledge the whole sphere of teleology or final causes. But while the good may be defined as that which has rational worth, the question arises immediately, "What is this good? What is it which has in itself some worth as estimated by reason; which is everywhere and always worthy of human acquisition and possession, and everywhere and always worthy to be the source of happiness to a rational being?" This Harris defines as "the perfection of his being; his consequent harmony with himself, with God the Supreme Reason, and with the constitution of the universe; and the happiness necessarily resulting" (HARRIS, Self-revelation of God, p. 271)

It will be seen, then, that perfect personality is not only the highest philosophical concept of the Divine Being, but it becomes also the supreme end of finite existence. The essential good is primarily the perfection of the being in personality. The good is itself the realization of the truths, laws and ideals of reason. In so far as man attains the perfection of his own being, he attains the end which reason declares to have true worth. This is an end worthy of pursuit and acquisition, not only for ourselves but for all moral beings. The steps in this process of development must begin in the acquisition of a right moral character. Character begins in choice, and from thenceforth the will is a character will. Each succeeding choice develops, confirms or modifies this character. The moral law requires of its subjects, love to God as supreme, and love to our neighbor equally with ourselves. Love is therefore the fulfilling of the law. It is the essential germ of all right character But the good not only includes harmony within the individual person, in the sense of a character unified and motivated by perfect love, it includes also the perfection of all the powers and susceptibilities of the person progressively unfolding according to the law of love. This tends toward the discipline, development and refinement of the individual, but implies also a correspondence of finite reason with the Supreme Reason, the finite will with the infinite will of God. Holiness, as we have pointed out, is "the glorious fullness of God’s moral excellence, held as the principle of His own action and the standard for His creatures," and therefore the Supreme Good for all of God’s creatures. Furthermore, we must regard harmony with God’s universe as involved in this Supreme Good. The universe, both physical and spiritual, is the expression of the archetypal ideas of God, and was brought into existence through the Divine Word or Logos (John 1:3). The individual cannot work out his own good apart from the universe. He belongs to a universal system of which God is the Author, and in which His wisdom and His love are evermore coming to harmonious expression. His well-being consists in a proper and harmonious adjustment to the system of which he is a part, and which was designed by the Supreme Reason for his progressive good. Here is the deep and profound meaning of the words, All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose (Romans 8:28). Then again, the good must include happiness. This follows as a consequence of the perfection of the person and his harmony with God and the universe. Happiness can have no separate existence. It is always inseparable from that in which it has its source. Thus joy springs out of right character and action and is inseparable from it. This is the meaning of Jesus who said to His sorrowing disciples, I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you (John 16:22). The personal, therefore, must ever be the true end or object of acquisition, possession or enjoyment. It is only in personality that the ideas of the true, the right and the perfect culminate. God as Perfect Personality is the only worthy object of human choice, and love to God the fulfilling of the law. With perfect love to God and man, the soul must forever unfold in the light of this Supreme Good, and at every stage of its progress will embrace enlarged conceptions of the true, and the right, the perfect

and the good.

That the goal of the universe is spiritual and is to be found in Perfect Personality is given definite and beautiful expression in these words of St. Paul : Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued...then shall the Son himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all (1 Corinthians 15:24-28). Behold I show you a mystery; 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. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality (1 Corinthians 15:51-53). This is the lively hope unto which we have been begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (1 Peter 1:3)

All truth among men, whether mathematical, logical, moral or religious, is to be regarded as having its foundation in this immanent truth of the divine nature and as disclosing facts in the being of God,-STRONG, Syst. Th., I, p. 261

Harris uses the term good as synonymous with well-being. The occasion in experience on which the idea of good and evil arises is some feeling impelling to exertion for some end or reacting in joy or sorrow, pleasure or pain. If man were never impelled by any motive to action and were incapable of enjoyment or suffering, he could have no idea of good and evil. If it were possible to conceive of a being as pure reason and nothing else, we could not conceive of that being as a subject of good and evil; for the being would never experience the impulse of any motive nor be affected by any feeling.-Harris, Philosophical Basis of Theism, p. 256.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF GOD In our discussion of the Divine Names and Predicates, we pointed out in a preliminary manner, some of the Scripture predicates of God as used by our Lord and His apostles. Among these were the terms Spirit, Life, Light and Love. Having now presented the philosophical aspects of God as the Absolute, the Infinite and the Personal; and having shown the necessity of a personal God to meet the ethical and religious demands of finite personality, we turn from philosophy to discuss the religious concept of God. Christianity holds that the true concept of God is that which Christ revealed, or more specifically, which God himself revealed through Christ. We shall therefore endeavor to fill up in some measure the outline already presented, by a further discussion of Christ’s concept of God, enlarged and interpreted by those additional concepts given by Him to the apostles through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit

God Is Spirit. In a revealing statement our Lord declares that God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24). Perhaps the passage should be more truly translated as "Spirit" and not "a Spirit." Doubtless the statement is intended to affirm the personality and religious value of God, and not primarily the mere philosophical essence as it is sometimes used. God is Spirit, an infinite Spirit; man is spirit, a finite spirit, but there is a common relationship so that "Spirit may with spirit meet"; and this possibility of spiritual communion is the basis of true worship. St. Paul emphasizes the aspect of spirit in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. Of the Spirit of God he affirms, the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of

God. Of the human spirit he says, For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God (1 Corinthians 2:11-12)

It is sometimes objected that our Lord's declaration concerning the nature of God cannot be called a definition of God. Christlieb, however, affirms that we have here "the most profound definition of Scripture as to the nature of God, a definition to the sublimity of which the presentiments and longings of no heathen people ever rose, although the truth of them directly forces itself on the reason and the conscience. Man has spirit, God is Spirit. In Him the Spirit does not form merely a portion of His being; but the whole substance of His nature, His peculiar self is Spirit. Here we have the idea of God in His inner perfection, just as the names Elohim and Jehovah tell us mainly of His external position. As Spirit, God is the eternal, self-dependent brightness and truth, absolute knowledge, the intelligent principle of all forces whose glance penetrates into everything, and produces light and truth in all directions" (CHRISTLIEB, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief, p. 221)

God as Spirit Is Life. Of God the Scriptures predicate not only that He exists but that He lives. The Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself (John 5:26). Of Himself Jesus declared, I am the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6). This life, which exists absolutely in the Father, is mediated to the Church through Jesus as the bread from heaven. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever (John 6:57-58). St. John affirms also of the eternal Logos, that in him was life; and the life was the light of men (John 1:4); while St. Paul in his discussion of the redemptive mission of Christ testifies that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death (Romans 8:2). We are to understand by the term "life" as here used, not only the ens which denotes simple reality or being, but organized life, an organism including the fullness of truth, order, proportion, harmony and beauty. The Scriptures give us no warrant for thinking of God as mere Being in repose. Neither may He be regarded as merely thought or ideal. "As absolute Life," says Dorner, "He has a pleroma (plhrwma), a world of real forces in Himself. He bears within Him an inexhaustible spring, by virtue of which He is Life eternally streaming forth, but also eternally streaming back into Himself. Still He is not to be defined as transient Life; He is before everything essentially Absolute Life; He neither empties nor loses Himself in His vital activity. He is a sea of self-revolving life; an infinite fullness of force moves, so to speak, and undulates therein... The life of God is expressed in an especially picturesque manner, in that vision of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 1:1-28 : cf. Revelation 4:1-11) where the theme is Living Beings, who are not angels, but who belong to the throne of God or to His manifestation. They are united with the symbols of wheels which lift of themselves and move freely on all sides, because in them there is a spirit of life, of forcibly revolving life, which flashes to and fro. The wheels point to the circular movement of life: (Cf. James 3:6, the course or 'wheel' of nature) they are sown with a thousand eyes, to express that space is everywhere equally present to them; whilst the wings signify the life which moves freely on all sides. But it is to be considered that in Ezekiel this life and motion of the powers of life do not exhaust the description of the theophany. All this, the cherubim with the living wheels, merely forms, so to speak, the chariot, the

base for the living God, is the mere forecourt of the divine sphere-the innermost circle is reserved for God as living Spirit (Ezekiel 1:26). If we approach from the side of the world, this heavenly fullness of life may already appear to be the Godhead or God. But later on, when we are in possession of the Divine Personality, that fullness will be a predicate of God, a mere substratum, so to say, of His Personality. As absolute Life, He is absolutely exalted above passivity or diminution and transitoriness, as well as above increase. He has absolute Sufficiency in Himself, for He has Life in Himself" (John 5:26; cf. John 1:3) (DORNER, System of Christian Doctrine, I, pp. 259, 260). As absolute Life, God is Perfect Personality. Life is in some sense the substratum in which the attributes in here. The necessary powers of personal spirit are not attributes, but the essence of the Being who possesses the attributes. Life may thus in some sense be indefinable, but it is known in consciousness as thought, feeling and will, and therefore the source of all reason, emotion and self-directed activity. In God thought is creative, His affections perfect and His activity infinitely free and powerful

God as Spirit Is Light. Another fundamental property of Spirit, as set forth by St. John , is that of Light or Absolute Truth. The apostle uses the term in its most general sense, not "a light," but "light." "God is light," says Meyer, "so also all light outside of Him is the radiation of His nature." God as Absolute Personality is luminous with truth. In Him is no darkness at all. Hence the possibility of falsehood and error is excluded. Light is revealing, and the supreme revelation of God in Christ becomes the firm basis of the Christian religion, in both its objective and subjective subsistence. But the contrast between natural light and darkness is but the symbol of a deeper contrast between holiness and sin. Isaiah uses both terms in a related sense prophetically, And the light ofIsraelshall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briers in one day (Isaiah 10:17). Light is therefore the outshining or effulgence of the Father’s intrinsically holy nature, for the natural and the moral in God must be regarded as one. "Holiness is the hidden glory," as one writer expresses it, and "glory the manifested holiness of God." This is the conception of God as revealed in Christ according to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, affirms that Christ is the full objectification of God’s inner glory; and upholding all things by the word of his power, relates Him as the Divine Son to the whole creative process; while the last clause identifies Him with God’s redemptive purpose, when he had by himself purged our sin, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high (Hebrews 1:3). St. Paul , also in a single verse of great depth and comprehensiveness, uses the term light as a miraculous consequence of the Divine Word, to express the spiritual transformation in the hearts of men. For 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 Corinthians 4:6). Here the terms light, knowledge, and glory are identified or at least used in a closely related sense, and all shining in the face of Jesus Christ as God’s supreme revelation of Himself to the world

There are two doctrines of primary significance in the Christian system, which arise immediately from the conception of light as absolute holiness and truth. First, there is the negative conception of moral depravity as the absence of spiritual light. This results in ignorance of God and His relations to the world and to man. But this absence of light is such, because of personal freedom asserting itself in contradiction to God. It is a voluntary shutting out of the light with its illuminating and healing influences. But this contradiction of God is also a self-contradiction, that is, it is a

violation of the immanent law of God in the nature and constitution of man. This perverted activity of personal freedom brings about a false attitude on the part of the human spirit, giving rise to a sphere of inner contradictions characterized by falsehood and ignorance. The self-contradictory state which follows in the intellectual and ethical life is that in which reigns the deceitfulness of sin as self-perverted personality. It is therefore a state of moral darkness. It is the consequence of a "deprivation" of light, and therefore a state of moral depravity. Original sin as a state is due to original sin as an act, and becomes in turn the state or condition of the natural man out of which springs the transgression of the law of God. St. Paul declares of the heathen, that even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind (Hom. 1: 28), a state which he in the same epistle calls the carnal mind which is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be (Romans 8:7). Back of this, the apostle maintains, is the "God of this world," who is not merely the personification of darkness, but a personality, a spirit which embraces within it that moral and spiritual darkness occasioned by the absence of every ray of spiritual light. Satan therefore, as 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 Corinthians 4:4). There is, second, the positive content of light which issues from the holiness of God, as over against the negative concept of moral depravity, consequent upon the absence of spiritual light. The Scriptures affirm that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all (1 John 1:5). We have seen that Spirit implies not only self-consciousness but self-determination, and the eternally free self-determinations of God must be in accord with His divine nature. His goodness and His holiness being absolute, his self-knowledge and self-determination must be commensurate with the infinitude of His Being. Consequently, down to the depths of His infinite Being, there is no darkness, nothing that is undiscovered, nothing that is unfulfilled, nothing that needs to be brought to completion or perfection. He is the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning (James 1:17). God as light is the inexhaustible fountain of truth, Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen (1 Timothy 6:16)

God as Spirit Is Love. The third fundamental property of Spirit is love. Here again we are indebted to St. John for his clear and strong utterances on this phase of the nature of God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. And again, God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God dwelleth in him (1 John 4:8; 1 John 4:16). Personality, as we have seen, demands a subject and an object in order to knowledge, and in self-consciousness this subject and object are identified. So also in love there is an equal necessity for subject and object, and also a free and reciprocal relationship between them. In love, the subject and the object are identified with each other, and yet each asserts and maintains a distinct selfhood. Here again we must anticipate the trinal nature of Spirit and the Trinitarian distinctions in the Godhead. To the Father primarily belongs life; to the Son light, and to the Spirit love, which is the bond of perfectness (Colossians 3:14). Of the Father, the Son declared Thou lovedst me before thefoundation of the world (John 17:24), and in a statement immediately preceding it, affirms the same love toward the disciples in the words, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me (John 17:23). Here the communion is personal. Not only are the terms Father and Son personal, but the organ of this reciprocal love, the bond of perfectness, is likewise personal. "This unity, this absolute communion of love with love, of the personal subject with the personal object, in the glory

of the Divine Life, is," says Gerhart, "the Holy Spirit" (GERHART, Institutes, I, p. 447). But love belongs to both the nature and the attributes of God. Here we must consider love as the essence of God only, leaving the discussion of the attribute of love which forms a link between the absolute Godhead, and His manifestation to His creatures, for a later chapter.

The references to the "Living God" are many, both in the Old Testament and in the New. The following is but a partial list: 1 Samuel 17:36, 2 Kings 19:4, Psalms 42:2; Psalms 84:2, Jeremiah 10:10; Jeremiah 23:36, Acts 14:3, 1 Timothy 6:16; 1 Timothy 3:15; 1 Timothy 4:10, 2 Corinthians 3:3; 2 Corinthians 6:16, Romans 9:26, Hebrews 10:31, Revelation 2:8; Revelation 7:2; Revelation 22:13, Cf. also John 6:63; John 6:69, Matthew 22:32.

Scanned by John Mitchel Gianatalla. Edited by John Patterson. Corrected by George Lyons. © 2002 Wesley Center for Applied Theology and the Wesley Center Online, Northwest Nazarene University, Nampa, ID 83686

13. Chapter 14 - THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

Chapter 14 - THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

We have previously pointed out in our analysis of terms, that there are two groups of definitions applied to the attributes-the one more general and popular, the other more technical and philosophical. The former may well be represented by the definition of Henry B. Smith who holds that "an attribute is any conception which is necessary to the explicit idea of God, any distinctive conception which cannot be resolved into any other." In this sense, the attributes may be regarded as the qualities which belong to and constitute the divine nature. Dr. Pope calls them "the full assemblage of those perfections which God ascribes to himself in His Word; partly as the fuller expansion of His names, and partly as designed to regulate our conception of His character. They are to be distinguished from the properties of the Triune Essence on the one hand; and on the other from the acts by which His relation to His creatures are made known. Hence Dogmatic Theology regards them, first in their unity as perfections manifesting the divine nature; and secondly in their variety as attributes capable of systematic arrangement" (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 287). Quenstedt, the Lutheran theologian (1617-1686), says the attributes were so-called because they are attributed to God by our intelligence; and perfections because they make up the divine essence. Theology therefore adopts the word perfections for these qualities as they are applied to God by Himself; attributes, as they are assigned to Him by His creatures At the other extreme is the more technical and philosophical definition of Dr. Shedd, who regards the attributes "as modes either of the relation or the operation of the divine essence." They are therefore merely an analytical and closer description of the essence. In support of his position, which is so evidently Platonic, he cites the position of Nitzsch, who says that "every divine attribute is a conception of the idea of God." Here the term "concept" and "idea" are used in the sense of Schelling's philosophy. As the general and undefined idea is reduced to the form of the particular and definite conception, so the general divine essence is contemplated in the particular attribute. The attributes are not parts of the essence, of which this latter is composed. The whole essence is in each attribute, and the attribute in the essence. We must not conceive of the essence as existing by itself, and prior to the attributes, and of the attributes as an addition to it. God is not essence and attributes, but in attributes. The attributes are essential qualities of God" (SHEDD,Dogm. Th., I, p. 334). Here it is well to point out also, the distinction between hypostasis and attribute. The Hypostasis or "Person" as the term is used in reference to the Divine Trinity, is a mode of the existence of the essence; while an attribute is a mode either of the relation or external operation of the essence. Over against this external operation is the internal operation of the essence which refers necessarily to the persons or hypostases and not to the attributes

There are two questions which must be answered concerning the attributes, and in answering them, the Church has had to guard against two prevalent errors. First, are the attributes realities in the divine nature, or are they merely human modes of apprehending God with nothing in the divine essence corresponding to these human conceptions? Second, how do we come to know the attributes? As a corollary of this question, do we know God through His attributes; or knowing God,

are the attributes merely an analytical and closer description of the essence as suggested above? The first problem concerns the relation of the attributes to the nature of God-are they realities in the divine essence, or merely human modes of conception? To which we must reply, they are objective and real. They are not merely subjective human conceptions, with nothing objective corresponding to them in the nature of God. However, this question has been discussed at great length by theologians of a philosophical cast such as Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, William of Occam, and in modern times by Nitzsch and Dorner. Augustine taught that "God is truly called in manifold ways, great, good, wise, blessed, true, and whatsoever other things seem to be said of Him not unworthily; but His greatness is the same as His wisdom; for He is not great by bulk, but by power; and His goodness is the same as His wisdom and His greatness, and His truth the same as all those things; and in Him it is not one thing to be blessed, and another to be great, or wise, or true, or good, or, in a word, to be Himself.-De Trinitate, VII, p. 7. The Nominalist Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, William of Occam (100: 1270-1347) and Gabriel Biel (d. 1495) maintained that God had and could have but one quality or attribute, a position which grew out of an attempt to justify the being of God as ens simplicissimum, and therefore without distinction of qualities and powers. Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274) on the other hand, marks carefully the distinction between what God is in Himself, and what He is in relation to finite being, defining the attributes as relations corresponding to nothing in God viewed in Himself, but to something not merely thought but objectively real in His relation to the world. This position preserves the unity of God sufficiently against the danger which arises from ascribing to Him a variety of attributes, in that these represent only the undivided essence in its relation to the world. Schleiermacher (1768-1834) follows Augustine (354-430), and states his position in a similar manner. "All attributes which we ascribe to God, are to be taken as denoting not something special in God, but only something special in the manner in which the feeling of dependence is to be related to Him. . . . the divine thinking is the same as the divine will, and omnipotence and omniscience are one and the same" (Der Christliche Glaube, Eng. Trans., p. 474). This overemphasis upon the Absolute has been the bane of both philosophy and theology, and if carried logically to its length, would lead directly into agnosticism. Martensen states the position truly when he declares that the attributes are "not human modes of apprehending God, but God’s mode of revealing Himself." Dr. Olin A. Curtis takes practically the same position when he defines an attribute as "any characteristic which we must ascribe to God to express what He really is." The second problem is concerned with the manner in which we come to know the attributes of God. Like the former question, much error has been associated with attempted solutions of the problem. Closely connected with this is the problem of the knowledge of God. Do we know God by means of His attributes? Or, knowing God, do we know the attributes as closer and more explicit analyses of this primary personal knowledge? The two positions are at opposite extremes, the one making more prominent the mystical element in knowledge, the other the rational. Here again, many of the older theologians took the position that we know God through knowing His attributes. The rationalist in philosophy and theology seeks to come to a knowledge of God through the theistic proofs. This he does in a piecemeal manner by organizing them into a unity. The rationalistic spirit is seen also in certain types of biblical study, especially that which would merely collate the Scripture teachings concerning the attributes of God and blend them into a totality. In both of these instances the seeker after God can attain nothing more than a "knowledge about God," never a "knowledge of God." We must maintain that we come to a personal knowledge of God in the same manner as we

come to a knowledge of finite human personality. However much we may learn about a person, we can never be said to have personal knowledge until there is spiritual contact. But having once made this spiritual contact, everything that we learn or discover through personal association may be regarded as personal qualities or human attributes So also is our knowledge of God. We gain our idea of the attributes only by analyzing the personal knowledge of God which has been revealed to us in Christ through the Spirit. Having this personal knowledge we may analyze it into more definite and specific forms. Consequently we must maintain that we know God personally in the unity of His Being, however imperfect this may be; and the attributes are the analyses of this total knowledge of God by which He manifests Himself in nature and in grace. In other words, it is our personal knowledge of God that makes possible a true knowledge of His attributes, and not a mere rationalistic summing up of the attributes that gives us our knowledge of God

It follows, then, that a proper arrangement of these attributes is of great importance, in bringing the distinctive features of the divine nature to clearest expression. As in each finite person, some trait of character seems dominant and central, so it is in our finite conceptions of God, though we shall show later, that there can be no disunity or lack of harmony in the attributes of God. Philosophy has generally made omniscience or wisdom the central attribute, although the divine will has sometimes been advanced as of prime importance. Augustinianism regarded grace, or condescending love as central. Calvinism makes justice the central attribute. But none of these fully reproduce Christ's conception of God as Father. If God is Father, holy love must be supreme and central. Indeed, love is so central, that the other attributes of personality may be regarded as love energizing in certain directions. Justice is love in relation to moral law, omniscience is love exemplifying wisdom, and omnipresence is love in its universal presence. Holy love must occupy the central place in our knowledge of God. But we are anticipating our discussion of the moral attributes

It may be admitted that the doctrine of the attributes is not quite germane to the simplicity of the Christian idea of God, and we have previously referred to the attempt, on the part of theologians to preserve this simplicity from logical disunity. On the other hand, there is the constant danger of looking upon God as a bundle of attributes. The present day trends in psychology are toward the simpler forms of classification. Psychology is not nearly so sure as it was, as to the advisability of marking off the human mind into clearly defined and separate departments. It is the mind as a whole that acts in the unity of personality, and hence the intellectual, the volitional and the emotional aspects must be considered in relation to the mind as a whole. It is better, therefore, to guard against a multiplication of the attributes, and to center the interest in a few fundamental characteristics. This is the position of Dr. Carl Knudson who begins his study with an inquiry concerning the existence of God, and arranges the material following in three chapters dealing with, first, the absoluteness; second, the personality, and third, the goodness of God

Perhaps the chief value of the study of the attributes lies in the fact that it tends to preserve the idea of God from indefiniteness and corruption. But it must be constantly kept in mind that the attributes can have no existence apart from the nature of God, nor can the being of God have reality apart from its attributes. The attributes are simply the qualities revealed to us, and as such belong to, and are inseparable from personality PRINCIPLES OF CLASSIFICATION

One of the simplest forms of classification is the twofold division into absolute and relative attributes, or the attributa absoluta and attributa relativa of the older theologians. This twofold division is sometimes expressed in other terms, as communicable and incommunicable, transitive and immanent, positive and negative, moral and natural, ethical and metaphysical. Whatever the term used, the principle of classification is the same. Martensen adopts the twofold classification, but rejects the terms absolute and relative as attended with difficulties, since there are no attributes that are not relative or transitive, that is, do not express a relation to the world; nor are there any which are not reflexive, that is, which do not go back to God himself. "We gain a more determinate principle of division," he says, "when we consider the twofold relation which God holds to the world. The relation of God to the world, namely, on the one hand a relation of unity, on the other hand, a relation of diversity or antithesis. Indeed, our religious life, with all its morals and states, moves between these two poles-that of unity and that of diversity, that of freedom and that of dependence, that of reconciliation and that of separation" (MARTENSEN, Christian Dogmatics, p. 93). In his consideration of the attributes, therefore, he finds it necessary to give consideration to the momenta of both unity and diversity. On the other hand, Dr. Pope objects to the terms incommunicable and communicable, on the ground that those termed communicable may be similar to the attributes of God, but considered strictly as attributes, they are not communicable. Similarity there may be, but the one belongs to God, and the other to finite human personality

Another method of classification follows the analogy of human personality. This according to Dr. Miley is the true classification, since the method of science always gives attention to the most determinate factor, which in this instance is personality. "Personality is the most determinate conception of God," he says, and therefore, "the truest, deepest sense in which he can be viewed as the subject of His own attributes." Since man is conscious of the substantiality of his being, and knows that he has a self which is unaffected in its identity by all changes, so also he conceives of the subsistence of God as apart from all phenomena. But man is a person with intellect, feeling and will, and in his consciousness is aware of these three modes of the manifestation of the self. Under this classification God as Absolute Personality is first, Absolute Reason or Omniscience; second, Absolute Feeling or Goodness, which Dr. Miley interprets as holiness, justice, love, mercy and truth; and third, Absolute Will or Omnipotence But man is also conscious of his own substantial existence through all the changes of time and space, and this gives rise to the thought of Absolute Existence, and the consequent attributes of aseity or self-subsistence, and immutability or unchangeableness; hence there is omnipresence in relation to space, and eternity in relation to time. These latter give expression to that which is primary and fundamental in the Christian concept of God, and to these the previous classification does not appear to do full justice. Both William Newton Clarke and William Adams Brown take this into consideration, and therefore arrange the attributes as follows: (a) Attributes of personality: spirituality, life and unity; (b) attributes of character: wisdom, love and holiness; (c) attributes of absolutism: omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience and immutability. The first is primary, the others secondary. With the same emphasis upon personality as a determining factor, another class of theologians think that the truth may be reached in a more direct and simple manner, by following a twofold outline or classification; (a) attributes of absolute personality, including what is usually presented under the term absolute and relative attributes; and (b) attributes of holy love, or the moral attributes. In this class we may mention Luthardt, 1823-1902) Haering and Dickie

Differing from these and yet with the determining principle of personality as the basis of classification, is another class of theologians who, following Schleiermacher, have stressed more especially the religious demands upon man's nature. Here we have (a) the sense of dependence giving rise to the necessity of the absolute attributes; (b) man's sense of sin, the moral attributes; and (c) the whole consummated by the revelation of love through Jesus Christ. McPherson thinks that the classification under being, understanding, feeling and will is not sufficiently exact, and admits of a very confusing cross division. The correct principle of classification he thinks is that which follows the leading moments in the historical development of the Christian revelation. God's attributes then are His ways of manifesting Himself in the world and to men. They are to be classified therefore according to God's relation, (a) to the natural world; (b) to the moral world apart from redemption; and (c) to the world of grace, or the moral world inclusive of redemption. Here may be classified Alexander Schweizer (1808-1888), Herman Schultz (1836-1903), and F. A. B. Nitzsch (1832-1898)

Having reviewed the various principles of classification, we turn to the threefold method as being the simplest and most practical method for our discussion of the various attributes of God. If the twofold method of absolute and relative attributes be adopted, we are under the necessity of classifying such attributes as omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence, which imply God's creative relation to the world, with the moral attributes, such as wisdom, justice, love and goodness, by which He administers His government of moral and responsible beings. If on the other hand we accept such a twofold classification as natural and moral, or incommunicable and communicable, we are compelled to classify together, the so-called absolute and relative attributes. This is confusing, in that we must thereby overlook the distinction between God's mode of existence, and His mode of operation. We therefore adopt the threefold method of classification, as being logically the most simple method of arrangement, and at the same time the clearest form of presentation from the pedagogical standpoint. Our outline is as follows:

I. The Absolute Attributes, or those qualities which belong to God apart from His creative work

II. The Relative Attributes, or those arising out of the relation existing between the Creator and the created, and which of necessity require the creature for their manifestation

III. The Moral Attributes, or those which belong to the relation between God and the moral beings under His government, more especially as they concern mankind.

The favorite method has been to make a division into two counterpart classes. Hence they are distributed as natural and moral by a distinction which the meaning of neither of these words will allow; both are inappropriate to Deity, and the harshness is not removed if metaphysical and ethical are substituted. The instinctive objection we feel to these terms is not felt to the correlatives of absolute and relative, immanent and transitive, internal and external: these distinctions furnish the right clue and are sound as far as they go; but they do not suggest those special manifestations of God which give their peculiar glory to Christian theology. It is dangerous to speak of positive and negative attributes; for while there is no positive excellence in Deity which does not imply negation or its opposite, the negative ideas of infinity and so forth are really and truly positive. Lastly, when they are classed as communicable and incommunicable, it must be remembered that, as attributes, all are alike incommunicable to the creatures-POPE, Compend.Chr. Th., I, p. 290

Drury (Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, p. 143) thinks the best warranted classification is that given by Dr. Samuel Harris, although previously developed and used in part by others. This classification is as follows:

Self- existence

Immensity Absolute... Eternity

Plenitude Divine Attributes..

Omnipresence Love Personal... Divine Sensibility... Holiness

Omnipotence The subdivisions of love and holiness are not directly given by Dr. Harris but are used by Dr. Drury in his adaptation of the scheme.

THE ABSOLUTE ATTRIBUTES By the Absolute or Immanent Attributes we mean those qualities which have relation to God’s mode of existence, in contradistinction to those which refer to His mode of operation or activity. They must be conceived as far as is possible, apart from any relation to the creature. They are absolute in that they are unlimited by time or space, are independent of all other existence, and perfect in themselves. They have their basis in the fact that God is, in Himself, Absolute Being. They are immanent in that they belong to spirit, and are essential to any right conception of the Divine Nature. They are the attributes of a Personal Being, and may be summed up as spirituality, infinity, eternity, immensity, immutability and perfection

1. Spirituality. This has frequently been regarded as belonging to the essence of God, rather than as an attribute of that essence. This would be true were we using the term in the sense of pure spirit. But even this must be known by its effects, as is implied in the term pneuma, which means a breathing forth. Consequently we use the term which most closely approaches pure spirit; and as previously analyzed, this gives aseity or self-subsistence, which is sometimes enlarged to include unity, simplicity and ideality. Viewing spirituality from the standpoint of self-subsistence, there can be no objection to regarding it as an attribute By "aseity" (aseitas) we mean self-subsistence, or the possession of life in Himself which is independent of all other existence. Man has life in himself but only in communion with the Son (John 6:53); the Son has life in Himself, but even this is given to Him of the Father (John 5:26); but the Father alone has it from no one. He has it in Himself precisely because He is the Absolute Person. Aseity, therefore, denotes that the ground of being is in Himself. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life and breath, and all things (Acts 17:24-25)

It is evident that this truth concerning the independence and self-subsistence of God was not known to the heathen, but was understood by Israel , and declared with clearness and power by the early Church. For this reason Van Oosterzee regards it to a certain extent, as the test of the purity of our conception of God- whether or not it acknowledges this independence without limitation. That philosophy which holds creation to be necessary to the personality of God as a subject, and the world as His object, must necessarily issue in pantheism. Yet from the standpoint of theism it must be recognized, that while the world is not necessary to existence of God as Absolute Personality, as the Highest Love He will have creatures of His own. This is not the self-sufficiency of Stoicism, but Love’s inexhaustible fullness of life which can give without the

need of receiving The term "simplicity" as applied to pure uncompounded spirit, is sometimes referred to as an attribute. Dr. Boyce for instance, treats the first attribute under this head, which he affirms "means more than the spirituality of God, for that includes only that He must be spiritual." However, created spirits may have a composite spiritual nature which includes a spiritual body as well as a spiritual soul, and in this there is no contradiction. But in God spiritual nature must be uncompounded, and His attributes and His nature are in such a manner one, that they are inseparable from each other. Simplicity, therefore, is the unity of the spiritual nature as opposed to form and limitation. The difficulty of this concept to the finite mind, which is under the necessity of thinking in terms of time and space, frequently gives rise to anthropomorphism, although the church has always rejected it. Melito (A.D. 162) is said to have been the first Christian writer to ascribe a body to God. Tertullian also ascribed a body or corpus to God, and regarded the soul as material, but this materiality was not that of the human body. It was as he viewed it, a tertium quid or a different substance from that which we call matter, and was considered the necessary form of all existence. Origen opposed this as did the entire Alexandrian School. Their tendency toward idealization, as has been pointed out, resulted in a concept of the Deity as mere negation. Irenmus held that God is not to be compared to frail men, and yet His love justifies us in using human phraseology when speaking of Him. In modern times the Church has expressed clearly its belief in the spirituality and simplicity of God. This statement is found in Article I of the Thirty-Nine Articles as revised by John Wesley for the American churches and generally known as the Twenty-Five Articles of Methodism. That portion of the Article which refers to the spirituality of God is as follows: "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions." The term "passions" in the foregoing statement, early became a matter of disagreement in the Church and the bishops of the Conference of 1787 removed it. Originally the word passion referred to passivity, and hence God, not being a creature of environment and acted upon from without, the creed denied a passive nature to Him. But in time the word came to mean an emotion or a manifestation of feeling. To deny the term passion, then, seemed to convey the idea that God was devoid of an affectional nature. Those who held to the former view, maintained that the references to God as possessed of emotions were purely metaphorical. Richard Watson, the theologian of early Methodism, opposed this view. "It is assumed," he says, "that the nature of God is essentially different from the spiritual nature of man. This is not the doctrine of Scripture The nature of God and the nature of man, are not the same; but they are similar, because they bear many attributes in common, though on the part of the divine nature, in a degree of perfection infinitely exceeding" (WATSON,Institutes, I, p. 389). We must therefore conceive of knowledge and love as being the same in God as in man, only in God they are free from all imperfections

2. Infinity. By infinity, we mean that there are no bounds or limits to the Divine Nature. The term applies to God only, and is peculiarly applicable to the personal attributes of wisdom, power and goodness. It is for this reason that the creedal statements, found in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church and the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism, include the words "of infinite power, wisdom and goodness." Modern theologians of the Arminian type, have tended to absorb the doctrine of infinity in the other attributes. Neither Watson, Wakefield , Raymond, Ralston nor Summers mentions it among the attributes. Field mentions it briefly, and Banks treats it as infinite wisdom. Pope alone gives it any extended treatment. On the other hand, the Westminster Catechism defines God as "A Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." Consequently we find the Reformed theologians tending to

the opposite extreme of absorbing the other attributes in infinity. Strong makes infinity basic to self-existence, immutability and unity, while Foster considers it the ground of eternity and immensity or omnipresence. Dr. Charles Hodge states that the infinitude of God relative to space is immensity or omnipresence; relative to time, it is eternity. He further regards immensity as that aspect of infinity by which God fills all with His presence, while omnipresence is His infinity viewed in relation to His creatures (Cf. HODGE, Systematic Theology, I, pp. 383ff) The term, "infinity," being negative in form, has sometimes been interpreted to be negative in content This leads directly to agnosticism as we have shown in our treatment of that subject. We must, therefore, consider the term infinite as a positive concept in negative form, and as such it applies only to Personal Spirit. It has no meaning when applied extensively to time and space, and its application in this sense leads directly to pantheism. For this reason we must not regard transcendence as mere externality but as a boundless supply from within. In the words of Augustine, "He knows how to be everywhere in His whole Being and to be limited by no place. He knows how to come without departing from the place where He was; He knows how to go away without leaving the place whither He has come (Ep. 137: 4); and again, "He is everywhere in His whole Being, contained by no place, bound by no bond, divisible into no parts, mutable in no respect, filling heaven and earth with the presence of His power (De Civ. Dei, 7: 30). Theologians have generally recognized three modes of presence in space. Bodies are in space circumscriptively, that is they are bounded by it. Spirits are in space definitively as having an ubi, 1:e., they are not everywhere but only somewhere. God is in space repletively, as filling all space. This, however, cannot be considered from the standpoint of extension, for this property applies only to matter. God is above the limitations of space, in that these are not applicable to Him. He is not absent from any portion of space any more than He is present in one portion more than another. Man and nature are everywhere present to Him, for all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do (Hebrews 4:13). Yet the Christian concept of a Personal God prevents any trend toward pantheism, and clearly distinguishes God from all things in both fact and thought, If it be insisted that infinite Being must include all things, we can only refer again to our treatment of the Absolute. Infinite Spirit, to which only the term can apply, must if it is infinite in any true sense of the term, be able to create finite existences and endow them with free will

3. Eternity. By eternity as an attribute of God, we can mean only that He stands superior to time, free from the temporal distinctions of past and future, and in whose life there can be no succession. This is the sense of those scriptures which speak of the eternity of God, none of which more explicitly set it forth than the revelation of the name I AM THAT I AM. From its first declaration made to Moses (Exodus 3:14) to the final revelation made to St. John in the Apocalypse as that which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty (Revelation 1:8), this name not only declares the Aseity or Self-sufficiency but the Eternity of God. Earlier than the revelation to Moses, we are told that Abraham called there on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God, or as it may be translated, the God of eternity (Genesis 21:33). In Deuteronomy we read that The eternal God is thy dwelling place, and underneath are the everlasting arms (Deuteronomy 33:27, R.V.). The psalmist declares that Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God (Psalms 90:2); and again, Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end (Psalms 102:27), The Prophet Isaiah is specific in his reference to this attribute. I am the first and I am the last; and beside me there is no God (Isaiah 44:6); and again, thus saith the high and lofty One that

inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy (Isa. 57: 15; Cf. 40: 28). In the New Testament the same idea is expressed, but still in a more or less negative form. St. Paul speaks of his eternal power and Godhead (Romans 1:20). And closely related to this thought mentions the glory of the uncorruptible God (Romans 1:23). In the First Epistle to Timothy, the attribute of eternity is expressed by an ascription of praise, Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen (1 Timothy 1:17). Apart from the august name I AM, it is evident that the references just cited carry with them the thought of duration indefinitely extended, but this is due to the fact that finite beings have no other mode of conception. Eternity must therefore be expressed in finite terms although the notion of a timeless being is not wanting. Furthermore, the pure idea of eternity was too abstract to find expression in the earlier ages of the world, and Knapp points out that there was no word to express it in any of the ancient languages. The Hebrews like other nations were compelled to have recourse to circumlocution. To express eternity a parte ante, they used the expression, before the world was; and for eternity a parte post, they said, when the world shall be no more

There are three different senses in which theologians have understood eternity in its relation to time. First, as endless duration, according to which time is a sort of existence which is external to God and conditions His existence. This would destroy His unity and likewise prove contradictory to His attribute of unchangeableness or immutability. Second, there is the idea of timelessness. As a philosophical theory this dates back to Plato and his timeless flow of ideas. But whether in philosophy or theology, the deepest thinkers of all the ages have seen the impossibility of attributing to God the ideas of time and succession as the conditions under which finite beings must think and act. To do so would indicate that the life of God was in successive parts, which must either be finite or infinite; if infinite, then each part would be equal to the whole, and each would be equal to the other. On the other hand, if the successive parts were finite, then the infinite would be the sum of finite things, and in either case the conclusion would be a reductio ad absurdum, Third, there is the position that both time and eternity are combined in the divine consciousness. One of two positions has generally been held concerning this relation in the Divine Mind, either that time has no meaning for God and therefore He bears no relation to the temporal order; or, that God’s superiority over time is in some way connected with His intervention in time. As the finite self is above the stream of consciousness, without which there could be no knowledge of the temporal flow, so God as the Eternal is above all limitations of time; and it is exactly because of this that time exists or has any meaning. The two ideas of time and eternity are not exclusive. They are, on the other hand, objectively connected. The temporal, of necessity presupposes the eternal; and the eternal is at once the positive ground and the perpetual possibility of the temporal. The movement of the world in time, by which the past becomes the present and the present the future, would immediately cease were it not for the eternal. "The temporal and eternal do not in any way exclude each other," says Rothe. "The opposite of the temporal is the timeless, and therefore originless; the opposite of the eternal is the nonexistent" (ROTHE,Still Hours, p. 99). Instead of being opposed to each other, we must regard the eternal as the guaranty of continuity. From the negative point of view, eternity is merely the negation of time, but in the positive sense it is a mode of being which God sustains to time. The truth of eternity in the positive sense, is in some mysterious manner connected with the intuitive idea of God, while the temporal belongs to the intuitive idea of man. We must then hold fast the truth that as in self-consciousness, the self transcends the flow of time and yet recognizes this flow, so God also as the Eternal transcends

time, but as the God of His creatures He works out His purposes for them under the law of time which He has Himself created. There is succession in the order of things as they exist; there can be no succession in God’s knowledge of them. In dealing with His creatures, therefore, God recognizes them as past, present and future in this succession of existence; or as one theologian has so aptly stated it, God knows the past as past, the present as present and the future as future

4. Immensity. As eternity expresses the contrast with the temporal world in God’s mode of existence, so immensity expresses the same contrast with reference to the space world. It is sometimes identified with infinity in opposition to the limitations of space, and is related to omnipresence as transcendence is to immanence. As time is born out of eternity, so space is born out of immensity. Space is objective in that it is an existence mode of man, and subjective in that it is a thought mode of human reason. So also the immensity of infinitude is objective as the mode of the divine existence; and subjective as the order of divine reason. Immensity cannot be conceived as extension of space, as eternity cannot be conceived as the extension of duration. God as Spirit is above all spatial limitations, and it is because of this that such relations have validity This attribute is mentioned directly but once in the Bible, in two parallel passages found in 1 Kings 8:27 and 2 Chronicles 6:18, Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house which I have built. There are other passages, however, which indirectly teach the same truth. Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool (Isaiah 66:1). Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord (Jeremiah 23:24). The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God (Psalms 14:2). As with the other attributes, the appeal of the Scriptures is primarily religious and devotional; and in this instance is designed especially to guard against the danger of unduly localizing our thought of God

5. Immutability. By the immutability of God is meant His changelessness in essence or attribute, purpose or consciousness. Dr. Dickie thinks that this attribute should be included under eternity, and Dr. MacPherson points out, also, that eternity is generally associated with unchangeableness. The two are related in much the same manner as omnipresence is related to immensity. When viewed ad intra immutability excludes all development, the process of becoming, any change or possibility of change; when viewed ad extra, God is the same after creation as before, the fullness of life and light and love, undiminished by the free outflow in creation. It is opposed, therefore, to pantheism, or to any other form of emanation. "God is immutable," says Rothe, "because His being, in all its changes and modifications, remains constantly true to its own conception Seeing that God, at all times and in all His relations with the world, perfectly corresponds to His own idea. He is at all times like Himself, and consequently immutable" (ROTHE, Still Hours, p. 102). But there are some limitations. The divine unchangeableness must not be so interpreted as to preclude any movement in the divine life. Immutability is not a rigid sameness of being, but a characteristic of free intelligence. It refers to the essence or attributes of God, and not to His operations in creation and providence, only in so far as these are always in harmony with the immutability of the divine nature. He loves righteousness and hates iniquity. Consequently His moral government is always in harmony with His nature as holy love. He regards a person now with displeasure and now with complacency, according as that person is disobedient or righteous. The Divine immutability is therefore vital to both morality and religion The scriptural references to

the immutability of God are peculiarly rich and satisfying. The psalmist declares, Thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end (Psalms 102:27) and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews restates it in the words, But thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail (Hebrews 1:12). In the last book of the Old Testament the Prophet Malachi voices this attribute in the words, For I the Lord change not (Malachi 3:6). Every good gift, says St. James, and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (James 1:17). In Hebrews it is again stated that, Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us (Hebrews 6:17-18). "This is the perfection," says Dr. Blair, "which perhaps more than any other distinguishes the divine nature from the human, gives complete energy to all its attributes, and entitles it to the highest adoration. From hence are derived the regular order of nature and the steadfastness of the universe." The Eternal God who revealed Himself as the I AM to Moses, is the I AM of today, "infinite, eternal, unchangeable, in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth."

6. Perfection. By the term perfection is meant that attribute which consummates and harmonizes all the other perfections. It is by virtue of this that God is self-sufficient. Nothing, therefore, is wanting to His being which is needed for His blessedness. His knowledge, His will and His love are not dependent upon the existence of the creature, but find their relations and the infinite scope of their activity in the Persons of the Triune God

We must regard this perfection also as a unity, unique and absolute. It is not the combination of the individual perfections, it is not the culmination of a process, it is the ground and source of all other perfection, and it excludes all possibility of defect. God’s perfection is simple and unique, excluding all plurality, and is peculiar to Himself. When, therefore, our Lord enjoined upon His disciples, Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect (Matthew 5:48), He is presenting the Father as the Summum Bonum of all spiritual good and the chief end of man’s enjoyment and devotion; because as the Perfect One, He comprehends in His own being all that is needed for our own eternal blessedness.

Watson classifies the attributes as follows: (1) Unity; (2) Spirituality; (3) Eternity; (4) Omnipotence; (5) Omnipresence; (6) Omniscience; (7) Immutability; (8) wisdom; (9) Goodness; (10) Holiness

Wakefield: (1) Unity; (2) Spirituality; (3) Eternity; (4) Omnipotence; (5) Omnipresence; (6) Omniscience; (7) Immutability; (8) Wisdom; (9) Truth; (10) Justice; (11) Holiness; (12) Goodness

Raymond: (1) Unity; (2) Spirituality; (3) Eternity; (4) Immutability; (5) Omnipotence; (6) Omnipresence; (7) Omniscience; (8) Wisdom; (9) Goodness

Ralston: (1) Unity; (2) Spirituality; (3) Eternity; (4) Omniscience; (5) Wisdom; (6) Omnipotence; (7) Omnipresence; (8) Immutability; (9) Holiness; (10) Truth; (11) Justice; (12) Goodness

Miley: (1) Omniscience; (2) Divine Sensibility; (3) Omnipotence. Dr. Miley treats Eternity, Unity, Omnipresence and Immutability as predicables but not distinctively attributes The idea we have of what the Divine Spirit is, is derived from our idea of what the human spirit is; this involves the actual existence of a real entity, a substance, an individual, simple substance, endowed with

power to know, to feel and to will, a person conscious of self and not self, capable of moral actions and susceptible of moral character. These elements of being, conceived of as without limitation or defect, with all other known or unknown possible perfections, infinite in degree, make up our idea of God, and this, in the light of our conscious intuitions, confirmed, illustrated and enlarged by revelation, we are confident is, so far as it goes, a true idea; our knowledge of God is at best extremely limited and imperfect, but it is still positive knowledge; of spirituality and consequent self-conscious personality we cannot reasonably doubt.-RAYMOND, Syst. Th., I, p. 314

Three of the more essential attributes of God-namely, His self-existence, His eternal existence, and His literal independence-are all involved in the very idea of Him as the first originating cause. Thus, if He is the first cause of all things, then He is in Himself without cause. And if there is no cause of His existence outside of Himself, then He must have the grounds, the elements of existence within Himself; which is but saying that He is self-existent.-POND, Chr. Tb.., p. 49

It follows also that God is a simple Being, not only as not composed of different elements, but also as not admitting of the distinction between substance and accidents. Nothing can either be added to, or taken from God. In this view the simplicity, as well as the other attributes of God, are of a higher order than the corresponding attributes of our spiritual nature. The soul of man is a simple substance, but it is subject to change. It can gain and lose knowledge, holiness and power. These are in this view accidents in our substance. But in God they are attributes, essential and immutable.-Hodge, Syst. Th., I, p. 379 When it is said that God is eternal, the primary idea is, that His existence had no beginning, and will have no end; but evidently the Scripture representations and the philosophic thought involve something more than the mere idea of duration: eternity is regarded as an attribute of God; that is, He is eternal in the sense that it is His nature to exist.-RAYMOND, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 315 When considered as without a beginning, the schoolmen spoke of eternity as a pafle ante; when considered as having no end, it was called a parte post. This latter was frequently called immortality, which unlike that of finite creatures was considered necessary

Nothing of a material or bodily nature can appertain to spirit. Matter possesses no power of thought or will, and is governed by laws entirely different from those which prevail in the sphere of spirit. The former is governed by the law of necessity, the latter by that of freedom. If this is so, and spirit is wholly unlike matter, it cannot be compounded, and is therefore simple (Cf. John 4:24). Here belong those texts which teach that God cannot be represented (Isaiah 40:25, Exodus 20:4) .-KNAPP Chr. Tb.., p. 98

In the Scripture doctrine of God we, however, not only find it asserted that God has no beginning, but that He shall have no end. No creature can, without contradiction, be supposed to have been from eternity; but even a creature may be supposed to continue to exist forever. Its existence, however, being originally dependent and derived, must continue so. It is not, so to speak, in its nature to live, or it never would have been nonexistent; and what it has not from itself, it has received, and must through every moment of its actual existence receive from its Maker.-WATSON, Theolog. Institutes The question of God’s eternity has been a fruitful field for debate among theologians. It resolves itself into this, Is there succession in the divine consciousness? Some affirm, others deny. Those who affirm make eternity to consist in duration or continuance of being; those who deny maintain a nunc starts or eternal "Now." Of the former class, Watson says, "Duration as applied to God, is no more than an extension of the idea as

applied to ourselves, and to exhort us to conceive of it as something essentially different is to require us to conceive what is inconceivable. Charles Hodge says, "If, therefore, God be a Person, or a thinking Being, He cannot be timeless; there must be succession; one thought or state must follow another. To deny this, it is said, is to deny the personality of God. The dictum, therefore, of the schoolmen, and of the theologians, that eternity precludes succession-that it is a persistent unmoving Now-is according to this repudiated (HEDGE, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 388ff). Dr. Summers criticizes this position advocated by Dr. Dwight as open to serious objection The explanation seems to lie in a truer conception of the nature of personality. There is a self which must be supra-temporal to the temporal flow of consciousness, or there could be no conception of this flow. Without an observer outside or above the temporal flow, how could succession be known. So also in man as finite personality, there is an abiding element which constitutes itself one and the same, regardless of the multiplicity of changes in its own consciousness, Now may it not be possible, that those theologians above mentioned which are so insistent upon succession, and who regard eternity as mere duration, are referring rather to the content of consciousness with its multiplicity and change, while those who refer to the nunc starts or eternal Now, regard eternity as that which is back of and conditions the idea of succession. Dr. Summers seems to admit this when he says that perhaps the objection to succession in duration arises from confounding it with change in substance. We change by the flow of time; but we can conceive of an essence or substance which does not change, though there is a flow or succession in its duration. Simple duration has nothing to do with mutability or immutability; it is compatible with the former as predicated to us, and with the latter as predicated of God (Cf. Summers, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 78)

Dr. Raymond takes a clear and strong position. Referring to such Scripture citations as Isaiah 44:5; Isaiah 57:15, he says, "It is sometimes said that these affirmations so evidently true are equivalent to the affirmation that with God there is no past or future, but from eternity to eternity one eternal now. If this be a denial that God sees things and events in succession, it is obj ectional; for evidently events occur in succession, and God sees things as they are; not that He is older today than yesterday; nor yet that He is a stagnant ocean, eternally, immutably the subject of one and the same sole consciousness. He apprehends all His intelligent creatures as having a present, a past, and a future, as doing this now and that then. To Himself his own thought, purposes, and plans may be as eternal as Himself; and in this regard perhaps the conception of an eternal now may be valid; but as to all that is not God, it must be conceived that God regards them as existent yesterday, today and tomorrow. Of the truthfulness of the primary thought in respect to eternity of God, namely, that His existence had no beginning and will have no end, and also of the conception of necessary and therefore eternal existence, there can be no reasonable doubt; beyond this, probably silence is wiser than speculation.-RAYMOND, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 316ff

Dr. Pope takes a definite position in favor of the nunc stans. He says, "The perfect idea of eternity, as it is in the human mind, cannot tolerate duration or succession of thoughts as necessary to the divine consciousness. And this is the deep perplexity of our human intellect, which, however, must accept the profound meaning of the I AM as teaching an eternal now enfolding and surrounding the successive existence of time. The Personal Jehovah once and once only declared His pure eternity. His name is the only word which human language affords in its poverty to express that thought; such terms as eternal and everlasting have temporal notions clinging to them; and all our phrases go no farther than that the Supreme fills all space and all time, and that He was before

them, the very word carrying duration with it. But I AM - before time or space was I AM has in it all the strength of eternity. It is literally the assertion of pure existence, without distinction of past, present or future as measured in time and regulated by motion in space. We must therefore accept this doctrine of God in all its incomprehensible-ness, as the only one that satisfies the mind. The Eternal in Himself knows no succession in time any more than He knows circumscription of space; and when He created all things, His being remains as independent of duration as it is independent of locality. (Pors, Compend. Cb.r. Tb.., I, p. 295ff). Dr. Pope finds the explanation of his relations between time and eternity in Christ the eternal Logos. "We may dare to say that the Eternal inhabits eternity; and yet in the Son, the Firstborn of every creature, He inhabits time also. As in the incarnation God is manifest in the flesh, so in creation God is manifest in time. And as God will forever be manifest in His incarnate Son, so will He have forever in and through His Son, the Viceregent of created things, a manifestation in time; that is to say in plain words, eternity and time will forever coexist. Something pertaining to time will cease; its change and probation and opportunity. In this sense time will cease to be, but in no other sense than this.-POPE, Compend. Cb.r. Tb.., I, p. 298ff

Lotze says, "According to the ordinary view space exists, and things exist in it; according to our view, only things exist, and between them nothing exists, but space exists in them" (Outline Metaphysics, p. 87)

Most closely connected with this eternity of the Divine Being is the Unchangeableness, in virtue of which every idea of modification in His form of existence is utterly excluded (Malachi 3:6, James 1:17), since He dwells in eternity; so that His perfection just as little admits of increase or diminution. In so far then, it is less accurate to speak of God’s nature, since this word, by virtue of its derivation (nature from "nasci") necessarily suggests the idea of a growing or becoming. It is better to speak of the Being of God, as indicating that which in itself from eternity to eternity IS. (Exodus 3:14). What strong consolation flows from a believing acknowledgment thereof, can here only be indicated. Compare the 90th Psalm.-Van Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., pp. 257, 258 The divine intelligence is immutable, in the sense that it is an eternal, perfect knowledge of all things; but evidently a perfect knowledge of all things is a knowledge of them as they are: possible, as possible; actual, as actual; past, as past; present, as present; and future, as future; necessary events as necessary, and contingent events, as contingent. The phenomena of the divine moral and aesthetic nature are immutably the same, in the sense that they eternally correspond with the inherent nature of their object. God loves invariably that which is excellent, and ever feels aversion to that which is unlovely. He loves righteousness and hates iniquity and punishes the wicked. He is immutable in the principles of His government and is as variable in the application of those principles as are the ever varying objects to which they apply.-RAYMOND, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 318 The importance of this attribute is found in its use as a reverent defense of the adorable nature from all that would dishonor it in our thoughts or theological systems. If we sacrifice any one attribute to any other we derogate from the perfection of God who is the Being in whom every attribute has its supreme existence and manifestation. As it belongs essentially to God in Himself, so it impresses its stamp on all the divine works, and must give the law to all our theological views of His character.-POPE, Compend. Cb.r. Tb.., I, p. 304

Strong relates perfection to the moral attributes, making it not quantitative completeness but qualitative excellence. Right action among men presupposes a perfect moral organization, a

normal state of intellect, affection and will. So God's activity presupposes a principle of intelligence, of affection, of volition, in His inmost being, and the existence of a worthy object for each of these powers of his nature. But in eternity past there is nothing existing outside or apart from God. He must find, as He does find, the sufficient object of intellect, affection and will, in himself. There is a self-knowing, a self-loving, a self-willing which constitute His absolute perfection. The consideration of the immanent attributes is, therefore, properly concluded with an account of that truth, love, and holiness, which render God entirely sufficient to himself.- STRONG, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 260.

THE RELATIVE OR CAUSAL ATTRIBUTES In passing from a consideration of the Absolute to the Relative or Causal Attributes, it should be kept in mind that we are not presenting a new class of attributes, but the same perfections in another form and application. We have already sensed the difficulty of attempting to express the Absolute attributes apart from the relative, as for instance, when we speak of immensity or immutability, we are in reality applying to spiritual qualities the language of material things. It is this poverty of language that creates much of the difficulty in both philosophy and theology. If, as Dr. Pope suggests, we change our terms and speak of God as a Personal Spirit, infinite and eternal, ever the same in His nature and mode of being, and not thinking or acting of necessity under the limitations of time and space, we rid ourselves of this anomaly. But in doing so, we create another, this time the relation of personality and infinity. In dwelling upon the Absolute Attributes as we now attempt to bring them within the range of finite operation concerning the creature, we must hold firmly in our thinking to the fact that they form the background of every representation. This will obviate any difficulties which may arise from the use of anthropomorphic language and secure to us the truth, that without God speaking to man in terms which he can comprehend, there can be no science of theology and no religion. In changing from a consideration of the attributes as Absolute to the same attributes as Relative or Casual, we change our point of view from Absoluteness to Efficiency, from Being to Power. Thus the Divine Aseity or Self-sufficiency finds expression in omnipotence or the all-powerfulness of God; while the Divine Immensity considered in relation to space, and eternity in relation to time, with its closely related quality of Immutability, find expression in the omnipresence of God. Omniscience, however, does not appear to be so closely related to the Absolute Attributes as we have considered them, except in what we have summed up as Perfection. It belongs more especially to personality as we understand it in the finite sense, and therefore becomes the logical transition point between the metaphysical attributes considered as a whole, and the ethical attributes which belong to God in His relations with human personality. We shall then present the Relative or Causal Attributes in this order: first, Omnipresence, second, Omnipotence, third, Omniscience, and fourth, sum these up in the moral quality of goodness as related to perfection on the one hand, and the ethical attributes on the other

1. Omnipresence. The Divine Immensity as previously considered is the presupposition of the Divine Omnipresence. In the former, God was considered in a transcendental aspect as being superior to all spatial relations, here God is considered in an immanent aspect, as being present in all space as well as above it. By omnipresence we mean that God is not excluded from anything on the one hand, or included in anything on the other. But this immanence must be regarded as free and not necessitated. The error of pantheism lies in this, that it fails to recognize the truth that God's presence is not restricted to the limits of space; and further, that His immanence in space

can be understood only on the presupposition of His transcendence over space. "When, therefore, in harmony with Scripture, we speak of God as commensurable and everywhere present," says Van Oosterzee, "we have to understand this last expression, not in the extensive, but in the dynamical sense, and to be careful to keep ourselves from pantheistical leaven. Not a substantial, but an operative presence of God in every point of His creation must be ascribed to Him. In creating, He has not limited, but most gloriously revealed Himself. With His life-awakening power He is active in all things; but nevertheless is by no means imprisoned in His own work. He embraces, rules, penetrates it, not in the pantheistic, but in the theistic sense of the term" (VAN OOSTERZEE, Chr. Dogm., p. 258). Dr. Miley takes a similar position. He holds that the truth does not lie in the sense of a ubiquitous divine essence, which considered in itself would be without personal attributes, and therefore could not exercise the agency which must ever be a reality of the divine presence (MILEY, Systematic Theology, I, pp. 218, 219). So also, Thomas Aquinas taught (Summa Theologica, p. 8) that "God is in all things, not indeed as a part of their essence, nor as an accident, but as an agent is present to that upon which it works."

There are three ways in which God may be regarded as omnipresent in the universe. First, the actual presence of the Deity in every portion of the created universe. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord (Jeremiah 23:24). By this it cannot be meant that the essence of God is extended or diffused in a pantheistic sense, for Spirit is not extended substance. It means rather in the dynamical or spiritual sense as we have just indicated. Nor can He in this sense be absent from any portion of the universe, or from any act of the beings which He has created and still be regarded as omnipresent. Dr. Dickie thinks that this means simply that God is not limited by spatial relations as we are. Dr. Rudolph Otto holds that God’s relation to space is not the metaphysical abstraction of omnipresence, but that God is where He wills to be, and that He is not where He does not will to be. Dr. Pope holds that this position with all its inevitable consequences is His absolute, or natural omnipresence. Second, by omnipresence is meant the presence of every creature to God, as would seem to be indicated in the statement, In him we live, and move, and have our being (Acts 17:28). Viewed from the practical standpoint, this scripture is intended to impress upon men, that in His presence, every creature lives and moves, every thought is conceived and every deed done, so that nothing is hidden from the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. But it may be viewed in a metaphysical sense also. Creation as a potentiality is to be found in the very depths of the Eternal Being, but it becomes an actuality, only when there is an existence different and separate from that of God in which it lives and moves. True it is that everything is filled with God, but not in the pantheistic sense as we have already indicated. In this sense the divine omnipresence means simply that every creature is directly present to God and runs His course before Him. Third, by omnipresence is meant the exertion of God’s power, which relates it even more closely to the divine activity. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? (Psalms 139:7). This scripture when taken with its context indicates that God is present wherever there is a manifestation of His power. In the light of our previous discussion of the unity of God’s person, the manifestation of His power is to be understood in connection with His omnipresence - that He is present at every point with His entire being

One matter further, needs to be considered in our discussion of omnipresence. While God is omnipresent, He must be regarded as standing in different relations to His creatures. "God is present in one way in nature," says Bishop Martensen, "in another way in history; in one way in the

Church, in another way in the world; He is not in the same sense, present alike in the hearts of His saints, and in those of the ungodly; in heaven and in hell" (James 4:8) (MARTENSEN, Chr. Dogm., p. 94). Dr. Gerhart takes a similar position, maintaining that the presence of God with the world is determined by the form of receptivity with which each order of creation is endowed by His own free creative word (GERHART, Institutes, I, p. 487). With these distinctions before us, we must conclude that the omnipresence of God with finite things must ever be different from His presence with Himself in His glory. When the prophet called upon God to look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of thy holiness and of thy glory (Isaiah 63:15) he could but mean that God who is omnipresent everywhere, manifests His glory more peculiarly and brightly in the region which we call heaven than in any other sphere, just as the sun which shines everywhere displays its full splendor only in the firmament. Nothing, therefore, prevents us from thinking of heaven as a place higher than the earthly and material sphere of things, and that it is to this habitation of His presence that Jesus intended to point us, when He taught us to pray, "Our Father which art in heaven" (Matthew 6:9)

While the question of omnipresence has given rise to many metaphysical problems, the Scriptures are rich and varied in their teaching on this subject. Furthermore, it is a truth also, which is admitted by common intelligence. The devout always worship Him as a very present help in time of need. Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord (Jeremiah 23:23-24). For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones (Isaiah 57:15). Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool (Isaiah 66:1). For he looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven (Job 28:24). The Lord looketh from heaven; he beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of his habitation he looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth (Psalms 33:13-14). It is such scriptures as these that lead us to a conception of the value of the divine omnipresence in religious worship. How it is possible that the Infinite Person should be everywhere is to the finite mind beyond all comprehension, and yet whenever God’s people draw near to Him in prayer, they apprehend Him as then and there present in the fullness of His infinite perfections

2. Omnipotence. The omnipotence of God is the ground of all that we call efficiency or causality. It is related to the absolute attribute of Aseity as personality expressed in will, and to the omnipresence of God, as Aseity related to the creature. Being an expression of the divine will, it is also directly and vitally connected with the moral attributes of God. Omnipotence is rightly defined as that perfection of God by virtue of which He is able to do all that He pleases to do. This is the scriptural definition. There is nothing too hard for thee (Jeremiah 32:17). But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased (Psalms 115:3). Both the prophets and the psalmist are discriminating in their thought, limiting God’s power to that which is in conformity with His good pleasure. He can do all, not perhaps in the abstract as appertaining to that which is contrary to His nature and will, but all that He wills to do. Whatever is impossible to Him, is not such because of a limitation of His power but solely because His nature makes it so, in the same sense that His holiness is incompatible with sin. Tertullian says, "For God to will is to be able, and not to will is not to be able." With the exception, therefore of that which is contrary to His nature,

nothing exists for Him of which the realization surpasses the power The Scriptures throughout abound in expressions which declare the infinite power of God. From the earliest time God revealed Himself to Abraham saying, 1 am the Almighty God; walk before me and be thou perfect (Genesis 17:1); and this is followed by the declaration, I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (Exodus 6:3, R.V.). The Psalms with their devotional richness, make much of the all-powerfulness of God. God hath spoken once; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God (Psalms 62:11). Let all the earth fear the Lord: let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast (Psalms 33:8-9). The Prophet Jeremiah declares that He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom. .. . when he uttereth his voice, there is a tumult of waters in the heavens, and he causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth, he maketh lightnings for the fain, and bringeth forth the wind out of his treasuries (Jeremiah 10:12-13, R.V.) The New Testament is equally explicit in its teaching concerning the omnipotence of God, but here the religious significance is even more marked than in the Old Testament. It is well understood that in the Greek creeds the word pantokrator (pantocratwr), translated into the Latin as omnipotens, means the all-governing; and it is in this sense that it is largely used by the New Testament writers. In its application to the work of salvation, Jesus declared that with men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible (Matthew 19:26). Referring to God's preserving and protective power as exerted toward His people, Jesus said to the Jews in Solomon's porch, My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand (John 10:29). The Apostle Paul in a reference to Abraham, speaks of God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were (Romans 4:17). Later in an ascription of praise he says, Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen (Ephesians 3:20-21). The last book of the New Testament gives us a vision of God as the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending. which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty (Revelation 1:8). And again, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created (Revelation 4:11). Thus the attribute of omnipotence is made the basis on the one hand, for deep and abiding religious adoration; and on the other, is the ground and firm support for quiet trust and assurance

It is evident that even omnipotence must be conditioned by God's wisdom and goodness. William Newton Clarke points out that it is easy to fall into the error of regarding omnipotence as the ability to do everything that can be thought, but divine power must always operate in harmony with the divine nature. He cannot do anything contrary to His divine will, this would be irrational, and contradictory to Himself. It was this that occasioned in Van Oosterzee the contention that Sovereignty must be regarded as an attribute of God, and this in an unlimited sense (VAN OOSTERZEE, Chr. Dogm., p. 263ff). William Adams Brown defines omnipotence as God's ability to do all things which His character and purpose may suggest (BROWN, Th. in Outline, p. 116). This, says Dr. Charles Hodge, is all we need to know on this subject, were it not for the vain attempts of theologians to reconcile these simple and sublime truths of the Bible with their philosophical speculations

There are several deductions of importance that should be mentioned here. (1) Theologians have generally made a distinction between the mediate and immediate, an ordaining and an ordained manner in which the power of God is manifested. To this difference in the manifestation of power, the term potestas absoluta is applied to the absolute power which creates all things at first; and potestas ordinata to the government through secondary laws. The immediate exertion of power in this sense would be the potestas absoluta, while the mediate exercise of that power would be the potestas ordinata. The first would be ordaining or absolute; the second ordained or relative. This distinction makes clear the difference between the supreme creative power of God, and the economical exercise of that power for the benefit of His creatures. (2) Modern empirical philosophy which denies cause as that to which an effect is due, and makes it consist solely in that which uniformly precedes it, destroys thereby the idea of power, and finds no place for the omnipotence of God. This was the doctrine of causation advanced by Hume, Kant, Brown, Mill and in some sense by Hamilton ; and it is this idea which lies at the foundation of Comte's Positive Philosophy. (3) Dr. Miley calls attention to an important distinction between the elective and the executive agency of the divine will. The choice of an end, he points out, is not necessarily its producing cause, otherwise the effect must be instant upon the choice. This would deny to God the possibility of a plan or purpose and destroy all future effectuation by the causal energy of His personal will (Cf. MILEY, Syst. Th., I, p. 213). God as a personal Being is free to determine His own plans by the elective agency of His will, and to perfect them by the executive agency of that same will. This is the meaning of the apostolic declaration that He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. (Ephesians 1:11.) As previously indicated, there is no doctrine more important in religious value than that of the divine omnipotence. It led our Lord courageously to the cross, in the confidence that through the omnipotence of God, His cause would triumph even over death, the last enemy. It has given courage to the saints of all ages, and in spite of discouragement and apparent defeat, has caused them to be more than conquerors

3. Omniscience. By omniscience is meant the perfect knowledge which God has of Himself and of all things. It is the infinite perfection of that which in us we call knowledge. Consequently we read that His understanding is infinite (Psalms 147:5). God understands and knows the hearts of men. Nothing is hidden from Him. He sees things as they are, in both their causes and ends. The teaching of the Scriptures concerning this attribute is, as in the case of those which we have previously discussed, made the basis of religious values. The Prophet Isaiah expressly assigns an insight into all futurity, as marking the distinction between Jehovah and false gods. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods; (Isaiah 41:23) and again, Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them (Isaiah 42:9). Ezekiel takes a like position. Thus have ye said, O house ofIsrael: for I know the things that come into your mind, every one of them (Ezekiel 11:5). In 1 Chronicles 28:9 David enjoins obedience upon Solomon, declaring that the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts. Again he seems overwhelmed with the thought that He knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off For there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it (Psalms 139:2-6 and entire Psalm). The New Testament presents this attribute with even greater clearness. The Apostle James in speaking to the Council at Jerusalem uses the expression, Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world (Acts 15:18). St. Paul uses foreknowledge in conjunction with pre-

destination, For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren (Romans 8:29 . Cf. also Ephesians 1:4-5). Conformable to this are the words of St. Peter, Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:2) The attribute of omniscience occupies a critical and important place in theology. There is something about it peculiarly perplexing, even more so than the attribute of omnipotence. As omnipotence cannot be considered apart from the attributes of wisdom and knowledge, so omniscience seems to bear even a closer relation if possible to the unique and Divine Personality. It does, in fact, furnish the transitional point between the relative and moral attributes, although we must sum up the former in a consideration of goodness, which as an attribute of God, may in some sense be included in either classification. In the New Testament citations of the preceding paragraph, it has been shown that the attribute of omniscience has, for the most part been considered in relation to the moral government of God. This gives rise to two problems; (I) the question of the divine knowledge of contingent events, commonly known as foreknowledge. This subject is frequently discussed under the head of nescience and prescience, the former being a denial of foreknowledge in God, the latter its affirmation. (II) The question concerning the relation which exists between foreknowledge and predestination

(I) The question of the divine foreknowledge has been the occasion of much speculation. Its importance lies in the fact that it is closely connected with predestination, which as the ground for a type of redemptive theory, forms the subject of our next paragraph. The question of the reality of the divine knowledge has been held in the following forms. (1) Pantheism denies the divine knowledge in the sense of omniscience, for the Divine Being in the pantheistic sense is a coming to consciousness only through finite creatures, and therefore can never be infinite. (2) Divine foreknowledge has been denied by some Christian theologians on the ground of a nunc stans or eternal now in the consciousness of God. Thus Augustine says, "What is prescience but the knowledge of future things? What can be future to God, who transcends all time? But of the knowledge He has of things themselves, they are not to Him future, but present, and consequently it cannot be called prescience but knowledge." (3) Both the Arminian and Calvinistic theologians hold to the scientia necessaria, or the knowledge that God has of Himself, and scientia libera, or the free knowledge which God has of persons and things outside of Himself. However, they differ as to the ground of this foreknowledge, the Arminians generally maintaining that God has a knowledge of pure contingency, while the Calvinistic theologians connect, it with the decrees which God has purposed in Himself. (4) There is a mediating position commonly known as scientia media or a knowledge of the hypothetical. This theory was advanced by the Jesuits, Molina, Fonseca, Suarez and other distinguished theologians of this order, who were opposed to the predestinarianism of the Jansenists. It was accepted by the Arminian theologians, Limborch and Curcellaeus, and by a number of the Lutheran divines. Pope states that it has been generally accepted by all antipredestinarian theologians. The Calvinists were generally opposed to it. Van Oosterzee defines the three positions as follows: "The divine knowledge," he says, "is divided into a natural knowledge, which He has of Himself; and a so-called free knowledge, which He has of all that exists beyond Himself. And then again, from these two is further distinguished the conditional knowledge (Scientia media or hypothetica), by virtue of which He is exactly acquainted, not only with all which will happen, but also with all which would or would not happen under certain nonexistent conditions-the so-called futuribile. That this last also is known to God, will certainly not

be denied: it is simply an insignificant part of that great whole which lies naked and open before Him." His conclusion is that whether knowledge be free or conditional, "absolutely nothing is excluded from the divine knowledge."

(II) Our second question is concerned with the relation which exists between foreknowledge and predestination. Three positions are taken in theology: (1) The Arminian position holds that the power of contrary choice is a constituent element of human freedom, and that foreknowledge must refer to free acts and therefore to pure contingency. Both Limborch and Curcellaeus maintain that God's ability to know is not to be judged by human standards, but that He foresees the necessary as coming to pass in a necessary way, and the contingent as occurring contingently (CURCELLAEUS, II, 6; LIMBORCH, II, 8). "It is not the divine foreknowledge that conditions what takes place," says Dr. Pope, "but what takes place conditions the divine foreknowledge. We have seen again and again that the God of eternity has condescended to be the God of time, with its past, present and future. Instead of saying with the schoolmen that to God there is only an eternal now, it were better to say that to God as absolute essence there is the eternal now, and also to God as related to the creature there is the process of succession. Predestination must have its rights; all that God wills to do is foredetermined. But what human freedom accomplishes, God can only foreknow; otherwise freedom is no longer freedom" (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 318ff). Dr. Sheldon says that this theory should rather be called the Catholic than the Arminian, since it was the current theory in the pre-Reformation Church from the apostolic age onward. It has in general been held by both the Lutheran and Anglican divines, and is still the dominant theory in the Greek and Roman Catholic churches (Cf. SHELDON, Syst. Chr. Doct., p. 173). (2) The Calvinistic position identifies foreknowledge and foreordination, maintaining that the divine decrees are the ground for the occurrence of all events, including the voluntary actions of men. On this theory, foreknowlege depends upon the certainty of the decrees, and is not strictly a knowledge of contingent events. "He foresees future events," says Calvin, "only in consequence of His decree that they should happen" (CALVIN, Institutes, Bk. III, Chapt. 23). Turretin takes the same position. "The reason is," he says, "that the foreknowledge of God follows His decree, and as the decree cannot be changed, so neither can His knowledge be subject to mistake" (TURRETIN, Inst. Locus III, Quoest. 12). Cocceius, after identifying foreknowledge with the divine agency, makes a place for second causes. "God foresees from eternity what is to take place," he says, "because nothing is to take place without the agency of God." Then follows the statement, that "What He sees as hereafter to come to pass, He sees in the decree, by which either He summons events to take place, or by which He has decided to supply to the sinning creature the concursus of the first cause, without which the second is not able to act" (COCCEIUS, Summa Theol., Chapt. X). Dr. Charles Hodge thinks that the difficulty vanishes when a distinction is made between the certainty of an act and the mode of its occurrence. (3) The Socinian position denies that God has any foreknowledge of contingent events. Both Faustus Socinus and Johannes Crell maintained that the contingent is in its very nature unknowable, and that therefore it is no more derogatory to exclude prescience from the omniscience of God than it is to exclude from omnipotence the power to do those things which are contradictory to the divine nature. This theory was advanced in an attempt to harmonize foreknowledge and freedom. At a later time Dr. Adam Clarke advanced the peculiar view that God can know all future events but does not choose to do so. This view was never accepted by the Methodist theologians. Rothe and Martensen have in a measure reasserted the Socinian theory, the latter maintaining a conditional foreknowledge. "The

actual alone," he says, "which is in and for itself rational and necessary, can be the subject of an unconditional foreknowledge, the actual which is not this, cannot be so; it can only be foreknown as possible, as eventual." Again, he says, that events "in so far as these are conditioned by the freedom of the creature, can only be the subject of a conditional foreknowledge; 1:e., they can only be foreknown as possibilities, as Futurabilia, but not as realities, because other possibilities may actually take place" (Cf. MARTENSEN, Chr. Dogm., pp. 218, 219). It is evident that here the original Socinian position is considerably modified. In other statements in this section (Sec. 116) the reformed tendencies are in evidence, and appear in contrast to the strict Lutheranism of the greater portion of his valuable work The Arminian position, as has been pointed out, is in reality the Catholic view of the Church, and is the only one which can be consistently maintained in harmony with the great doctrines of salvation. Both the earlier Arminians and the later Wesleyans have substantiated their positions with lengthy and logical arguments. Perhaps the best known of these arguments in favor of divine prescience is that of Richard Watson in his Theological Institutes (I, p. 365ff). Wakefield asserts, that the position which holds that certain prescience destroys contingency, is a mere sophism. Dr. Raymond with no little zeal declares that "with the exception of atheists, pantheists, positivists, and that class of thinkers who have discussed the absolute and the infinite in a way to philosophize themselves into a profession of total ignorance, and into a conviction that the knowledge of God is impossible, all men regarded the infinite First Cause as not only absolute and infinite, but also a Person possessing intelligence and free will, and especially regard His intelligence as without limitation. In the common apprehension, God has a perfect knowledge of all that is or can be; all existence and all events, the actual and the possible, the present, the past and the future" (RAYMOND, Syst. Th., I, p. 330)

4. Wisdom. As a divine attribute wisdom is closely related to and dependent upon omniscience, but is usually given separate treatment by Arminian theologians. Dr. Summers, however, treats omniscience as comprehended under the attribute of Wisdom. Wakefield defines the wisdom of God as "that attribute of His nature by which He knows and orders all things for the promotion of His glory and the good of His creatures" (Cf. WAKEFIELD, Chr. Th., p. 159). While wisdom and knowledge are closely related, the distinction is clear. Knowledge is the apprehension of things as they are, and wisdom is the adaptation of this knowledge to certain ends. As knowledge is necessary to wisdom, so omniscience in God is necessary to His infinite wisdom. The Scriptures are peculiarly rich in their references to the religious value of the divine wisdom and to this we shall give our attention

Job declares that With him is wisdom and strength; he hath counsel and understanding (Job 12:13), and again, He is mighty in strength and wisdom (Job 36:5). The psalmist exclaims, O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches (Psalms 104:24). The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens (Proverbs 3:19). Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his (Daniel 2:20). The New Testament is equally rich in its praise of this divine attribute. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out (Romans 11:33). The Apostle Paul in his refutation of the Gnostic tendencies, declares that Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Corinthians 1:24); again, that He is made unto us wisdom,and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption (1 Corinthians 1:30). This is a reference to the Logos or the

Divine Word, which in the Old Testament was personified as Wisdom. The Lord possessed me in the be ginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was Then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him (Proverbs 8:22-23; Proverbs 8:30). This wisdom became the incarnate Word, which was in the beginning with God and was God (Cf. John 1:1). Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen (1 Timothy 1:17)

5. Goodness. The goodness of God is that attribute by reason of which God wills the happiness of His creatures. Perfection as we have shown, is the absolute excellence which God has in Himself; goodness is that excellence which moves God to impart being and life to finite things apart from His divine essence, and to communicate to them such gifts as they have capacity to receive. Goodness is generally expressed by the Hebrew word chesedh, and by the Greek words agaqosunh or crhstoth" and such like terms. The goodness of God ad intra belongs to the Holy Trinity, in which the Blessed Three eternally communicate to each other their infinite richness. In this sense, goodness is eternal and necessary. The goodness of God ad extra is voluntary, and refers primarily to His benevolence which may be defined as that disposition which seeks to promote the happiness of His creatures. Schouppe defines it as "the constant will of God to communicate felicity to His creatures, according to their conditions and His own wisdom."It is related to love, but love is limited to responsive persons or to those capable of reciprocation, while goodness applies to the whole creation. Not a sparrow is forgotten before God (Luke 12:6). The word is applied to the whole creation in the dawn of its existence. And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good (Genesis 1:31). The positive declarations of Scripture concerning the goodness of God are numerous and convincing. God said to Moses, I will make all my goodness pass before thee (Exodus 33:19); and again, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth (Exodus 34:6). The psalmist seems to take delight in meditating upon the goodness of God. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever (Psalms 23:6). I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living (Psalms 27:13). O how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee (Psalms 31:19). The goodness of God endureth continually (Psalms 52:1). They shall abundantly utter the memory of thy great goodness, and shall sing of thy righteousness (Psalms 145:7). Isaiah mentions the great goodness toward the house of Israel (Isaiah 63:7) and Zechariah voices the exclamation, For how great is his goodness, and how great is his beauty! (Zechariah 9:17). In the New Testament the Apostle Paul speaks of the goodness of God as leading to repentance (Romans 2:4); and in the same epistle mentions the goodness and severity of God as apparently the constituent elements of the divine holiness (Romans 2:22). In Galatians 5:22 and Ephesians 5:9 goodness is mentioned as a fruit of the spirit

It is common in this connection to append a theodicy, or at least to give the subject some consideration, By theodicy is meant the vindication of God’s wisdom and goodness in the creation and government of the world. Within the sacred canon, the Book of Job may be said to be the theodicy of the Old Testament. In true philosophical form, the first work of importance on this subject in modern times was that of Leibnitz (1747); and closely following were the works of Benedict (1822), Von Schaden (1842), Maret (1857), and Young, Evil and Good (1861). Dr. Summers gives

a chapter to this important subject (Cf. SUMMERS, Syst. Th., I, pp. 122-146). Dr. Pope treats the subject briefly, introducing it as follows: "But the tremendous difficulty arises that evil exists. The goodness of God is the attribute which this fact most directly confronts: not His love, which does not emerge in its glory from the ground of His lovingkindness until sin already exists; not His holiness, which likewise implies the existence of what He forever rejects; not His wisdom, which has its grandest illustration in its making evil subservient to His designs. But it is forever argued that a Creator of unbounded benevolence and power, must, or might, or ought to have prevented the origination of evil. There are only two possible solutions of this profound difficulty. Either the desperate expedient must be adopted of renouncing a supreme God altogether; a solution which is really no solution, for atheism solves nothing but dissolves all. Or, accepting the testimony of God himself, we must bow before an unfathomable mystery, and seek our refuge in the harmony of the divine attributes (Cf. POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 322). Probably no better solution has ever been offered than that of John Wesley. "Why is sin in the world? Because man was created in the image of God; because he is not mere matter, a clod of earth, a lump of clay, without sense or understanding, but a spirit like his Creator; a being endued not only with sense and understanding, but also with a will exerting itself in various affections. To crown all the rest, he was endued with liberty, a power of directing his own affections and actions, a capacity of determining himself, or of choosing good and evil. Indeed, had not man been endued with this, all the rest would have been of no use. Had he not been a free as well as an intelligent being, his understanding would have been as incapable of holiness or any other kind of virtue, as a tree or a block of marble. And having this power, a power of choosing good and evil, he chose the latter, he chose evil. Thus 'sin entered into the world.'" (WESLEY, Sermons).

There is another predicate which must be given consideration also, before passing from the absolute to the Relative Attributes, that of the Divine Freedom which we must posit in opposition to pantheism as a sufficient reason why anything not God exists at all. But in ascribing will to God, we have carried our study to a consideration of His spiritual nature in the light of our own as we have not done before. But the Spirit as it applies to God must embrace knowledge, sensibility and will. Personality has its essential factors, self-determination, and self-evaluation. The apostle sums up this idea of will as expressed in purpose and resulting in act in the Epistle to the Ephesians (1:11) Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. Here we have thelma or will in exercise; boula or determination of that will; and the issue in action as energountos. It is therefore one of the attributes which with the divine omniscience forms a link between the absolute perfections and those perfections related to the creature. This needs to be understood, for it means that the act of God going toward His creatures is to be sought only in Himself; the will is indeed the necessity of His essence, like the attributes already considered, but it is itself under no necessity.-POPE, Compend. Chr. Tb.., I, p. 303

Dr. Knudson treats the attribute of omnipresence as a specification under omnipotence. E. G. Robinson regards omnipresence as a compound of omnipotence and omniscience. Foster considers Immensity and Omnipresence together, regarding them as the same attribute under different aspects. He makes this distinction in that he regards omnipresence as limiting the Divine essence to the bounds of creation, while immensity carries with it the thought that the essence is limitless beyond the bounds of creation. Wakefield defines the Omnipresence or Ubiquity of God as His being everywhere present at the same time

We are not to conceive of the omnipresence of God, however, as a universal, material extension; so that a part of him is in one place and a part in another; for, being a spirit, God is not divisible into parts. Besides, something more than a part of God is needed here, and everywhere, for the performance of Divine works.-POND, Chr. Th., p. 50

Turretin says, "Bodies are conceived of as existing in space circumscriptively because occupying a certain portion of space, they are bounded by space on every side. Created spirits do not occupy any portion of space, nor are they embraced by any. They are in space definitively as here and not there. God is in space repletively, because in a transcendent manner His essence fills all space."

It was on this principle that the apostle argued when he disputed with the learned Athenians. God is not far from every one of us, that is, He is intimately near and present with us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being. If things live, God is in them and gives them life. If things move, God imparts to them their motion. If things have being, that being is in God. Every object that meets our eye on the surface of the earth, or in the expanse above us, announces His presence. By Him the sun shines, the winds blow, the earth is clothed with vegetation, and the tides of the ocean rise and fall. Everywhere He exists in the fullness of perfection. The universe is a magnificent temple, erected by His own hands, in which He manifests Himself to His intelligent creatures. The Divine Inhabitant fills it, and every part shines with His glory.-WAKEFIELD, Chr. Th., p. 150

Hahn remarks, that from the history of the various opinions which have prevailed respecting the omnipresence of God, it appears that most of the errors have arisen from confounding the ideas of body and substance. In doing this our author has followed the example of Reinhard, Morus, Doederlein and others, who adopted the philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolf. In denying to God a body, and thus avoiding the errors of pantheism, they seemed at the same time unconsciously to deny Him substance, and to transmute Him into an unessential thought, and then to locate Him somewhat beyond the limits of the universe, from whence He looks forth, and exerts His power upon all His works; in which, therefore, He is not otherwise present than by His knowledge and agency. -KNAPP, Chr. Th., p. 106

Knapp points out that some of the older theologians entertained more than others the scriptural position that both the substantial and efficient presence of God were involved in His omnipresence. The tendency to separate between these two, were it possible, leads to a misplaced emphasis. Thus Dr. Miley sees only in omnipresence the divine efficiency, and tends to minify the notion of an omnipresent divine essence as the necessary ground of omniscience and omnipotence. He maintains that personal agency is for us the only vital reality of this presence. It is to this position that Dr. Hills objects, maintaining that this omnipresence is not to be understood as a mere presence in knowledge and power, but an omnipresence of the divine essence. This, however, is in nowise interpreted in the pantheistic sense (Cf. HILLS, Fund. Tb.., I, p. 230ff). Dr. Raymond, with his usual comprehensive grasp of truth, gathers up both phases of the truth in the statement, "Such assumptions as are inconsistent with the Bible representations and the common apprehensions must be rejected. For example, if it be affirmed that God is everywhere present by extension or diffusion, so that it may be said that a part of God is here and a part of God there; or if it be said that God is present everywhere solely by His knowledge and His power, such views are to be rejected, since truth requires us to conceive that the divine essence is unlimited as fully and

as perfectly as are the divine attributes. God, as to all that is God, is everywhere always; the infinite essence is incapable of division and separation; essence and attribute, immutably inseparable, fill immensity; all of God everywhere is a truth cognized both by piety and sound philosophy."-RAYMOND, Syst. Th., I, p. 328

Proceeding from this principle, we may dwell on a few important inferences. (I) The omnipotence of God is the ground and secret of all efficiency, or what we call causality. No argument, however specious, can rob us of the indestructible conviction that there is such a power in the nature of things as we call cause; that there is a connection between events which is more than sequence. As in regard to almost every attribute of God, but in this case with more than usual distinctness we perceive in ourselves the finite reflection of the Infinite. We are conscious of producing effects as ourselves their cause. From that, remembering two things, we rise to the Divine Omnipotence. (II) The range of our direct causation is exceedingly limited: very decisive so far as it extends, it soon reaches its term. In the interior economy of our spiritual nature it is comparatively great; in the government of our bodily constitution less; in our action upon others it has decreased rapidly; and in our action upon external nature it is gone. (III) All power in us is derived from Him: He is the absolute source of all causation. It is not simply that He can do all things; but all things that are done are done by the operation of causes that owe their efficiency to Him, though in many cases the efficiency is contrary to His will-POPE, Compend. Chr. Tb.., I, pp. 311, 312 In explanation of the foregoing paradox, Dr. Pope says, "In the infinite wisdom of God things contrary to His will in one sense are permitted by His will in another. This leads up to the original mystery that the Almighty created beings capable of falling from Him; and down again to the present mystery that omnipotence sustains in being creatures opposing His authority; and then forward to the same mystery in its consummate form that omnipotence will preserve in being, not indeed active rebels against His authority, but spirits separated from Himself. It is the solemn peculiarity of this attribute, in common with wisdom and goodness, that it is traversed and thwarted, so to speak, by the creatures that owe to it their origin. But the same three attributes are conspicuous in the redeeming economy-POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 313

God cannot do that which is repugnant to any of His perfections. He cannot lie, or deceive, or deny Himself, for to do so would be injurious to His truth. He cannot love sin, for this would be inconsistent with His holiness. He cannot punish the innocent, for this would destroy His goodness. This, however, is not a physical, but a moral impossibility, and is, therefore, no limitation of omnipotence; but to ascribe a power to God which is inconsistent with the rectitude of His nature, is not to magnify, but to abase Him.-WAKEFIELD, Cbs. Tb.., pp. 148, 149

Concerning the distinction between potentia absoluta and potentia ordinata as he expresses these terms, Dr. Charles Hodge says, "This distinction is important, as it draws the line between the natural and the supernatural, between what is due to the operation of natural causes, sustained and guided by the providential efficiency of God, and what is due to the immediate exorcise of His power. This distinction indeed, is rejected by modern philosophy." Modern philosophy holds that God in creating and sustaining the world, does it as a whole. Nothing is therefore isolated and consequently there are no individual acts, but only a general efficiency on the part of God. Nothing is referred to His immediate agency. Everything is natural, and hence both miracles and special providences are rejected. (Cf. HODGE, Syst. Tb.., I, p. 410.)

Dr. Raymond says of the Scripture representations of divine power, that they are "incomparable in their perspicuity and their sublimity; perspicuous because written by the inspiration of the Almighty, who alone can comprehend the measure of His power; and sublime because the thing described is itself the perfection of sublimity. These are not the invented words of a poetic fancy, but the words of truth and soberness, literally presenting the thought intended.-RAYMOND, Syst. Tb., I, p. 320ff

Foster affirms that aside from the first chapter of Genesis, perhaps the finest description of physical omnipotence is the description found in Job, chapter thirty-eight

William Newton Clarke attempts an explanation similar to that of Pope by maintaining a twofold aspect of omniscience, a knowledge of the universe as it exists eternally as His own idea, and a knowledge of that universe as existing in time and space, and therefore as a perpetual process of becoming. This goes back to the Logos idea of a pleroma. Dr. Clarke offers this as an explanation as to how God may have at once a foreknowledge of things as under the temporal order and a simultaneous knowledge in the eternal order (Cf. CLARKE, Outline of Chr. Th., p. 82)

"This whole difficulty," says Hodge, "arises out of the assumption that contingency is essential to free agency. If an act may be certain as to its occurrence, and yet free as to the mode of its occurrence, the difficulty vanishes. That free acts may be absolutely certain, is plain, because they have in a multitude of cases been predicted. It was certain that the acts of Christ would be holy, yet they were free. The continued holiness of the saints in heaven is certain, and yet they are perfectly free. The foreknowledge of God is inconsistent with a false theory of free agency, but not with the true doctrine on that subject. After Augustine, the common way of meeting the difficulty of reconciling foreknowledge with liberty, was to represent it as merely subjective. The distinction between knowledge and foreknowledge is only in us." -Honor, Syst. Th., I, p. 401

Knapp states the argument as follows: "The foreknowledge of God, which is contended for, invades the freedom of the will in man and other moral beings. For if God foreknows all things, and is infallible in His knowledge, whatever He knows must take place, is therefore necessary, and no longer dependent on the freedom of man. But this argument is fallacious; for man does not perform one action, or another because it was foreknown by God; but God foreknew the action, because man in the exercise of his free will would perform it."-KNAPP, Chr. Th., p. 104

Watson’s great argument may be summarized as follows: "The great fallacy in the argument that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature, lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other If, however, the term contingent in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their freedom and stands opposed not to certainty, but to necessity. Free actions foreknown will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action foreknown, does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause; and in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause, that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action, is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the

will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by knowledge, and the action though foreseen, is still free and contingent. The foreknowledge of God then has no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown, without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge.-WATSON, Institutes, I, pp. 379ff

Richard Watson gives the following marks of wisdom: (1) The first character of wisdom is to act for worthy ends. To act with design is a sufficient character of intelligence; but wisdom is the fit and proper exercise of the understanding. (2) It is another mark of wisdom when the process by which any work is accomplished is simple, and many effects are produced from one or a few elements. "When every several effort has a particular separate cause, this gives no pleasure to the spectators, as not discovering contrivance; but that work is beheld with admiration and delight as the result of deep counsel, which is complicated in its parts, and yet simple in its operation, when a great variety of effects are seen to arise from one principle operating uniformly (ABERNATHY on Attributes). (Cf. WATSON, Institutes, I, p. 405ff.)

Watson gives an interesting and helpful discussion of this subject in that he gives the older viewpoint, with rather extended excerpts from Paley’s Natural Theology, King’s Origin of Evil, Gisborne’s Testimony of Natural Philosophy to Christianity, and Scott’s Remarks on the Refutation of Calvinism. The tone of the apology is to place nature in a better light than is commonly done by those who viewing it under the curse and consequences of sin, find in it nothing of good In recent times, The Philosophy of the Christian Religion, by A. M. Fairbairn, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford , is a sincere and reverent attempt to present a true philosophy of the Christian religion. Whatever the judgment which may be formed as to his conclusions, all will admit that for scholarship and candor, the book is of a high order.

THE MORAL ATTRIBUTES The moral attributes of God relate to His government over free and intelligent creatures. Since moral bonds are essential to the existence and perpetuity of society, the knowledge of God must ever be a determining factor in the community life of men. Clear views of the divine nature are indispensable to both stability and progress. There is abundant proof from history that society is ultimately dependent upon the strength of its moral bonds, and when these are relaxed or decay, the social structure collapses. There is a marked difference also between the metaphysical attributes and the ethical in this, that while both may in a measure be comprehended by finite reason, the latter depend more particularly upon a common experience. Man being made in the image of God, may as a rational being comprehend within the limits of his finiteness, the natural attributes of God; but man having fallen into sin lacks the subjective basis for the perception of God’s moral and spiritual character. It is only the pure in heart who see God. God’s holiness forbids the approach of sinful man. There is no meeting place, no common basis for understanding. It is evident, therefore, that only through the mediator-ship of Jesus Christ can man become a partaker of the divine nature, and hence come to know in the deepest and truest sense His holiness and His love. It is at this point of the moral attributes of God, that natural revelation is most defective. Man cannot rest satisfied with it. To no inconsiderable extent, the errors in theology have grown out of the confused notions of God which are consequent upon it. Our question then is, "What is the nature and character of God made known to us through this redemptive revelation?" Herein lies the importance of this department of theology

We need first of all to remind ourselves that the term personality, as we have used it in its application to God, conveys the idea of a richer content than that given to it by metaphysics alone. It embraces not only self-consciousness but self-determination. It involves the perfection of reason, power and love, and has, therefore, not only metaphysical existence but ethical and moral quality. Every objection urged against ascribing a Nature to the Divine Being, rests upon a false and unreal conception of the absolute. The arguments for the existence of God presuppose His ethical character, in order to account for the moral nature of man. But to ascribe a moral nature to God carries with it something more than merely ethical distinctions. It means that moral feeling must be coordinated with perfect knowledge and unlimited power. It means, further, that the Divine Will must give perfect expression to that which constitutes His Being, so that He wills that holiness which forms the essential quality of His nature. It follows, then, that the moral nature of God is not merely a quiescent state, but active with infinite intensity in the free and unlimited range of His personal powers. If in the metaphysical realm we may speak of the existence of God under the twofold distinction of essence and attribute, we may also with equal propriety in the realm of God's moral government, observe the distinction between the divine nature and the moral attributes; and if we may regard the metaphysical attributes as inhering in the essence of God and expressive of it; so we may regard the moral attributes as inhering in a Divine Nature or Moral Character, to which likewise they give expression

All the perfections of God as manifested in His moral government may be resolved into two: His holiness and His love. These in their essence and relation can be understood only through a proper analysis of the nature of personal life. It is a characteristic of personality to mark itself off as separate and distinct from all other existences, personal or otherwise, in what is commonly known as self-grasp or self-affirmation. But it likewise belongs to personality to reveal and impart itself. If, then, we view the ethical nature of God from this standpoint of self-grasp or self-affirmation, we have the concept of divine holiness; if we view it from the standpoint of self-impartation or self-communication, we have the concept of divine love. We may with perfect propriety say, therefore, that the nature of God consists in holy love, but in this statement we neither identify nor confuse the terms

Holiness as Nature or Attribute. Theologians have greatly differed in their positions concerning the holiness of God. Three positions may be and are taken concerning this subject: first, it may be regarded as one attribute alongside of and coordinate with other attributes; second, it may be regarded as the sum total of all the attributes; and third, it may be regarded not as an attribute, but as a nature, of which the attributes are the expression. "The holiness of God," says Wakefield , "is commonly regarded as an attribute distinct from His other perfections; but this, we think, is a mistake. Holiness is a complex term, and denotes not so much a particular attribute, as that general character of God which results from all his moral perfections. The holiness of man is not a distinct quality from his virtuous disposition, but signifies the state of his mind and heart as influenced by these. When we proceed to analyze his holiness, or to show in what it consists, we say that he is a devout man, a man of integrity, a man faithful to ail his engagements and conscientious in all his relative duties, a man who abhors sin and loves righteousness. In like manner, the holiness of God is not, and cannot be, something different from the moral perfections of his nature, but is a general term under which all these perfections are comprehended" (WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 168). This is similar to the position of Dr. Dick who held that

holiness was not a particular attribute, but "the general character of God as resulting from His moral attributes" (DICK, Theology, I, p. 274). Dr. Wardlow defines holiness as "the union of all the attributes, as pure white light is the union of all the colored rays of the spectrum" (WARDLAW, Systematic Theology, I, p. 619). Dr. Strong regards holiness as the fundamental attribute of God. Veracity and faithfulness he regards as transitive truth; mercy and goodness as transitive love; and justice and righteousness as transitive holiness. To this position Dr. Dickie objects, refusing to classify either love or holiness as distinct attributes. To make either holiness or love fundamental would, he thinks, either subordinate the one to the other, or formally countenance a dualistic conception of the divine nature, as if love and holiness were opposed to each other. To him, the love of God is holy and the holiness of God loving. For this reason he maintains that Dr. Strong's position falls short of the full statement of Christian truth. Dr. Pope takes the dual position just mentioned, but to him, holiness and love as attributes are co-ordinate with each other, "two ascendencies in their yet not fully explained union and harmony." They therefore become the foundation for two classes of prominent attributes, justice, righteousness and truth belonging to God's holiness, and grace and its related attributes to His love (Cf. DICKIE, Organism of Christian Truth, p. 94; POPE, Compendium of Christian Theology, I, p. 329). Dr. Sheldon takes a position similar to that of Dr. Dickie, maintaining that the ethical nature of God is best expressed in the phrase, holy love, or with nearly equal propriety, loving righteousness. He recognizes, however, the distinction between them which Dr. Pope indicates, and holds that holiness may not be subsumed under love, nor love under righteousness, but are to be regarded as terms of a couplet which stand for closely related and perfectly harmonious perfections (SHELDON, Syst. of Chr. Doct., p. 184). Dr. Summers treats holiness under the head of goodness, which he regards as both essential and relative. Essential goodness he defines as holiness (SUMMERS, Systematic Theology, I, p. 98). In this connection, also, we may refer briefly to those theologians who attach the idea of holiness to some faculty of personality such as the will or the affections. Those theologians who make will the highest expression of personality commonly treat holiness in relation to it. Thus Dr. Fairchild holds that holiness or virtue is a benevolent regard for the good. This is a voluntary attitude, a state of will, a simple exercise, not changed in its character by changing perceptions or feelings (FAIRCHILD, Elements of Theology, p. 127). Dr. Foster likewise defines holiness as an attribute of the divine will, but in so doing is not to be understood as limiting it to the volitions. The will itself is holy. "All his self-determinations are holy, whether we conceive of them as eternal or temporal. If God is a person, we cannot conceive of Him as thinking, without first conceiving of Him as one who wills to think. If we speak of His thoughts as holy, it is because we regard them as the expression of His eternally holy will. If we regard His very essence as holy, as indeed we must, it is because we must at the same time regard it as personal essence; and we regard it as an eternally personal essence because it exists eternally as an essence willing. This will is the form of an immanent, and of course, conscious preference" (FOSTER, Christian Theology, p. 227). Dr. Miley, on the other hand, relates holiness more closely to the divine sentiency, affirming that there is a truth of moral feeling in God which is deeper than the more definite distinctions of mode, the moral feeling which is intrinsic to the holiness of the divine nature (MILEY, Systematic Theology, I, p. 199). From this brief review of the various positions held, it is evident that holiness occupies a central position of importance in the moral government of God; and that when it is limited to one faculty in contradistinction to others, it is only because this particular faculty is regarded as supreme in personal life

We may say then, that holiness belongs to the essential nature of God in a deeper and more profound sense than merely as one attribute among others. If it be objected that holiness could not be known were it of the essence and not of the attributes, we may refer the reader to our discussion of the absolute. It was indicated that the term is used in three different senses, first, as that which is entirely unrelated, which leads directly to agnosticism; second, as the totality of all relations, which leads to pantheism; and third, as that which is independent and self-existent. This is the theistic and Christian position. The Christian maintains that his knowledge of God is limited but that it is true so far as it goes; and that this knowledge to any degree or extent is due solely to the self-revelation of God. This is as true of the ethical as of the metaphysical nature of God. God can be known only as He reveals Himself through the eternal Son and the ever blessed Spirit. And this knowledge of God which comes through the mystical contact of Spirit with spirit, is unfolded to the understanding in an ever deepening and widening concept of the moral attributes. We are not, however, averse to the position of Dr. Pope, who holds that the two divine perfections, holiness and love, may be called the moral nature of God; and that these two are the only terms which unite in one the attributes and the essence of God (Cf. POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 331). As essence, these constitute the moral nature of God; as attributes they are the revelation of this nature through the economy of divine grace The moral attributes differ in a peculiar sense from the natural attributes, in that they cannot be understood without that subjective character in man which corresponds to the moral nature of God, and therefore cannot be separated from the redemptive work of Christ. The perfect revelation of God’s holiness is found in the incarnate Son of whom it is written, Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows (Hebrews 1:9). Holiness, then, is primarily that disposition which is back of all the attributes-a disposition or a nature which manifests itself in a love for righteousness and in a hatred for iniquity. It is holy love. But as previously indicated, holiness belongs to the self-affirmation of personality, rather than self-impartation; and self-affirmation is always deeper and more fundamental than self-manifestation. That which severs God from the creaturely nature, even apart from sin, that by which the soleness and integrity of His being is maintained, is holiness. Nor must this idea of separateness be forgotten or overlooked. Holiness is not merely synonymous with perfection generally, nor can it be interpreted as communicative goodness, an indefinite flowing over of love into man’s nature apart from moral distinctions. Holy love demands a community of persons, each separate and distinct, and the purity of the love depends upon the strict regard which is paid to the limits which separate one from the other. Holiness in the ethical aspect of the Divine Being is characterized by the separateness of God in essence from all other beings. It belongs to the integrity of His being rather than to His relationships. Holiness is immanent and essential to the very idea of God. Love indeed has its seat in the free relations of the persons of the Divine Trinity, but holiness belongs to the necessary relationships. Holiness is therefore more fundamental in some sense than love, at least it must be given logical priority, though love may occupy the more exalted sphere. "The kingdom of love," says Martensen, "is established on the foundation of holiness. Holiness is the principle that guards the eternal distinction between the Creator and the creature, between God and man, in the union affected between them; it preserves the divine dignity and majesty from being infringed by the divine love; it eternally excludes everything evil and impure from the divine nature. The Christian mind knows nothing of a love without holiness" (MARTENSEN, Christian Dogmatics, p. 99ff)

We may further refer in this connection to the trisagion found in Isaiah 6:3, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, and also in Revelation 4:8 where the "living creatures" corresponding to the seraphim of Isaiah, rest not day nor night saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. The Church has always maintained that this threefold ascription refers to the Divine Trinity, and therefore that holiness belongs equally to the Father, the Son and the ever blessed Spirit. The glory which by Isaiah is ascribed to the Lord of Hosts, is by St. John ascribed to the Son (John 12:41) and by St. Paul to the Holy Spirit (Acts 28:25-26). If we may be permitted to refer again to our discussion of the Christian conception of God, we found there as basic to this concept, the statement of our Lord that God is a Spirit (John 4:24), and this was further interpreted by the New Testament writers as life (John 5:26), light (1 John 1:5) and love (1 John 4:8). In the Trinity, therefore, life is peculiarly the property of the Father, Light of the Son, and Love of the Spirit. But basic and fundamental to each is ascribed a nature characterized as holy, and the threefold ascription of adoration and praise is not on the ground of life or light or love, but of holiness. We may say, then, that holiness in the Father is the mystery of life, separate, distinct and unoriginated; holiness in the Son is light, which down to the depths of His infinite being, reveals no darkness, nothing undiscovered, nothing unfulfilled, nothing which needs to be brought to perfection; holiness in the Spirit is the disclosure of love which exists between the Father and the Son, and is by St. Paul called the bond of perfectness. In the Father, holiness is original and underived, in the Son holiness is revealed, and in the Spirit holiness is imparted. It is therefore not by mere chance that we find the expression partakers of the divine nature (2 Peter 1:4), associated with partakers of his holiness (Hebrews 12:10); and partakers of the glory (1 Peter 5:1) with partakers of Christ (Hebrews 3:14) and of the Holy Ghost (Hebrews 6:4). These distinctions must be further considered as "The Biblical Concept of Holiness" and "The Concept of Divine Love." The Biblical Concept of Holiness. The term holiness has had a long and complex history. In the religion of Israel it first appears as expressive of the nature of God in Exodus 15:11, Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like unto thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders. It occurs in the same relation for the last time in Revelation 15:4, Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest. It is significant also, that the term first occurs as a revelation of Jehovah to His chosen people in His redemptive relation, and not in His revelation of Himself as Creator. This fact marks it as the ground of His ethical character in the moral government of a free and responsible people. The word indeed occurs in Genesis, but there it is associated with the perfection of the works of God. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made (Genesis 2:3). While the idea of perfection stands out more prominently, there is even here the idea of separateness. Holiness attaches to the day because of the presence of God. God’s resting place, or the place of His abiding presence is holy. Later the same idea attaches to the house of God, concerning which the psalmist declares, Holiness becometh thine house, O Lord, for ever (Psalms 93:5). The idea of separation in order to possession attaches to both the day and the house. The day is set apart or devoted as a memorial of the finished creation. It is holy, because it is separated in devotion to God, and thus becoming peculiarly His possession, He rests or abides in it. Of the house it is written, Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them (Exodus 25:8). We may say, then, that even at this early date the two ideas of separation and possession attach to the word holiness. Both of these qualities come into clearer light with the

Abrahamic covenant, and are set forth in their perfection by the redemptive Trinity in the New Covenant. Following the suggestion of the tnsagion we shall consider the term holiness in its threefold aspect as it relates to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit

Holiness as it relates to the Father, expresses the perfection of moral excellence which in Him exists unoriginated and underived. It is therefore first, the ground of reverence and adoration. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? (Revelation 15:4). It was because of this resplendent glory that the psalmist exclaimed, Holy and reverend is his name (Psalms 111:9). Here the idea is suggestive of majesty. This is true also of the passage his holy arm hath gotten him the victory, and again, Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at his holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy (Psalms 99:9). Second, holiness is the standard of all moral goodness. It is in this connection that the concept of holiness held by William Newton Clarke is peculiarly appropriate. As previously indicated, he regards holiness as the glorious fullness of God’s moral excellence, held as the principle of His own action and the standard for His creatures (CLARKE, An Outline of Christian Theology, p. 89). Here it is evident that holiness is not only the inward character of God as perfect goodness, but consistency with this character as a standard for His own activity; and further, it is a requirement for His morally responsible creatures. It is for this reason that we have the injunction, Be ye holy, for I am holy (1 Peter 1:13). Holiness demands character, consistency and requirement. The character of God as holy could not be such unless it possessed all moral goodness. It is the sum of all excellencies, not as a mathematical total but as a nature which includes every perfection, not one of which could be diminished without destroying His holiness. In God’s consistency with His perfections, we have the action of the will to which holiness is sometimes ascribed. But perfect character demands perfect conduct, and for this reason His perfect freedom must be in perfect harmony with His character. During the scholastic period the question was frequently debated, as to whether God willed the good because it was good, or whether it was good because He willed it. Thomas Aquinas held to the former position, and Duns Scotus to the latter. But the question is a meaningless one, for God’s holiness is not determined by something outside of Him but within Him. He cannot contradict Himself and is therefore morally incapable of that which does not truly express His nature as holy. He cannot make evil good without ceasing to be God. By omnipotence in God we mean that He is not limited by anything outside of Himself, but we do insist that He is limited by His own divine nature or character. He cannot will anything contrary to His nature or in anywise be untrue to Himself. Third, and closely related to the foregoing, holiness as the standard of goodness is eternally opposed to sin. Consequently we read Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look upon iniquity (Habakkuk 1:13), and again, Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God? (1 Samuel 6:20). Holiness is therefore not only the standard of all good, but as such must necessarily include the repulsion of all evil. It is evident that this aspect of the divine nature comes into clearer light by contrast, and it may be as Dr. Pope suggests, that it is always "displayed against the dark background of sin." This brings us to a discussion of holiness as related to the redemptive work of Christ

Holiness as it relates to the Son is found in both His revealing and redemptive mission. Holiness in God can be known only by those who like Him are holy. It is for this reason, as we have previously indicated, that He says, Be ye holy, for I am holy (1 Peter 1:16). Holiness repels every approach of defilement. It is evident, therefore, that the holiness of God may be known by sinful man only through an economy of divine grace is this conception which underlies and gives significance to

the ritualistic system of Judaism, as preparatory to the redemptive work of Christ. The idea of sacrifice in the Scriptures carries with it the thought of uncleanness in the offerer, who by a propitiatory act must be cleansed or made holy. The love of the Father finds its highest expression in the gift of His Son, but this gift is specifically declared to be a propitiatory offering for sin. By it man may be made holy and again enter into fellowship with the Father. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins (1 John 4:10). Thus love made the offering or propitiation for sin which holiness required. (The word "to be" is better omitted. Love sent the Son the propitiation for our sins, 1:e., already a propitiation, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.) The same thought underlies the familiar text, For 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 3:16). Here the love of God rests upon His divine holiness as an immutable basis. It was this alone which required and made possible the stupendous exhibition of divine love. If love sent the Son, it was His holiness that demanded the sacrifice-our God is a consuming fire (Hebrews 12:29). Sanctification is not by an effusion of love, but by the sprinkling of blood. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach (Hebrews 13:12-13). Holiness and love in the nature of God assume the form of righteousness and grace in the redemptive economy. For this reason it is declared that the right-eousness of God is revealed from faith to faith (Romans 1:17); while from the standpoint of divine love, St. Paul declares that the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men (Titus 2:11)

Holiness as it relates to the Spirit is holiness imparted or made accessible to men. It is through the Spirit that we become "partakers of the divine nature." Hence the term "Holy Spirit" affirms not only the nature of the Spirit as in Himself holy, but declares also that it is His office and work to make men holy. Holiness and love thus appear to be closely conjoined if not identified in the Holy Spirit. He is at once the Spirit of holiness and the Spirit of love. The distinction, however, remains, and must be given due consideration. For this reason we must not overlook the distinctions made by our Lord in His high priestly prayer: I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:26). Here is a revelation of both the holiness and love of God which is to be imparted or communicated through the Spirit. The "name" or nature must be declared before the love can be manifested. The Spirit by His hallowing act must identify man with the sanctifying blood of Christ, the propitiatory offering, before there can be any free inflow of divine love. There must be a partaking of His holiness before there can be the fullness of His love. Hence to be partakers of the divine nature is to share in both His holiness and His love. This is further set forth in the declaration, I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me (John 17:23). St. Peter approaches this truth differently from St. Paul or even St. John . Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:2); and again, Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently (1 Peter 1:22). We may say then that our partaking of the divine holiness is by the sanctification of the Spirit; while our partaking of the divine love is explained to be because he hath given us of his Spirit. While the act of the Holy Spirit in sanctification must ever precede logically that

communication of Himself by which "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts," yet in human experience the two may be said to be concomitant (Cf. Romans 5:5 and IJohn 4:13) The Concept of Divine Love. In our discussion of the holiness of God we found it necessary to mention briefly the nature of divine love. This subject, however, is of such vast importance both to religion and to theology, that it now demands further consideration, first as to its origin; second as to its nature; and third as to its relation to holiness. We may say then, (1) that love has its origin in the triunity of God. In the mysterious intercommunion of the Father and the Son, love is the bond of union. Thus St. Paul characterizes charity or divine love as the "bond of perfectness" (Colossians 3:14). While the more extended treatment of this subject belongs to the following chapter we must at this point call attention to the personal nature of this relationship. The communion of the Father and the Son is vital and real, as between a personal subject and a personal object. But not only are the terms Father and Son personal, the organ of reciprocal interaction and intercommunion must likewise be personal. The bond of union which exists between the Father and the Son as personal Beings, and furnishes both the condition and ground of communion, is the personal Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity. And this absolute inter-communion and reciprocity of love, demands the equality and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father and Son, "the glory equal, the majesty coeternal." It is for this reason that He is called the Spirit of communion in the apostolic benedictions, The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all (2 Corinthians 13:14). The Father loves the Son and is in turn loved by the Son, and the bond of love which is the ground of communion is the Holy Spirit. We may then regard love as the moral or ethical expression of the Divine Unity, and therefore the focal point of all the moral attributes. Here is displayed the profound truth that God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him (1 John 4:16). We may also, on the authority of the sacred Scriptures, confidently believe that the Triune God exists eternally in the sphere of love; that this love gave Jesus Christ our Lord as a propitiation for sin; and that it is into this holy fellowship of divine love that His finite creatures are to be received through the gift of the Holy Spirit. It was for this reason that our Lord in the fulfillment of His mission concluded His high priestly prayer with the words, I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:26)

We must consider (2) the Nature of Divine Love. Schleiermacher defines love as "that attribute in virtue of which God communicates Himself"; Dr. Francis J. Hall, as "the attribute by reason of which God wills a personal fellowship with Himself of those who are holy or capable of being made so" (HALL, Theological Outlines, p. 89); while William Newton Clarke whose definitions are always concise and clear, regards it as "God’s desire to impart Himself and all good to other beings, and to possess them for His own spiritual fellowship" (CLARKE, Outline of Christian Theology, p. 95). From these definitions, it is evident that there are at least three essential principles in love: self-communication, fellowship, and a desire to possess the object loved. Referring again to our characterization of holiness as the self-affirming aspect of God’s nature as holy love, we insisted that holiness is not merely self-affirmed purity in the negative sense of the term, but includes also a positive delight or complacency in the right. Here we see these qualities reappearing in a new light within love itself. Love must come to expression in the twofold desire to possess other beings for Himself, and to impart to them Himself and all other good. It is frequently pointed out that the self-sacrificing mother who gives herself for her child, is the one whose longing for the answering love of the child is most deep and inextinguishable. However great the self-surrender and sacrifice

of love, it is always accompanied by the desire for reciprocation. But in the very devotion of a mother to her son, that mother affirms her distinct personality. The self-surrender and the self-assertion must be equal, nor can either increase without the other if love is to be maintained. If self-assertion is not accompanied by its equivalent in self-surrender, we have not love but selfishness under the guise of love; if self-surrender be not balanced by self-assertion, we have not love but weakness. As love develops, it grows richer in self-sacrificing, and increases its desire for possession of the object loved. When therefore St. John declares that We love him, because he first loved us (1 John 4:19) he is giving voice to that reciprocal love which delights the heart of God. From the standpoint of divine love, it is well also to remember that without God man is an orphan; without man, God is bereaved

One of the outstanding contributions to modern theology will be found in Ritschl's analysis of love (Cf. RITSCHL, Justification and Reconciliation, p. 277ff). After defining love as "will, aiming either at the appropriation of an object, or at the enrichment of its existence, because moved by a feeling of its worth," he enumerates several conditions necessary to its existence. We may summarize these briefly as follows: (1) It is necessary that the objects loved should be of like nature to the subject which loves, that is, persons. To speak of love for things or animals, is to degrade the conception of love beneath its proper meaning. (2) Love implies a will which is constant in its aim. If objects change, we may have fancies but cannot have love. (3) Love aims at the promotion of another's personal end, whether known or conjectured. Nor is love interested merely in those things which are accidental, it estimates everything which concerns the other by its bearing on the character of the loved one. Love desires either to promote, to maintain, and through sympathetic interest to enjoy the individuality of the character acquired by the others, or to assist him in securing those blessings which are necessary to insure the attainment of his personal ideal. (4) If love is to be a constant attitude of will, and if the appropriation and the promotion of the other's interests and ideals are not to diverge but to coincide in each act, then the will of the person who loves must take up the other's personal interests and make them a part of his own. Love continually strives to appropriate the other personality, regarding this as a task necessary to his own conscious individuality. This characteristic implies that the will as love does not give itself up for the other's sake

We must consider (3) the Relation of Holiness to Love. We have all along carefully guarded against any confusion of these terms, and therefore the question is forced upon us as to the relation which the one bears to the other. If the nature of God as holy love is, from the standpoint of self-affirmation to be defined as holy, and from the standpoint of self-communication to be interpreted as love, then holiness and love are equally of the essence of God. Holiness is considered fundamental solely from logical priority, for self-affirmation must always precede self-communication. Holiness and love in God are related in much the same manner as integrity and generosity in man. Holiness demands not only a nature, but a nature consistent with itself. Since that nature is in its out-goings always love, then holiness in God requires that He always act out of pure love. Hence in the first Christian Council at Jerusalem, St. Peter says concerning the Gentiles that God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith (Acts 15:8-9); and in his general epistle, Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart

fervently (1 Peter 1:22). If, on the other hand, we view the nature of God from the standpoint of love or self-communication, then it is God's nature to impart Himself and that sell is holy. Holiness must always act according to love, and love must always win its object to holiness. We may say then with Dr. Clarke, that love is in fact the desire to impart holiness, and this desire is satisfied only when the beings whom it seeks are rendered holy (Cf. CLARKE, Outlines Chr. Th., p. 100). Consequently we read that God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us (Romans 5:8); and again, Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the pro pitiation for our sins (1 John 4:10)

There is, however, a danger here which we must not fail to take into consideration. Dr. Strong defines holiness as self-affirming purity, and in virtue of this attribute of His nature, God eternally wills and maintains His own moral excellence. This purity is not only negative, but positive, not only the absence of all moral stain, but complacency in all moral good. Hence in God's moral nature as necessary acting, there are the two elements of willing and being, but the passive logically precedes the active, and being comes before willing. God is pure before He wills purity. God is holy in that His nature is the source and standard of right. Holiness furnishes the norm for love and therefore must be superior to it. God is not holy because He loves, but loves because He is holy. Dr. Strong thus preserves the distinction between holiness and love and makes holiness logically prior to it. In all this he is true and strong. But he goes farther, he makes holiness fundamental, in that it is a necessity of the divine nature while love is voluntary. For this reason, justice as transitive holiness must be exercised, while mercy as transitive love is optional. Hence God was under no obligation to provide a redemption for sinners. Thus there is laid the basis for the Calvinistic concept of divine grace which finds its logical issue in election and predestination. The same position is taken by Dr. Shedd who states that God can apply the salvation after He has wrought it out to whomsoever He will (Cf. SHEDD, Discourses and Essays, p. 277ff). Dr. G. B. Stevens in his review of Dr. Strong's Philosophy and Religion states that this view underlies the whole soteriology of this author's Systematic Theology as it does that of Dr. Shedd's Dogmatic Theology (Cf. STEVENS, Johannine Theology, pp. 285, 286). Dr. Pope avoids this error and states the true Arminian view when, as we have previously indicated, he takes the position that holiness and love are the two perfections which together may be called the nature of God, and that these are the only two terms which unite in one the attributes and essence (Cf. POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 331). Both holiness and love belong to the divine essence as well as to the attributes and cannot be separated except in thought. Justice, therefore, can never be necessary and mercy optional, but are always conjoined; and in the redemptive economy, holiness and mercy are supreme

It may be well also, to note at this time the close connection existing between holiness and perfect love, between purity and perfection. These qualities are all strangely blended in the divine nature. We have already shown that God could not be love if He were not holy. Love being the impulse to give all, then perfect love in its highest degree can exist only as it has all to give. If He were not perfect it could not be said of Him, God is love. Thus perfection and perfect love are inseparably conjoined. Nor can there be perfect love in the creature unless to the measure of his capacity he gives his all. But, on the other hand, love desires to possess another in fellowship, a fellowship which demands the highest good of the object loved. There must be no touch of selfishness, else it would not be pure love. Purity is, therefore, love free from all defilement, and the self-affirmation of

this purity is holiness

Two other subjects are closely connected with this concept of divine love, the idea of blessedness, and the idea of wrath. These demand only brief mention at this time. (1) The Idea of Blessedness. This subject is rarely mentioned in the general works on theology, yet the word itself was frequently on the lips of our Lord (Cf. Matthew 5:3-11; Matthew 11:6; Matthew 13:16; Matthew 25:34, Luke 11:28, John 20:29). Bishop Martensen defines blessedness as a term "expressive of a life which is complete in itself," and further describes it as "the reflection of the rays of love back on God, after passing through His kingdom" (MARTENSEN, Chr. Dogm., p. 101). The word is frequently translated happiness, but this is too weak to convey the full meaning of the original term. However, it is so translated in the words, I think myself happy, king Agrippa (Acts 26:2). The term may be said to convey the delight which God has in the reciprocation of His love on the part of His creatures, and this delight He communicates to those who respond to His love. It is closely akin to the peace and joy which Christ communicates to His disciples apart from the happiness which arises from favorable circumstances. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you (John 14:27); and again, These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full (John 15:11). Blessedness is closely akin also to the rest of faith (Hebrews 4:3) or the keeping of the sabbath (Hebrews 4:9), but the idea of rest must be sharply distinguished from the eudaimonia or idle enjoyment attributed to the gods of paganism. (2) The Idea of Divine Wrath. There are two positions which have been taken in the church concerning the subject of divine wrath. The common view is that wrath is not incompatible with divine love, and this has the support of the Scriptures. Speculative theologians, in order to avoid the difficulties which attach to this subject, have sought to explain it as a mere mode of human speech without any reality in the nature of God. The common view was contested very early in the Church, due doubtless to the influence of pagan philosophy. The Neo-Platonists and the Stoics with their pantheistic views of God and the world, held that God could not be subject to any emotion, for this necessitated passivity. Wrath, therefore, was impossible to God. To this position Lactantius (100: 320 A.D.) objected, maintaining that God must be capable of just resentment or His character would be imperfect. Augustine seems to reveal the influence of philosophy in his own thought when he identifies the wrath of God with the sentence which He pronounces against sin. "God’s anger does not inflame His mind," he says, "nor disturb His unchangeable tranquillity." During the Deistical Period in England when divine love was reduced to complacent indulgence, Bishop Butler met the arguments of the Deists in his sermons on Resentment and The Love of God, which are usually regarded as the English classics on this subject. Ritschl, whose analysis of love we have already cited, attempted a mediating position, maintaining that wrath in God was purely eschatological, and consisted in the final sentence against sin which He would pronounce at the end of the world The Christian position generally, is that wrath is but the obverse side of love and necessary to the perfection of the Divine Personality, or even to love itself. God revealed Himself in Jesus Christ as loving righteousness and hating iniquity; and the hatred of iniquity is as essential to Perfect Personality as the love of righteousness. Divine wrath, therefore, must be regarded as the hatred of iniquity, and is in some proper sense the same emotion which exercised towards righteousness is known as divine love As the concept of holiness has developed through an age-long process of history, so love also had its historical development. The two are always associated in the Scriptures. It is interesting to note, however, that in the earlier history of the chosen people, the idea of holiness seems to precede

that of love. The divine majesty is essential to adoration, and adoration to love. Holiness is ever the guardian of love, excluding every approach of evil. Thus we have the concept of God as glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders (Exodus 15:11). While the aspect of holiness here is that of separation, a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, there is immediately following, the declaration that He shows mercy unto thousands of them that love Him and keep His commandments (Exodus 20:6). At a later period in the progressive unfolding of divine grace, the revelation of love precedes that of holiness. The Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth (Exodus 34:6). It is only in the Word incarnate that the supreme revelation of God's holiness and His love is to be found. Christ was the holy One. He loved righteousness and hated iniquity. He was also the revelation of the Father's love. For 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 3:16). Here we begin to sound the depths of the mystery of the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here do we find for the first time an identification of love with the very Being of God. St. John makes bold to speak it, God is love (1 John 4:8) The nature of God as holy love exhibits itself in two great branches of the moral attributes-the one corresponding more nearly to the idea of holiness, the other to that of love. From the aspect of the divine holiness we may mention; (1) justice or righteousness, which though sometimes given separate treatment are usually considered together; and (2) truth, which divides itself into veracity and faithfulness. From the aspect of divine love, we may mention mercy, benevolence, long-suffering, compassion, and all those qualities which are generally known as the fruit of the Spirit

Justice and Righteousness. Dr. Strong regards justice and righteousness as transitive holiness, by which he means that the treatment of His creatures always conforms to the purity or holiness of His nature. While closely related, justice and righteousness may be distinguished from each other, and both from holiness. The term holiness applies to the nature or essence of God as such, while righteousness is His standard of activity in conformity to that nature. This refers both to Himself and to His creatures. Justice may be said to be the counterpart of God's righteousness but is sometimes identified with it. Righteousness is the foundation of the divine law, justice the administration of that law. When we regard God as the author of our moral nature, we conceive of Him as holy; when we think of that nature as the standard of action, we conceive of Him as righteous; when we think of Him as administering that law in the bestowment of rewards and penalties, we conceive of Him as just. Justice is sometimes considered in the wider sense of justitia interna, or moral excellence, and sometimes in the narrower sense as justitia externa, or moral rectitude. A further division of the term is (1) Legislative Justice which determines the moral duty of man and defines the consequences in rewards or penalties; and (2) Judicial Justice, sometimes known as Distributive Justice, by which God renders to all men according to their works. The justice by which He rewards the obedient is sometimes known as remunerative justice, while that by which He punishes the guilty is retributive or vindictive justice. But whether as legislator or judge, God is eternally just In the following scripture references no distinction is made between the terms justice and righteousness. The careful student of this subject will be impressed with the many and various ways in which these attributes are combined. The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether (Psalms 19:9). Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face (Psalms 89:14). There is no God else beside

me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me (Isaiah 45:21). The just Lord is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity (Zephaniah 3:5). Who will render to every man according to his deeds (Romans 2:6). Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways (Revelation 15:3)

Dr. Strong takes the position that neither justice nor righteousness can bestow rewards, in that obedience is due to God and therefore no creature can claim a reward for that which he justly owes. Dr. Pope takes a more scriptural position, insisting that while all that is praiseworthy in human nature is of God, either by prevenient grace or the renewing of the Spirit, there can be no mention of merit except as the word is used in divine condescension. Nevertheless, He who crowns the work of His own hands in glorifying the sanctified believer, constantly speaks of his own works of faith as a matter of reward. God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love (Hebrews 6:10). Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? (I speak as a man) God forbid for then how shall God judge the world? (Romans 3:5-6). (Cf. STRONG, Syst. Th., I, p. 293 and POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 341.) The rewards of God's judicial or distributive justice are, therefore, according to St. Paul , to be reckoned not of debt but of grace (Romans 4:4). The last day is, by the same apostle, called the revelation of the righteous judgment of God (Romans 2:5). We may therefore with confidence believe that the punishment of evil-doers, will be at once an infliction of the divine judgment and the consequences of the treasuring up of wrath against the day of wrath. And we may equally assure ourselves that the rewards of the righteous will be at once the decision of a Just Judge, and the fruitage of their own sowing in righteousness

Truth. This perfection, like justice or righteousness, is closely related to holiness. It is commonly treated from the twofold aspect of veracity and faithfulness. (1) By veracity is meant that all God's manifestations to His creatures, whether natural or supernatural, are in strict conformity to His own divine nature. Thus when the Scriptures speak of the "true" God, the intention is to distinguish Him from the false gods of the heathen; but when they mention Him as the "God of truth," they intend to convey the idea of His veracity. (2) By faithfulness is meant God's fulfillment of His promises, whether these promises are given directly by His Word, or whether they are indirectly implied in. the constitution and nature of man The Bible abounds with references to both God's veracity and His faithfulness. (1) As to His veracity, the psalmist declares Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth (Psalms 31:5); The truth of the Lord endureth forever (Psalms 117:2); The sum of thy word is truth (Psalms 119:160, R.V.); and further refers to God as He which keepeth truth forever (Psalms 146:6). The references to truth in the New Testament are equally specific. Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me (John 14:6). In His high priestly prayer Jesus says, Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth (John 17:17). Here the first clause evidently refers to the faithfulness of God, but this is grounded in His veracity-thy word is truth. St. Paul in his description of the heathen, asserts that they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature mpre than the Creator (Romans 1:25); and again, let God be.

God is the synthesis of all good by virtue of His very being; He is perfection, both metaphysical and ethical.-KUBEL The God whose glory filled the temple, and revealed only the unholiness of all who approached Him, nevertheless bade the unholy draw near to be sanctified. Was it then by the rays of His holiness shining upon and around them? Most assuredly not. The mystery of this paradox, that the attribute which separated God from sinners and Himself, is solved only by the

system of sacrificial expiation typifying the great atonement, which through a satisfaction offered to the divine righteousness opened the fellowship of love between God and man.- POPE, Cornpend. Chr. Th., I, p. 334 The well-known query: Is the good good because God wills it? or does God will it because it is good? is not properly put The question is not as to God's willing, but as to His essence. The good is good for the simple reason that it is an outflow, a self-manifestation, of God Himself. This answers the question also as to the ground of right. Right is God; a creature does right when it harmonizes with God-that is, when it fulfills the divinely fixed end of its being. The definitions of the divine holiness and righteousness are of the same character. God's holiness is that attribute in virtue of which He takes His own absolutely perfect self as the norm of his entire activity. His holiness as revealed to man, and as revealing to man God's purpose in creating him, constitute God's and man's righteousness."--Summers, Systematic Theology, p. 99

Julius Mueller in his doctrine of the Trinity states that 'its inmost significance is that God has in Himself the eternal and wholly adequate object of His love, independent of all relation to the world. Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world (John 17:24). This requires alike the unity of the essence, and the distinctness of the Persons. For without the distinction of Persons, without an I and Thou, there could be no love. Again, without the unity of the essence there would follow from the love of God a necessary relation to an essence distinct from God. Both are therefore implied in what is said of the Logos in the beginning of St. John's Gospel."-MUELLER, The Chr. Doct. of Sin, II, p. 136ff

Dr. Pope states that if we take the words, Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world, and connect them with those which immediately precede, and thou hast loved them, as thou hast loved me, and these again with the assurance, as the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you, and these once more with the command, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, it will appear how perfect is the identity in kind between the finite and infinite love, between the reflection in us and the reality in the essential Trinity, and how profound is the meaning of those words, "Love is of God," a form of expression used of no other grace. "Thus," he says, "we may boldly repeat that more glorious things are spoken of the divine perfection of love than of any other."-POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., pp. 344, 345

Ritschl's application of these principles is vitiated by two things, (1) he makes love to lie solely in the will, and therefore views the love of God as will without emotional content; (2) his lack of a proper conception of the Trinity makes it impossible for him to furnish any true ground for either love or holiness. He fails to see that God's love is primarily directed to the Son and only secondarily toward the Christian community, and consequently ignores the immanent or essential Trinity This sentiment or feeling in God, originating and directing the economy of redemption, was not fully revealed until the Lord himself revealed it. And when revealed, it is reserved for one service: to preside over the cross and the recovery of mankind. No record or register of the Divine Perfections, related to the created universe as such, contains that of love. His goodness and His loving-kindness are often alluded to as the nearest approach to the attribute that is never turned toward any but the objects of redeeming love. But at length the set time came for the new revelation, or at least the fuller revelation, of the attribute that governs all the rest: that which to adopt St. James' word, is the royal law in God as in man.-POPE, Compendium of Christian Theology, I, pp. 345ff.

Scanned by John Mitchel Giannatala. Edited by John Patterson. Corrections by George Lyons

14. Chapter 15 - THE TRINITY

Chapter 15 - THE TRINITY The evangelical doctrine of the Trinity affirms that the Godhead is one substance, and that in this one substance there is a trinality of persons. Perhaps the simplest statement of this truth is found in the Nicene Creed which declares “There is but one living and true God And in the unity of this Godhead there be Three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” The doctrine of the Trinity is one of the deepest and most sacred in the Christian system. Stearns points out that St. Augustine in beginning one of the books in his treatise on the Trinity breathes the following prayer: “I pray to our Lord God himself, of whom we ought always to think worthily, in praise of whom blessing is at all times rendered, and whom no speech is sufficient to declare, that He will grant me both help for understanding and explaining that which I design, and pardon if in anything I offend” (De Trinitate, 5: 1: 1) . Whether or not God would have revealed Himself as Trinity, if man had continued sinless, we need not inquire. We do know that it is in the mystery of redemption that this truth comes into clear vision. Reason may have suspected it, but only in the redemptive Christ has it been made visible. Nor can we enter into this most sacred sanctuary of the Christian faith by way of human knowledge, but only through Christ who is the Way as well as the Truth and the Life The Experiential Basis of the Doctrine. The doctrine of the Trinity is in the Bible as humid air. The cool wave of reflection through which the church passed, condensed its thought and precipitated what all along had been in solution. While there are philosophical views of the Trinity, yet philosophical analysis probably never could have produced, and certainly did not produce it

It arose as an expression of experience, and that too, of an experience which was complex and rich. The doctrine is an attempt at simplification, stating and summarizing briefly what is given more at length in the New Testament. It was religion before it was theology, and in order to be effective must again become in each of us, religion as well as theology The doctrine of the Trinity is not, therefore, a merely theoretical or speculative one. It is intensely practical. With it is bound up our eternal salvation. It is revealed historically in close connection with redemption, and not merely as an abstract metaphysical or theological conception. God the Father sent His Son into the world to redeem us; God the Son became incarnate in order to save us; and the Holy Spirit applies the redemptive work to our souls. The Trinity, therefore, is vitally involved in the work of redemption, and it is from this practical and religious aspect of the doctrine that the truth must be approached. Because of its bearing on human conduct and destiny, it has been necessary to define it metaphysically in order to prevent its perversion by speculative thought. The doctrine, while receiving contributions from the various systems and types of philosophy, does not owe its origin to any of them, and can never be fully explained by them The experience of the apostles and early disciples was intensely religious, rich, luxuriant and all-compelling. The Epistles of St. Paul which form an open gateway to the thought and life of the New Testament, reveal a full-fledged organized religion, a Church living in the ardent belief that Christ as the divinely glorified Son of God, was giving its life to it by the Holy Spirit. But later Judaism into which this new religion came was also a fully organized religion, aflame with faith in one God, the revealed law of

God, and the coming of the kingdom of God. It held at least some belief also, in a Messiah who should be connected with the Spirit of the Lord, and by this means inaugurate the new kingdom. What happened between these two viewpoints must furnish the clue to a solution of the problem. First, Jesus had ap peared in a ministry like that of the old prophets, had later been recognized as the Messiah by some of His disciples, had then claimed the title at Jerusalem, was then regarded with religious awe by His disciples, discredited and put to death by the rulers, leaving behind Him an utterly discouraged and desolate following. Second, there had followed immediately many appearances of Jesus risen and glorified, and these had turned the testimony of the disciples into one of triumphant joy. Third, after a brief period of tarrying in Jerusalem, there had been the bestowal of the Holy Spirit according to promise; and this had issued in confident and successful missionary effort. These facts were sufficient to bridge the gap, and accounted for the success of the gospel ministry through a continuation of the mystical presence of Christ in the Church. Increasing attention was of necessity given to Christ in the thought of the Church. He was proved to be the Messiah by the resurrection from the dead, and the bestowal of the Divine Spirit. Hence He was invoked in prayer, and without sharp personal distinctions was called God THE SCRIPTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

It is to the sacred Scriptures we must turn, as a foundation for our faith in both the unity and triunity of God. As God can be known only through His self-revelation, so also the Trinitarian distinctions which re~ late to the inner life of the Godhead can be known in no other wag (Cf. 1 Corinthians 2:10-12) The Unity of God. That the Lord our God is one Lord, is a truth asserted or implied throughout the entire body of Scripture. In earliest times the Israelite confessed his faith as he does now in the words, Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord (Deuteronomy 6:4). In the midst of the most seductive forms of polytheism, it was necessary that the Israelite be thoroughly instructed in the divine unity. The first and fundamental commandment therefore was, Thou shalt have no othergods before me (Exodus 20:3). Hence we find such statements as the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him (Deuteronomy 4:35. Cf. also 1 Kings 8:60). Of Jehovah Isaiah says, I am the Lord: that is my name:and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images (Isaiah 42:8; and again, I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God (Isaiah 44:6). Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any (Isaiah 44:8). In the New Testament we find the same explicit statements. And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, 0 Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord (Mark 12:29). And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jestts Christ, whom thou hast sent (John 17:3). Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also (Romans 3:29). There is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him (1 Corinthians 8:4-6). Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one (Galatians 3:20). (Cf. also 1 Timothy 1:17; 1 Timothy 2:5 and James 2:19.) The Triunity of God. That God is equally regarded as a Trinity is also clear from the Scriptures. The proof is usually drawn from the theophany at the time of Christ’s baptism; and from the fact that in the Scriptures, divine names, divine attributes, divine works and divine worship are ascribed respectively to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit. The baptismal formula is the fundamental text, in which two Persons are united with the Father, in a manner not elsewhere found in the Scriptures. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matthew 28:19). Closely associated with the baptismal formula are the benedictions which link together the three names of Deity. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen (II

Cor. 13: 14); and the gifts of the Spirit also as in 1 Corinthians 12:4-6, Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And thcrc are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. Since those who acknowledge the existence of a personal God never question His Fatherhood, it is evident that the question concerning the Trinity resolves itself into the proof of the Deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit The Old Testament Conception. There has been much discussion in theology as to whether or not the Old Testament gives us a revelation of the Trinity. Among the older dogmatists, Quenstedt maintained that since this doctrine is necessary for salvation, it must have been clearly taught in the Old Testament and known to the Old Testament saints. Calovius likewise taught that the doctrine is explicit in the Old Testament, and found fault with Calixtus for teaching that it was only implicitly there. Modern thought, however, seems to favor the position of Calixtus. Dr. Stump, a Lutheran theologian of the present time, breaks with the thought of the older dogmatists of his church, and asserts that the doctrine of the Trinity is not explicitly taught in the Old Testament, that it is a New Testament truth and could not be known until revealed in Christ, that the Jews never found it there, and had we no revelation but that contained in the Old Testament we should be in ignorance of the doctrine (STUMP,The Christian Faith, pp. 47, 48). We may safely take the position that the doctrine of the Trinity, like all other New Testament truths, was contained in germ in the Old Testament; but only with the revelation of God in Christ could it come to full development. In the clear light of the Christian disThe doctrine of the Trinity, like every other, had in the mystery of the divine education in the Church, its siow development. Remembering the law, that the progress of Old Testament doctrine must be traced in the light of the New Testament, we can discern throughout the ancient records a preintimation of the Three-One, ready to be revealed in the last time. No word of ancient record is to be studied as standing alone; but according to the analogy of faith, which is no other than the one truth that reigns in the organic whole of Scripture.—PoPE, Cornpendiwm of Christian Theology, I, p. 260 our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hear, ing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive (Acts 28:25-26). Here then the Trisagion is by later Scripture regarded as a reference to the Trinity. The descriptions of the Messiah found in the Old Testament refer implicitly to the Trinity also, but these will be considered in a later paragraph. It is sufficient to mention but two of them here. Isaiah in referring to the Messiah says, And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me (Isaiah 48:16) words manifestly spoken by the Messiah who declares Himself to be sent by the Lord God and his Spirit. The second reference is similar and is found in Haggai 2:4-7, I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts: according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you; fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts;. .. . I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come. Here there is a threefold reference to the Lord of hosts, his Spirit, and the Messiah as the Desire of all nations The Son and the Spirit in the Old Testament. There is no direct and immediate foreannouncement of the Son in the Old Testament, because the Fatherhood of God was not as such revealed. Both the Fatherhood and the Sonship are New Testament revelations and the one waited for the other. But the idea of sonship permeates the entire Old Testament Scriptures, from the first verse of Genesis to the last

verse of Malachi. Occasional mention of the Son may be admitted also. We have already indicated that intimations of the Second Person of the Trinity are to be found first of all in such expressions as “the Angel of Jehovah,” “the Word or Wisdom,” and the descriptions of the Messiah. The “Angel of the Lord” refers directly to the eternal Logos, who while distinct from Jehovah is yet Jehovah himself. And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord (Genesis 22:15-16). Here the “angel of the Lord” is clearly identified with Jehovah. It was the ‘angel of the Lord” who called to Moses out of the burning bush and said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God (Exodus 3:6). (Cf. also, Genesis 16:9-11; Genesis 48:1-22 :

14; Exodus 23:20-21; Judges 13:20-22). The second intimation of the Divine Sonship is found in the use of the terms “Word” and “Wisdom,” which express in a clearer manner the Divine Logos which was to become incarnate in the likeness of men. The “Word” appears in veiled form in the third verse of Genesis. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light (Genesis 1:3). The word “said” is the first intimation of the Logos or Word. This appears in clearer form in the personification of Wisdom found in the eighth chapter of Proverbs, and a portion of the ninth. Here Lady Wisdom appears in contrast with Madame Folly (Proverbs 9:13-18). Doth not wisdom cry? The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old Then was I by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him (Proverbs 8:1; Proverbs 8:22; Proverbs 8:30). We may say, therefore, that the Word appears at first in abstract form, then as personified, and later as the Word made flesh (John 1:1-18). It is in the descriptions of the Messiah that we find the clearest vision of the Second Person of the Trinity as the Divine Son. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the g3vernment shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, the Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace (Isaiah 9:6)

Throughout the Gospels, from Gabriel’s testimony to the angel greater than he, downwards, there is no question that the Jehovah-Angel is Jehovah himself, and that Jehovah himself reappears in the name Lord, very often though not exclusively. Not Esaias alone, but all the Old Testament writers, saw his glory andspake of him (John 12:41). But the uncreated minister of Jehovah’s will is not generally in the Old Testament foreannounced as the Son, any more than Jehovah is revealed as the Father. This, however, is not quite wanting. The link that connects the Angel of the Face in the ancient with the Son in the later Scripture is threefold. He is in the Psalms and Prophecy termed the Son expressly, the word or Oracle of God or hypostatised wisdom; and He is called Adonai or Lord, the Mighty God, But these more occasional testimonies flow into a general representation of the future Messiah; and as such they must be reserved for the fuller exhibition of the Mediatorial Trinity, and the Person of Christ.—Poes, Compendium of Christian Theology, I, p. 263

52, Acts 1:24; Acts 7:59-60, Hebrews 1:6, Revelation 5:13). Here may be mentioned also the doxologies, ascriptions of praise, and benedictions. To him be glory, both now and forever. Amen (2 Peter 3:18). Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen (Revelation 1:5-6). Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ (Romans 1:7). The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and! the

communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all (2 Corinthians 13:14) The personality and deity of the Holy Spirit does not require the same extended discussion, as that which has just been given to the deity of the Son, inasmuch as many of the principles involved have already been considered. That the Person of the Holy Spirit is distinct from that of the Father and the Son is clearly taught in the Scriptures. He is called “the Spirit,” “the Spirit of God,” “the Holy Spirit,” “the Spirit of glory.” He is spoken of by our Lord as “the Comforter” or “another Comforter.” That the Holy Spirit is more than an attribute or an influence is brought out clearly in the words of our Lord, I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever (John 14:16). But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you (John 14:26). Here the Holy Spirit is expressly stated to be the Third Person, as the Father is the First and the Son the Second in the Holy Trinity. There are certain texts, also, where it would be mere redundancy to speak of the Holy Spirit as a power or influence from God. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power (Acts 10:38). That ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost (Romans 15:1-33 :

13). Here it is evident that the Holy Spirit cannot be regarded as a power, but must be thought of as a person. Again, there are distinct symbolical representations of the Holy Ghost, as the dove at the baptism of Jesus and the rushing wind and the tongues of fire at Pentecost. But the highest evidence is the fact that the personal pronoun with a neuter noun is used in reference to the Holy Spirit. It is a departure from the ordinary rule to use a masculine pronoun with a neuter noun, says Dr. Charles Hodge, unless the masculine is warranted by the fact that the person referred to may be called “He.” Hence the use of the masculine pronoun is strong evidence that the writers of Sacred Scripture intended to set forth the personality of the Holy Spirit The deity of the Holy Spirit may be proved scripturally, by a collation of texts as in the case of the Divine Sonship. The name of God, His attributes, His works and His worship are all applied to the Holy Spirit. We can give only a few instances of the many found in the scriptures: Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God (Acts 5:3-4). The Apostle Paul in his reference to spiritual gifts attributes them to that self-same Spirit and concludes with the statement that it is the same God which worketh all in all (1 Corinthians 12:6-11). He also applies the term “Lord” to the Holy Spirit, Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (2 Corinthians 3:17). The work of Inspiration, as has been pointed out, is peculiarly the office of the Spirit. Hence we read that God spake unto the fathers by the prophets (Hebrews 1:1). St. Peter attributes this inspiration to the Spirit, holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter 1:21) and further to the Spirit of Christ which was in them (1 Peter 1:11) THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH

During the apostolic and subapostolic period, the doctrine of the Trinity was held in an undogmatic form. There was no scientific or technical expression of it, nor was there any necessity, until heresies arose which demanded exact and guarded statements. The fact Both Irenarns and Tertullian connected the Son and the Spirit with the Father to form a triad which tended toward either dytheism or tritheism accordingly as the Spirit was regarded as personal or impersonal. To safeguard against this, the idea of subordination was introduced which gave precedence to the Father and led immediately to what Tertullian first called Monarchism. “To be sure the plain people,” he says, “not to call them ignorant and common—of whom the greater portion of believers

is always composed . . . . shrink back from the economy They are constantly throwing out the accusation that we preach two gods and three gods We hold, they say, the monarchy" (Adv. Prax 3). Thus there arose the acute problem of attempting to relate Christ to God and yet preserve the belief in monotheism. Monarchism was a vain attempt to reconcile the Trinity with the essential unity of the Godhead, and took many forms. They all agreed in denying the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, and maintained that the Father alone is God. The first, or Dynamistic form, which regarded Christ as a creature, found its development in Origen's subordinationism and later in Arianism. The second form, known as Modalistic or Sabellian, identified Christ with the Father and regarded the Trinity solely as economic, that is, simply as three modes of manifestation. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit were therefore the same Divine Person manifesting Himself in different capacities Antitrinitarian Theories. Theologians usually classify the Antitrinitarian theories as (1) Monarchianism;

(2) Nominal Trinitarianism; and (3) Humanitarianism. Dr. Shedd and Dr. Foster both use this classification. (1) Monarchianism. The Monarchians, through a misapprehension of the nature of divine unity, held that the Trinity was irreconcilable with it. God the FaThe earliest tradition not only spoke of Jesus as sciSpioc, o'wr~5pand

&~5ácncaXoc, but as 6 vib~ roD OeoV, and this name was firmly adhered to in the Gentile Christian communities. It followed immediately from this that Jesus belongs to the sphere of God, and that, as is said in the earliest preaching known to us, one must think of Him cit repl OeoD.—HARNACK, Hist. of Dogma, I, p. 186 ther was the only Person, who becoming incarnate they called God the Son, or Logos. In this incarnate form, it was the Father himself who suffered for the sin of mankind. For this reason they were called Patripassionists or Father-sufferers. They denied a proper soul in the person of Jesus Christ, maintaining that He was God in alliance with a physical organization, but having no real human nature. The principal representatives of this form or Monarchianism were Praxeas (100: 200), who was opposed by Tertullian in his tract, Adversus Praxean; Ncetus (100: 230) opposed by Hippolytus in his Contra Hceresin Nceti; and Beryl (100: 250) an Arabian bishop who later was convinced of his error and renounced his Patripassionism. (2) Nominal Trinitarianism. This form of Monarchianism held that Christ was divine but not true Deity. The distinction between "divinity" and "deity" has held an important place in the history of Trinitarianism. The Logos was not regarded as a Person, but only the Divine Wisdom or Reason which emanated from Essential Deity, and united itself in a pre-eminent manner with the man Jesus at His birth. Because illuminated in a higher degree than any of the prophets before Him, the man Jesus was called the Son of God. The chief representative of Nominal Trinitarianism was Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (100: 260). He was pronounced heretical by two Antiochian synods, and after much delay was deposed from his office. Sabellius occupied a mediating position between this and the preceding forms of Monarchianism. His teachings will be presented in a later paragraph. (3) Humanitarianism. The Humanitarians asserted the mere and sole humanity of Christ and denied His divinity in any form. Some held to the ordinary humanity and others to an extraordinary humanity. Here we may class the Ebionites, Theodotians, Artemonites, Alogi and Cerinthians. They were so far afield from the commonly accepted teachings of Scripture that the Church engaged in no conflict or controversy with them

Sabellianism. This form of Monarchianism adopted the Modal Theory of the Trinity. It rejected the theory of three hypostases or Persons, and substituted, instead, three prosopa or faces or

semblances, corresponding to the three dispensations of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The doctrine was first taught by Praxeas in Rome, Ncetus in Smyrna and Beryl in Arabia, but it remained for Sabellius (100: 250-260) Presbyter of Ptolemais in Pentapolis to more fully develop the error which has taken his name. He held that God manifested Himself in three personal modes. God as Father is Creator; and manifested through the Incarnation the same God is known as the Son and fulfills the office of redeemer; and lastly, as the Holy Spirit, God carries on His spiritual ministry in the Church. The principle is pantheistic for it is the same God evolving Himself as Jehovah, then more clearly to His creatures as the Son, and still more fully and spiritually as the Holy Spirit. The only point which satisfied the Christian faith was the deity of the Son, but in asserting this, Sabellianism denied the distinct personality of the Father and the Holy Spirit. Its opposition to the scriptural position was clear, for there the Father is constantly addressing the Son, and the Son the Father. Dr. Shedd regards the position of Sabellius as midway between Patripassionism and Nominal Trinitarianism. He belongs to the first class in that he denied that Christ was merely an ordinary man upon whom the Divine Logos exerted a peculiar influence, and affirmed that the Logos power belonged to the proper personality of Christ. He approaches the second class in that he regards the Logos and the Holy Spirit as two powers (Svvctj~tac) streaming forth from the Divine Essence, through which God works and reveals Himself (Cf. SHEDD, History of Christian Doctrine, I, p. 257). The decisive blow against Monarchianism was struck by Origen of the Alexandrian School, in his De Principiis or First Principles, a work generally acknowledged to be the first positive and systematic presentation of Christian doctrine

Arianism. At the other extreme from Sabellianism is Arianism, which takes its name from the Presbyterrius (256-336), who held an important position in the Church of Alexandria at the time the controversy with Bishop Alexander began, about 318 AD. There were two stages in the full development of Arianism, (1) that of subordinationism as advocated by Origen, but which assumed various forms as presented by different writers: and (2) Arianism proper, which found expression in the teachings of Anus himself

1. The Subordinationism of Origen grew out of an attempt to explain the doctrine of the Trinity in the light of the current philosophy of his time. The Gnostics had upheld the Monarchian principle, by maintaining a series of emanations from what was known as Primal Being. The Neo-Platonists, especially Philo, had modified Platonism and applied this philosophy to the theology of the Old Testament. The Logos according to both Plato and Philo was the collective term for the ideal world. It was the Divine Reason, which containing in itself the ideas or types of all things, became in turn the living principles by which all actual existences are formed. In the development of the Philonic Logos, the term came to be used in a twofold manner: (1) as transcendent Reason, apart from its manifestation, to which the term Logos endiathetos (X~yoc evSuW€rog) was applied; and (2) as a personal existence begotten in the Divine Essence, and as such the Divine Archetype or Firstborn of Creation. To this term Logos pros phorikos (X6yoc irpoo-çbopuc6c) was applied, although Philo used other terms especially vMc or life, So'ea or glory (as used in the New Testament) and 8d'mpoc e€6~ a second or other God. In the first or transcendent sense, the Logos was merely impersonal and eternal reason. It was the sum or total of all the ideas and types, which in an abstract sense, existed as the archetypal forms in which created existences were to appear. In the second or personal sense, especially in its later development, the The writers during the first three centuries of the church may be classified as follows: (1) The catholic

doctrine of the Trinity: Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras, Iren~us, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, Novatian and Dionysius of Rome. (II) Monarchians or Unitarians: Theodotus, Artemon and Paul of Samosata. (III) Patripassionists or Sabellians: Praxeas, Noetus, Beryllus of Bostra and Sabellius

Logos was the sell-manifestation of God, which in creation had its birth and was sent forth or projected, as giving form and life to all things. It was divine but subordinate, divinity but not deity, except in a limited and accommodated sense. Those who held to the Monarchian principle, attempted to explain the Trinity on the basis of the concealed or hidden God, revealing Himself by two Powers streaming forth like rays of light from the sun. The one was an illuminating Power, the Logos or Divine Reason, existing first as the reflective reason of the Deity by which He is capable of rational intelligence (X6'yoc Ev&cWEroc), and second, the outworking of that self-expressive reason, whereby He creates and communicates with His creation, (Xdyoc 'rrpocr4'optKo'c). As the Logos was the illuminating Power, so the Holy Spirit was the enlivening Power, but neither were regarded as hypostases, only emanations. Justin Martyr, Tatian and Theophilus, on the other hand, applied the term Logos to Christ, but in the sense of hypostasis, and therefore asserted His personality. Justin in his Apologia (I, 13) declares, "We worship the Creator of this universe Again we have learned that He who taught us these things, and who for this end was born, even Jesus Christ was the Son of Him who is truly called God; and we esteem Him the second place. And that we with reason honor the Prophetic Spirit in the third rank, we shall hereafter shew." While Christ was by this means exalted above all creatures, it did not meet the demands of the Christian consciousness, in that it made the divinity The learned Christians of the second century confined their discussions of the Trinity largely to the Logos, a term applied in the New Testament to Christ. These philosophizing Christians connected in general the same idea with the term Logos as was done by Philo and the other Platonists, and consequently in many instances drifted far from the Johannine conception. The Neo-Platonists understood by the term Logos, the infinite understanding of God, which they conceived to be a substance which emanated with its functions from God. They supposed that it belonged from eternity to His nature as a power, but that agreeably to the divine will, as Justin expresses it, it began to exist out of the divine nature, and is therefore different from God its Creator and Father, and yet as begotten of Him, is entirely divine. The Holy Spirit was more rarely mentioned by these early Fathers, and their views respecting Him are far less clearly expressed than concerning the Son.—Cf. KxAPP, Christian Theology, p. 149 of Christ essentially subordinate, and His generation antemundane, but not eternal. They saw that after all the distinction between the hidden God (6 Seóc) or God in Himself, and the Logos, (866c), or God in nature, was but a revamping of the pagan pantheism which makes the universe a manifestation of the existence of God

It is at this point that the work of Origen begins, his deductions being of such importance that they mark an epoch in the history of Trinitarianism. Origen lifted the doctrine of the Logos to a higher plane, and introduced in his speculative thought, the idea of eternal generation. Tertullian had identified the Logos with the Son, and both he and Irena?us differed from Justin in that they employed the word "Son" more frequently than the term "Logos." They thereby brought more of the personal element into the doctrine. But Origen grasped more fully than his predecessors the idea of son-ship and its importance. This led him to assert that the Son was as truly a hypostasis as the Father, and that to either, the personal pronouns could be strictly applied. He associated the Holy

Spirit in dignity with the Father and the Son, but maintained that He had not the same immediate relation to the Father as did the Son, although He has direct knowledge and searches the deep things of God. Origen endeavored to harmonize the Trinity of Persons with the unity of essence by employing the idea of eternal generation. By this he meant, the eternal generation of the Son by the will of the Father. There are two momenta here, first, a subordination of the hypostasis of the Son to that of the Father in respect to essence, and second, creation as opposed to emanation. Origen opposed the idea that the Logos was merely antemundane and came into full expression through birth in creation, and asserted instead an eternal existence of the Logos. He objected to the position of the emanationists that the Son is generated out of the essence of the Father, and maintained that the generation of the Son proceeds eternally from the will of the Father. He was concerned primarily with the personality of the Son as over against Monarchianism, but he so interpreted this relationship as to make the Son subordinate in essence. Basing his discussion upon John 1:1 he makes a distinction between God (®€6c) as divinity, and the God (6 &6c) as deity. He uses, therefore, the article in referring to the Father or God as unbegotten, and omits it when the Logos or Word is denominated God. This leads him to adopt that form of subordinationism which holds that the Son does not participate in the self-subsistent substance of the Deity and therefore it is not proper to use the term homoousios (61.tooiicnoc) of the Son as being consubstantial with the Father. This furnished the basis upon which Anus later developed his idea of the creaturehood of Christ. Yet at the same time, Origen denied that Christ was a creature, insisting that he is of a nature “midway between that of the Uncreated and that of all creatures.” This distinction between the Son and the created universe, he maintains, lies in this, that the Son derives his divinity (®E~c) immediately from the Absolute Deity (6 e€~c), while the universe derives its being immediately through the Son who is the Logos or first ground and cause of all things. In proof of this he cites John 5:26, For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, that is, God the Father (6 O€I~c) has given to God the Son (®e?ic) to have life in Himself; and therefore He becomes the Creator of the world, which in relationship to God, is one degree farther removed. In this sense He cannot be classed wholly with the creatures. Origen, therefore, denies “that there was a time when He was not,” and on this ground was cited as an authority by the Athanasians in their opposition to the Arians

2. Arianism proper was the most formidable enemy encountered in the development of the Trinitarian doctrine. Anus was from the school of Lucian of Antioch, where the dynamic Monarchianism of Paul Samosata was the dominating influence. This, conjoined with the Jewish idea of transcendency, prejudiced him in favor of the unity of God to the disparagement of the Trinitarian concept. Anus sought to find a place for Christ above that of creation, and yet outside the Godhead. Beginning with the idea of subordinationism as advanced by Origen, the ultimate effect of his teaching was to make both Christ and the Holy Spirit created beings. God alone was eternal, and could not therefore communicate His substance to any created being. Furthermore, he regarded the unity of God in such a transcendent manner, that it not only excluded all distinctions within the Godhead, but also all contacts without it. When God would create the world, it was necessary for Him first to create the Son or “Word” as His Agent. The Son as a creature suggests that God was not always Father but became such only in the creation of the Son, who, therefore, was of a different essence from the Father. The Son, however, was different from other creatures by way of pre-eminence, so that we may speak of him as “God only Begotten.” Anus explains his view in a letter addressed to Eusebius of Nicomedia as follows: “But we say and

believe, and have taught and do teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor in any way unbegotten, even in part; and that He does not derive His subsistence from anything subjacent; but that by His own will and counsel He has subsisted before time, and before ages, as perfect God, only begotten and unchangeable, and that He existed not before He was begotten, or created, or determined, or established. For He was not unbegotten. We are persecuted because we say that the Son had a beginning, but that God was without beginning. We repeat it—for this we are persecuted, and also because we say that He is from nothing. And this we affirm, because He is neither part of God, nor of anything subjacent." According to Anus, Christ took only a human body in the incarnation, not a human soul; and the Holy Spirit bears the same relation to the Son that the Son does to the Father As the doctrine of the Trinity grew out of the devotional life of the Church and not out of philosophy, so it was its devotional consciousness and not its philosophy that rejected the Arian heresy. If Christ was not God, then to worship Him was idolatry. Again as Athanasius pointed out, Arianism destroyed the ground of redemption in Christ. If He was neither God nor man, He could not be a mediator; and if He could not himself know the Father, how could He reveal Him to others. Thus the Church then, as since that time, has rejected every attempt to make Christ a mere creature. The chief value of the Arian controversy lay in the fact that it forced the Church to clarify its belief in the Trinity, and to so state this belief as to include Jesus Christ within the eternal being of God. This it has done in the Nicene Creed (325) and its later revision at Constantinople (381), sometimes known as the Nicico-Constantinopolitan Creed. A more explicit statement is also given in the so-called Athanasian Creed of later date (449 A.D.). After a brief notice of the Trinitarian developments as found in the writings of the schoolmen and the Reformers, we shall give attention to the various forms in which the doctrine of the Trinity is stated, and summarize the results as generally held in the Church The Schoolmen and the Reformers. The Trinitarian doctrine underwent some change in the controversy over the single or double procession of the Holy Spirit, but otherwise the Nicene statement was generally accepted by the schoolmen. Through the influence of John of Damascus, the Eastern Church confirmed the creed and adopted the doctrine of a single procession, the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father only. Following this the emperor Charlemagne called a synod at Aix4a-Chapelle in 809 A.D. which added the word fihioque to the creed adopted at Constantinople, thus confirming the doctrine of the Western Church that the Spirit proceeded from the Father "and from the Son." Of necessity, therefore, the doctrine of the Trinity challenged the philosophical ingenuity of the scholastics and the imagination of the mystics. The dominant philosophy of the universals greatly influenced the thought of the schoolmen. John Scotus Erigena (100: 800-877) of Gnostic or Neo-Platonist tendencies, leaned toward Sabellianism. He declared that there were no distinctions in the divine essence corresponding to the names Father, Son and Spirit. Roscelinus on the other hand was a nominalist in philosophy and therefore regarded the term God common to the three Persons as a mere name, the abstract idea of a genus under which the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit are to be comprehended. By this position he laid himself open to the charge of tritheism. Abelard, also a nominalist (10 79-1142) fell into Sabellian views by maintaining that Power, Wisdom and Love were the three persons of the Trinity and that any distinction was merely nominal. Gilbert de Ia Porree (1076-1154) was a realist in philosophy but reached the same results as Roscelinus. He was charged with separating the persons much as did Anus. The error of Sabellianism, according to Gilbert, was a failure to distinguish between the quo est and the quod est, that is, we may say that the Father, Son and Spirit are one, but not that God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He

distinguished between God and the Godhead as between humanity and man, the former being the universal form in which man exists, but not man himself. This was an attempted compromise between the realist position in regard to the essence, and the nominalist position concerning the three persons. Gilbert was accused of reviving the error of Tetratheism held by Damian of Alexandria, but was not formally condemned. Anselm (1033-1109) was an extreme realist and defended the unity of God against the tritheistic position of Roscelinus The Reformers were faithful to the doctrine of the Trinity as set forth in the three Creeds. They were given to careful analysis, and carried to a higher degree of perfection the philosophical distinctions worked out with such ingenuity by the schoolmen. They maintained that the one essence subsisted in three Persons, the unity being numerical and the triunity hypostatical. They worked out minutely the distinctions between the properties and the processions, the acts ab intra, generation and spiration, and the acts ab extra, creation, redemption and sanctification. The circumcession is peculiarly a doctrine of the Reformation. Following the Reformation the older errors reappeared from time to time, the principal heretical doctrine being that of Socinianism, which issued later in modern Unitarianism This is a revival of the ancient Monarchianism, which recognizes the Father only as God, and denies the deity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit THE TECHNICAL TERMS OF THE CREED The technical terms in which the Church has set forth the doctrine of the Trinity demand special consideration. The terms “substance” and “essence” have already been discussed in connection with the philosophical conception of God. The terms which now demand attention are unity and trinity; person, subsistence and hypostasis; procession, generation and spiration; property and relation; mission and economy; circumcession and monarchy

Unity and Trinity. Unity as applied to God is used in connection with substance or essence, trinity in connection with persons. Thus Una substantia and Tres Personce first used by Tertullian came to be the accepted formula for expressing the unity and triunity of God. The term Trias was first used by Theophilus (100: 180) in connection with God, His Word and His Wisdom. Somewhat later than this the word trinitas was used by Tertullian. The formula Una substantia or “one substance” was used in a philosophical sense to denote a real entity. To Tertullian it was the underlying being by which things are what they are, and was, therefore, a deeper term than natura or “nature,” which he used only to denote the sum-total of the properties of things

Person, Subsistence and Hypostasis. The Latin word persona presupposes another term frequently used in theology, that of suppositurn, by which is meant an individual in the concrete sense. A person is a suppositurn with a rational nature or a rational individual. The term persona or “person” applies to the principle of unity, or to the center of that rational nature. In the modern use of the word, a person is the individual sub- ject or self (cn)r6c) of a rational nature, self-conscious and self-determining, and includes also the nature and properties of which it is the subject. This latter, however, is frequently termed personality in contradistinction to the individual subject. But in theology the word is never used in this sense. Here it must be clearly distinguished from the content of the nature of which it is the subject. It does not include the nature so united, nor the content or system of experience, nor is it the core or any part of this content. It is rather that by which the entire system of experience is united, a position of peculiar importance in Christology. The divine persons are not therefore separate individuals, but possess in common, one nature or substance, their distinction lying not in a separate substance, but in the manner in which they share the same substance. Since human persons are associated with bodies and are

separated in space, it is difficult for us to conceive of persons without the idea of separateness. By subsistence is meant a distinction within ultimate substance rather than substance itself. The term is reserved for the distinctions of the Trinity, and as commonly used is the equivalent of person or hypostasis The term hypostasis (i)irdcrrao-cc) is also used to express the distinctions of the Trinity, and as such is the equivalent of person or subsistence. The word originally meant simply being (ot)crta), and in this sense was the exact equivalent of the Latin word substance (substantia). But it also conveyed another meaning, that of the abiding reality of a thing which persisted through all changes and experiences. In this sense it most nearly approaches the term “ego,” and consequently came to be used in the sense of a subsistence or person. The use of the term in a twofold sense brought great confusion into the Church. The Latins used not only the word essence to translate ousia (oi)o-ta), but they used the word substance (substantia) to translate both hypostasis (l)lr&rrcw-tc) and ousia (oi)o-ta). The word hypostasis therefore became ambiguous. Augustine says, “That which must be understood of persons according to our usage, is to be understood of substances, according to Greek usage; for they say three substances (hypostases) one essence (essentia) in the same way as we say three persons, one essence or substance (essentiam vet substantiarn).” Bicknell points out that those who used ön-&rracnc as a synonym for oOcrta and spoke of pkt frwScrrao-tc seemed Sabellians to those who distinguished between the terms. Conversely, those who distinguished between them and spoke of rpeic l)lTocrr&ac seemed tritheists to those who regarded the two terms as synonymous. However at the Council of Alexandria (362) both uses of the word were recognized, and the formula rp€Zc -i)1Toonb~ec was approved as orthodox. After this the Eastern Church settled down to the formula j.cia. oi)cta rpac i5~roorc~oELc and the West retained its Una substantia, Tres Personce (Cf. BIcKNELL, Thirty-nine Articles, p. 65)

Procession, Generation and Spiration. By procession is meant the origin of one person from another. It belongs to both Son and Spirit in a general way, but more specifically to the Holy Spirit alone. By generation is meant an eternal relation which always exists, and not merely an event which once happened and then ceased to happen. The generation of the Son is usually referred to in theology as eternal generation. This does not mean that the Father existed before the Son, or that the attributes of the former are greater than those of the latter, but that the Father has his nature from Himself, and the Son has His nature by the gift of the Father (Cf. John 5:26). The term spiration is similar to that of generation and is the peculiar property of the Spirit. As the Son is said to be generated by the Father, so the Spirit is said to be spirated by the Father, and in a secondary sense by the Son

Properties and Relations. By properties (proprietates) are meant the peculiar characteristics of the persons; by relation is meant the order in which one person stands toward another. The properties are paternity (which means “to be of none”), filiation and procession. Paternity is the property par excellence of the Father, filiation is the property of the Son, and procession the property of the Holy Spirit. The relations are these:

1. The Father to the Son, paternity; the Father to the Spirit, spiration 2. The Son to the Father, filiation; the Son to the Spirit, spiration (Western theology)

3. The Spirit to the Father, procession; the Spirit to the Son procession, but in a sense different from that of the procession from the Father The Missions and Economies. The relations just

mentioned are eternal processions, sometimes known as opera ad intra; and from these the temporal processions or missions are derived. The working out of these missions constitutes the economies. They are not separate activities of the Persons since the activity of God is one, but relations to some temporal and external effect, or opera ad extra. It is evident that distinction must be made between the one who sends and the one who is sent (John 8:42); and it must be further recognized that the Person sent stands in some new relation to that to which he is sent (or terminus ad quem). The change is not in the Person but in the economic relation. For this reason the Father is specially related to God's work in creation; the Son by incarnation is specially related to God's work in redemption; and the Holy Spirit by His indwelling is specially related to God's work in sanctification. The entire Trinity of Persons of course comes into the world (John 8:42; John 14:23; John 16:7), but the Father does not proceed and therefore is not sent, while both the Son and the Spirit, though in different ways, proceed from the Father. The relation of each Person to the temporal effect is therefore different, and this accounts for the fact that acts are attributed to one Person rather than another. In this sense we may say (1) Hall classifies the Trinitarian terms as follows: There are one Nature, two processions (Son from the Father, the Spirit from the Father through the Son); three Properties (Paternity, Filiation and Procession); four relations (Paternity, Filiation, Spiration and Procession); and five notions (notiones) (Inascibility, Paternity, Spiration belong to the Father, Fiiation and Spiration to the Son, and Procession to the Spirit.) the Father is God above us; (2) the Son is God with us; and (3) the Holy Spirit is God in us. Thus the religious values of the economies make the Christian religion the full expression of practical and spiritual values. St. Paul used the term economy (oiicovopla) or "law of the house" in the sense of a dispensation or plan of God's government. It carries with it, however, the thought of truth as not having been fully revealed, and hence the apostle calls it a mystery (j.wo-n5ptov), incomprehensible in its fullness, but intelligible in so far as it has been revealed. The term "economical Trinity" has reference to the revelation of God progressively as Father, then as Son and finally as Spirit. In this sense it is true. It becomes false only when it is held to be merely aspects of one God, and not eternal distinctions in the divine essence itself. The twofold idea of the "essential Trinity" and the "economic Trinity" must be held in firm grasp, if there is to be any proper view of this fundamental doctrine of 'Christianity

Circurncession and Monarchy. Having recognized the distinctness of the Persons of the Trinity and their religious value, it becomes necessary to emphasize the divine unity in a new and different manner, not now because of the unity of their substance, but over and above this in the sense of social unity. The doctrine of the Circumcession (ir€pt~ct5pr~crtc or coinherence cnq.LITEpLxwp')7cnc) maintains that the three Persons permeate or dwell in each other by sharing the one nature, thereby giving social unity in the plurality of Persons. The Latin equivalents of perichoresis or mutual permeation are Interactiio, Interexistentia and Intercommunio. The Monarchia or Divine Monarchy further stresses the unity of the Godhead by maintaining one source of the Divine Persons, that is, the Father, and this in the sense of genetic unity or a kinship group THE EVANGELICAL DOCTRINE The evangelical doctrine of the Trinity is best expressed in the ancient creeds and articles of faith. The Athanasian Creed has the most explicit statement. It says, "We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal." Article I of the Thirty-nine Articles as revised by John Wesley

and the Methodist bishops of 1789 is as follows:

“There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity— the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” (Art. I of the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism.) We may say, therefore, that the evangelical doctrine affirms that the Godhead is of one substance, and that in the unity of this substance there are three subsistences or Persons; and further, that this must be held in such a manner as to not divide the substance or confuse the Persons. We shall therefore, summarize our statement of the doctrine under four heads as follows: (1) The Unity of the Essence; (2) The Trinity of Persons; (3) The Divine Monarchy and (4) The Circumcession The Unity of Essence. The term unity is applied to the essence or substance of God, trinity to His personality. It is sometimes asserted that unity and trinity are contradictory terms, but the Church has never used the one and the three in the same sense. It does not teach that the three Persons are one in the same sense that they are three; nor does it teach that the one substance is three in the same sense that it is one. There

While it is obvious, on the one hand, that no human language can utter this mystery, Theology, both scientific and practical, demands that the Trinitariaa phraseology be ordered with careful precision as at least guarding the truth against the approach of error. After all that may be said as to the inadequacy of human words, and the absence of definitions from Scripture, it still remains true that many others besides those of the New Testament must be used both in teaching and in worship. As it regards the scientific terminology of the doctrine, it is well to be familiar with the terms that express the relations of the One to the Three-in-One. No thoughtful student will either discard or undervalue them.—Popz, Compend. of Chr. Theology, I, pp. 285, 286 is not a trinity of essence or being, but a trinity of Persons, a plurality within the one being of God. This is the most simple conception possible. In affirming that the substance is numerically one and the same, the Church guards against the error of supposing this unity to be similar to that of human nature, which may be the same in two or more human individuals. In this case the human nature is generically the same, but not so numerically; whereas in the Godhead it is not only generically the same but numerically so—otherwise we should have three individuals or three Gods. This leads to Tritheism but not to the Christian conception of the Trinity. It was for this reason that the Church rejected not only Arianism but also semi-Arianism. The latter held that ‘Christ or the Son was not a created being but a generation, in which the substance or essence of the Son was not that of the Father but only like it, that is homojousios (6j.totoikrtoc) instead of homoousios (6j.~o-o*noc). While unity belongs to God in the sense of the simplicity and indivisibility of His being, it implies more than this, for the unity of the Divine Being must transcend all necessity, all human limitations and finite conceptions. It is used, therefore, to express symbolically what otherwise is outside the range of human consideration. In the case of human persons previously cited, by virtue of a common generic nature they become a class, and the term unity is applied to each individual as a member of that class. But this is not applicable to God. He is not one of a class. Hence in this sense of the definition, God is not an individual, that is, unity cannot be thus applied to Him. But an individual may be defined otherwise, that is, in the sense of a Being who can exist independently or alone. Dorner uses the term “soleness” to express this independency. In this sense, God only has individuality, for He alone is absolute being. It is in this sense also that we apply the term unity

to God. “Unity is not in any sense determinative of what God is in Himself,” says Dr. Miley. “Just the reverse is the truth. God is the deepest unity because He only is absolute spirit, existing in eternal personality, with the infinite perfection of moral attributes. This deepest unity, is therefore, in no sense constitutive or determinative of what God is in Himself, but is purely consequent to the infinite perfections which are His sole possession. Unity is therefore in no proper sense an attribute of God.”—MILEy,Systematic Theology,I, p. 217 The Trinity of Persons. While the Scriptures associate the Divine Trinity chiefly with the historic redemptive process, this does not give us ground to suppose that it is, therefore, merely an “economic” Trinity or a Trinity of manifestations such as Sabellianism holds. The Church has always maintained that the Trinity expresses not only God’s outward relation to man, but His inner relation to Himself; and therefore, that there is an “essential” as well as an “economic” Trinity. It does this on the ground of clear scriptural teaching. It believes that In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God (John 1:1). In the divine declaration that the Word was with God, and that the Word was itself God, it finds inner distinctions in the Godhead, a distinction between God and God, and a relation of God to God. St. Paul unfolds the same truth in another scripture, But God hat/i. revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God(1 Corinthians 2:10). Here conjoined with a statement concerning the economic or revealing Trinity, is another of equal import concerning the essential Trinity. The Spirit is not, according to this scripture, merely an activity directed outwardly toward the world, but is directed inwardly also, the Spirit being God who searches God. Hence on the basis of both Scripture and reason, the Church has maintained a distinction between the economic Trinity or the revelation of God to the world ad extra (irpcc,roc arroicaX v’~icwc) , and the essential Trinity

It is impossible to define the unity of God: the word unity in human language gives no adequate notion, barely serving to defend the doctrine from every opposite error. Hence it is our wisdom to study it in the light of its exhibition in Scripture: marking the uses to which the doctrine is applied, the scriptural method of stating it, and the confirmations of the truths which may everywhere be found in the one and uniform economy of nature.—Pops, Compend. Chr. Theology, I, p. 255 or the revelation of God to Himself ad intra (irpdiroc vmipfaoc) The earlier Fathers, both Greek and Latin, and later the schoolmen and the Reformers, made use of analogies to illustrate their teachings concerning the Trinity, though not to explain it. The human logos or word, they said, is spoken and thereby emitted from the human soul without loss from its essence, so the eternal generation of the Son left the divine nature unimpaired. Likewise the reason or wisdom or God mediates the divine essence without subtracting from it. The most common illustration, however, was borrowed from the human consciousness and has come down to us from the primitive Fathers. In modern times it has been given its most perfect form by the mediating theologians, Nitzsch, Wiesse, Dorner and Martensen. These writers have sometimes been charged with being Hegelian in their For if God be indeed Trinity in Unity, then there is every reason to suppose that the works of His hands should, in some degree at least, reflect His nature, and especially that man, who is created in the image of God, should evince in his nature certain analogies which indicate a triune Creator. And what an abundance of such indications meets our eye, so long as we do not forget that we cannot expect to find within the limits of created life analogies perfectly corresponding with that which is incomparable and unique! Christian thinkers, even in olden times, discovered traces of the Trinity in the life of the human spirit; and hence Augustine and others speak of a human trinity, consisting in the threefold function of feeling, thought and will. And indeed, these principal faculties

of the spirit present us, as it were, with a threefold cord, the threads of which are distinct and yet one, and they give us some idea of the united and harmonious co-operation of the three Divine Persons. No single one of these functions of feeling, thought, and will can be exercised without the simultaneous activity of the others In like manner, the process of our thought will explain to us in some degree the pre-existence of the Son as the Logos or Word of the Father. In our human consciousness a certain thought always simultaneously produces the corresponding word; we can only think in conceptions and words, for our thought is inward speech. 5o, too, God's thought of Himself necessitates the utterance of the Word which represents this primal thought; but the divine utterance is at the same time a real act, and hence this inner Word in God as a being equal to Him. True, in our human self-consciousness we do not, by conceiving ourselves, produce a second self: we all the time have only one ego. But we are only creatures, not the creative source of life: and even our human consciousness is still imperfect. But the case is different with God, who is the eternal and almighty source of life and power. His self-consciousness is absolutely perfect, and hence the intellectual image of Himself, which He has conceived, may become a real substantial antitype of the Father. In any case, we have an analogy to the Trinity in the thought, its product the word, and the unity of both, the spirit."—CHRIsTLUS, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief, pp. 275, 276 modes of thought, especially as it concerns the thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Hegel's philosophy makes God the thesis and the world the antithesis. This made the world necessary to the idea of God's existence and led to pantheism and agnosticism. The Trinitarian theologians, on the other hand, found the synthesis within the Trinity itself, God the Father being the subject, God the Son the object, and God the Spirit the bond of union or perfectness. "When, therefore, following in the footsteps of the Church," says Bishop Martensen, "we teach that not merely the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit eternally pre-existed and are independent of creation, we say that God could not be the self-revealed, self-loving God, unless He had eternally distinguished Himself into an I and Thou (into Father and Son), and unless He had eternally comprehended Himself as the Spirit of love, who proceeds forth from that relation of antithesis in the divine essence" (MARTBN5EN, Chr. Do gin., p. 107). To this it is sometimes objected that the distinctions in the human mind are merely ideas, not real distinctions. The objection rests upon a failure to distinguish the difference between created and uncreated self-consciousness. The created mind is bound down by the antithesis between being and thought, and therefore its self-consciousness can develop only in connection with the world outside of itself. But in God, thought and being are one, and the movement by which the divine self-consciousness is completed, is not merely of the divine subject but also of the divine substance. The three ego centers, therefore, are not merely forms of consciousness but become hypostatic distinctions or forms of subsistence. This, then, is the first step in the argument from self-consciousness, 1:e., that the three focal centers in created self-consciousness must be regarded as hypostases or real subsistences in uncreated or Divine Self-consciousness The second step in the argument is concerned with the nature of the Logos. As in human consciousness the self becomes conscious of itself, the act of self-cognition furnishing both subject and object in one being or substance, so God the Father out of the depths of His own eternal nature, sees the image of His own Ego in a second subsistence, which is the eternal Logosor Son. It is for this reason that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Son as the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person (Hebrews 1:2-3). Here the word "brightness" is the effulgence or outshining of the glory or doxa (&~v airav'yctcrjaa njc and the

“express image” (~apaKr~p Ic vflOtTTWTECOV avrov), the exact image or impress of the substance (l)lTocrrcfotcoc) of Him; thus sustaining (or making manifest) all things by the word of His power. As in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, the author of this Qpistle identifies the Logos as the intermediary of creation witffJesus Christ, who as the incarnate Son of God becomes the Mediator of redemption. His statement concerning the glory of the Son is therefore followed immediately by another which relates to His redemptive purpose, declaring that when he had by himself purged our sins (having made purification for sins), He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high(or at the right hand of the Majesty in high places)

It is worthy of note, that there is in the Old Testament an intimation of this conception of the Logos, found more especially in the description of Wisdom as previously mentioned. God becomes manifest to Himself in Wisdom which was with Him in the beginning, and rejoiced always before His face. Then was I by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him; rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men (Proverbs 8:30-31). The Jewish conception of wisdom, however, was impersonal. It was the eternal image of the world, the heavenly pleroma,

Nitzsch maintains that the Divine Ego, in order to have a living personality, must not only view its second “other self” as an object, but also revert to itself by a further act as a third subject, in that it comprehends its “alter ego” as the real image of itself. Thus if God be conceived as the Primal Ego, and from this basis begets an objective alter Ego, the thesis and antithesis would still remain severed or incomplete until a third Ego proceeds from the Divine essence through the medium of the second. and thus fully consummates the personality uncreated and supernatural, but as yet only personified. So also the Philonic Logos was a (Kdo~toc vo~’ro’c) merely a term for the heavenly world, and though uncreated was likewise impersonal. St. John, therefore, struck a deep note when by the pen of inspiration he declared that the Logos was the Son, and that as such He was not only the spoken Word but the speaking Word, not only a revelation, but a Revealer, not only personified Wisdom, but the eternal Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God (John 1:1). God therefore is not only the Father of the creature or the idea, but of the Logos who is the vehicle of the idea, without whom no single thought would present itself to the Father as an object, different from Himself. This is the true conception of eternal generation which has been so prominent in the controversies of the Church—not an event in time or even before time, but an eternal relationship without which personality is impossible. It was for this that the Arians were striving, but they failed in that they made generation so completely a birth out of the will of God instead of His essence, that the Son became a mere creature, of which they affirmed that there was a time when he was not The third step in the argument for the evangelical doctrine of the Holy Trinity is concerned with the nature of the Spirit and His relation to the Father and the Son. It is evident that if the revelation of the Father had terminated in the Son, this relation would have been one of necessity and not of freedom. It is the work of the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, to glorify this necessary relation into one of freedom and love. The relationship existing between the Father and the Son is therefore ethical as well as metaphysical. God’s relation to the world, then, is not merely one of contemplation, as the pantheists teach, but one of creation motivated by divine love The evangelical doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, perfectly satisfies the unifying principle of the human mind. The self-revealing energy of God is revealed also as personal activity in the Logos, manifested from the foundation of the world, and reaching its climax

in the Word made flesh. The incarnation is then but the focussing of that personal Light which lighteth every man coming into the world. The pre-existence of Christ is not only a religious but a philosophical truth, in which man and God are conjoined, in both natural and moral relations. For 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 Corinthians 4:6). Thus in this second hypostasis we have the Word as the “exact image” or true revelation of the Father, and also the Word as the Revealer, the “effulgence” or outshining of His glory. The third hypostasis, or the Spirit, has reference, not to the self-revealing energy, but to the self-imparting energy of God, which likewise is a personal activity. As the self-revelation of God advances there is a constantly increasing display of the self-imparting energy of the Holy Spirit. For this reason the Divine Word must come to full expression in the incarnation, before the Holy Spirit could come in the fullness of pentecostal glory. As the self-revealing energy of God found its perfection in the unique personality of Jesus Christ the Son; so the self-imparting energy of God reached its highest expression in the personal presence of the Holy Spirit. Here is the deep and abiding significance of the words of our Lord, It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you (John 16:7) The Divine Monarchy. Our previous discussion of the Trinity has been concerned mainly with the metaphysical questions of unity and triunity, and we must now give some attention to the social and governmental

Dr. Sheldon thinks that an intelligible statement of the Trinity is essentially comprised in a formula like this: “Corresponding to the threefold manifestation of Father, Son, and Spirit, there subsist in the Godhead, in a certain logical order, eternal and necessary distinctions, which enter into the divine consciousness and determine the perfection of the divine life. To affirm less than this is to fail to do justice to the total data of the subject. To affirm much more is to resort to unintelligible categories, or to an unintelligible combination of categories” (Cf. SHElDoN, Syst. Chr. Doct., p. 227) aspects of this important doctrine. What is termed the “Monarchia” of the Father has reference to His preeminence viewed, not from the standpoint of metaphysical essence, but from that of order and relation. It belongs to the offices of the persons and not to their substance. It is the principle of unity in the social aspect of the Trinity, not an inequality in the aspect of the essential Trinity. In the Nicene statement of the monarchy, the Father is not more divine than the Son, or the Son than the Holy Spirit. But in the order of subsistence in that one essence, the Father depends upon Himself alone for His Godhead, the Son derives His Godhead from the Father (God of God 8€6u EK that is, He is the Word or self-revelation of the Father and therefore eternally dependent upon Him; and the Holy Spirit proceeds from (~K) the Father and the Son (Father through the Son && zrapd), and therefore in order and relation is eternally dependent upon both. As to nature and being, however, the Son does not belong to a grade of divinity lower than that of the Father, but is “very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father.” The filial relationship as Son to Father is second and therefore in this sense subordinate; but the filial essence is equal and co-ordinate with that of paternity, “the glory equal, the majesty coeternal.” Furthermore, the order is not temporal or chronological, but grounded in the three distinctions or The Trinity is the chief cornerstone of the Christian system. Eliminate that, with what logically follows it, and nothing is left but what is common to all theistic systems of religion known among men. By so much as Christianity has any claims to consideration, by so much more as it contains excellencies confessedly superior to any other system of religion extant among men, by so much more is it authenticated by indubitable proofs as the revelation of God’s

will, by so much as man has reason to receive the Bible as his sole and authoritative rule of faith and practice, by so much more is it incumbent upon one who desires to know God and do His will to inquire diligently, honestly, without prejudice, without fear or favor, whether the Bible does or does not teach the church doctrine of the Holy Trinity.—RAYM0ND, Systematic Theology, I, p. 392 From all this it follows, that the doctrine of the Trinity is the consummation and the only perfect protection of Theism. We have already shown that the theistic conception of God is the only true one; and we may now add, that if this theistic conception is to be effectually guarded against Atheism, Pantheism, Dualism and Deism, it must be expanded into the Trinitarian idea.—Cusisnias, Mod. Doubt and Chr. Belief, p. 271 subsistences of the one essence, and therefore real and eternal. Hence we have the statement of the creed that “in this Trinity none is af ore or after other, none is greater or less than another; but the whole Three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal. So that in all things as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity is to be worshiped.” We have previously pointed out some of the errors which arose concerning monarchianism in the earlier or anti-Nicene period, such as the subordinationism of Origen, Arianism and SemiArianism. The Nicene statement of the Trinity marked a decided advance over the previous period in clarity of doctrine, but the theologians found it necessary to guard against two errors. The first was the confusion of essence or substance with personal distinctions. When these two were identified, or at least not clearly separated, the “generation” of a Person meant the generation of the essence, and the “procession” of a person meant the procession of the essence. This resulted in a difference of essence and as a consequence, the multiplication of deities, or tritheism. The second error was closely allied with the first, and consisted in a confusion of the ideas of generation and creation. Generation was regarded as creation from nothing; and the procession of a person from another, meant the creation of that person out of nothing by the former. This reduced the Son and the Holy Spirit to mere creatures. The Nicene theologians corrected the first error by making a sharp distinction between substance and subsistence, between essence and persons. They regarded these as two distinct and separate conceptions. To the first belonged the unity of the Godhead, to the second, the triunity. Hence it was possible to combine the unity of the essence with the trinality of persons. The generation or procession of one person from another did not, there-

Referring again to the Athanasian Creed we may say that “The catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one—the glory equal, the majesty coeternal.” fore, necessitate a difference of essence, and the two could be combined without any contradiction of terms. The second error was corrected by regarding the Father and Son as correlatives, so that the one could have no existence without the other, and the hypostasis of the one demanded the hypostasis of the other. In Origen’s teaching, the Father was a Monad existing anterior to the Son in the order of nature, and the Holy Spirit subordinate to both, rather than being divine and coeternal hypostases. And while Origen held to eternal generation, he made this to lie more in the will of the Father The Fathers illustrated their idea of this eternal and necessary act of communication by the example of a luminous body, which necessarily radiated light the whole period of its existence. Thus the Son is defined in the words of the Nicene Creed, “God of God, Light of Light.” Thus the radiance of the sun is coeval with its existence, and of the same essence as its source. By this illustration they designed to signify their belief in the identity

and consequent equality of the Divine Persons as to essence, and the relative subordination of the second to the first, and of the third to the first and second as to personal subsistence and consequent order of operation (Cf. A. A. HODGE, Outlines of Theology, p. 155)

Bishop Pearson maintains that the pre-eminence consists in this, “that He is God not of any other but of Himself, and that there is no other Person who is God, but is God of Himself. It is no diminution to the Son, to say that He is from another, for His very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of Him; and there must be some pre-eminence, where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, He is from none; what the Son is, He is from Him; what the first is, He giveth; what the second is, He receiveth. The first is Father indeed by reason of His Son, but He is not God by reason of Him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard to the Father, but also God by reason of the same.”—pEAnsow On the Creed, p. 35 The early Arian and Semi-Arian teachers laid so much stress on the Oetcn-~c or divinity of the two subordinate Beings. They were regarded as the bond, or rather the intermediary links, between the Absolute and the conditioned, the Infinite and the finite: looking toward the creature they were firstborn or rather first created before the worlds; but looking Godward they were more directly emanations of the Monad than the creature. The doctrine was a speculative substitution for the Gnostic errors of a~onic emanation Early Arianism also has been sporadic. It has molded opinion very extensively in later Christendom: never shaping a formulary or founding a sect, but influencing the thoughts of many thinkers and coloring the sentiments of poetry, and infusing itself into the devotions of many who are almost unconscious of their error. The history of the Arian tendency in England is an important and instructive one: it brings in some great names in our Philosophical and theological literature; but it shows that the healthy common sense of readers of Scripture never has and never will accept this compromise. Either the New Testament must be rejected as final authority and the Deistic Rationalism of Unitariapj~~ accepted, or, the Scriptures being received as the rule of faith, the fullness of the Godhead must be adored in the incarnate Son.—PopE, Coinpend. Christian Theology, .1, p. 283 than in the necessity of His nature. The Arians, therefore, making a distinction in essence as well as persons, held to a higher and lower form of divinity a 6 Seic and a S€~c. Athanasius insisted upon the identity of essence and therefore maintained the homo-ousia as over against the difference in essence or heter-ousia, held by the Arians. The Semi-Arians in an attempt at mediation proposed the term homoi-ousia or like essence, but this was also rejected by the orthodox theologians. We may say, therefore, that the Nicene Trinitarianism harmonized the doctrine of the one substance with the three Persons, by insisting upon the necessity of this generation and procession, as over against the voluntary idea of the Arians. They inferred from their idea of voluntary generation that there was a time when the Son was not. Against this, the orthodox affirmed that the generation of the Son was a necessary consequence of the divine nature, and hence was as independent of the volitional action of the Father as was the existence of any of the Divine attributes. This was a long step forward. It needs now the doctrine of the Circumcession, to guard against too strong a tendency toward an undue separateness of the Persons and their divine missions The Circumcession or Perichoresis. The circumcession or perichoresis comes from the Greek word impi~e5 p~qutc or o-vjiirept~Sp’qcrtc as previously pointed out in our definition of terms. The Latin equivalents are

Dr. Shedd summarizes the teachings of the Nicene theologians as to generation and creation in these brief statements: (1) Eternal generation is an offspring out of the eternal essence of God;

creation is an origination of a new essence from nothing. (2) Eternal generation is the communication of an eternal essence; creation is the origination of a temporal essence. (3) That which is eternally generated is of one essence with the generator; but that which is created is of another essence from that of the creator. The substance of God the Son is one and identical with that of the Creator. The Father and Son are one nature, and one Being, God and the world are two natures and two beings. (4) Eternal generation is necessary, but creation is optional. The filiation of the second Person in the Trinity is grounded in the nature of Deity; but the origination of the world depends entirely upon arbitrary will. It is as necessary that there should be Father and Son in the Godhead, as that the Godhead should be eternal, or self-existent; but there is no such necessity for creation. (5) Eternal generation is an immanent perpetual activity in an ever-existing essence; creation is an instantaneous act, and supposes no elements of the creature in existence.—SHEDD, History of Christian Doctrine, I, pp. 317, 318 interactio, intercommunio or interexistentia. The term signifies an intercoherence of the Persons of the Trinity, or that property, which by reason of identity of essence, they can communicate with each other without confusion of persons. It guards the unity of the Godhead, by affirming that the three Persons do not exist alongside of each other as sep~arate individuals, but that they permeate and penetrate one another, and so exist not alongside but in and through one another As the Divine Monarchy stressed the social aspect of the Trinity, so also does the perichoresis. It affirms that there is unity of purpose and coinherence in action as well as essence. As they were united in the work of creation, so also they are each engaged in the work of redemption, and will each share in the consummation of all things. The divine essence is undivided and indivisible. The whole Godhead is in the Father, in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. In the Father as the origination of all things; in the Son (Logos) as God's self-utterance and in the Spirit as His self-consciousness. The circumcession is especially necessary in guarding the religious unity of God, or that approach to the Trinity through religious experience. Reason is primarily concerned with the unity of God, but religious experience with the distinction of Persons. The danger of the one is abstraction, that of the other anthropomorphism. The mind tends to think of personality as that which distinguishes one individual from another. Tritheism, therefore, is the practical outcome of the distinction of Persons, unless the perichoresis be fully understood and kept constantly before the individual in his devotional life. And, further, the distinctness of persons tends to emphasize individuality and minify the social aspects of personality, whether considered with reference to the human or the divine. That there is a deep line of cleavage between the individual and social aspects of personality may be allowed, and this doubtless is intensified by sinful pride and selfishness. It is only as we realize that the higher goods of life must be shared in order to be fully realized and enjoyed, that we come to see that human personality is not less but more truly social. This has its perfect prototype in the perichoresis or circumcession, the mysterious indwelling and interpenetration of the three Persons of the Godhead, the promise and potency of spiritual fellowship in the Church. And the glory which thou gayest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one: and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou host

It is generally supposed that Augustine introduced the psychological analogies of the Trinity, maintaining that the complexity of the Trinity finds an image in our own being as memory, reason and will: or "I exist, I am conscious, I love the existence and the consciousness." Thus in the process of consciousness we discover three "I's" which form the foci of consciousness, the self

that thinks, the self which is thought of, and the self which is conscious of the self thinking of self. This self is at once, subject, object and consciousness of subject and object.—STUMP, The Christian Faith, p. 55

Liebner, Sartorius and others have drawn analogies from the standpoint of love rather than self-conscious reason. Love demands a process of self_communication which in its highest perfection must be Trinitarian. Love is the transposition of oneself into another person as an alter ego or second self. God who is Love, must therefore transpose Himself into His second Self, which as such is of the same divine nature, since otherwise the act of self_transposition would not be perfect. No less necessary, however, is the conception of a third homogenous Self, by which the infinite equality is mediated so as to produce harmonious unity in distinctions. It is this which fixes the Divine Personality, for mere self_transposition would be equal to infinite restlessness. Thus Spirit is predicated of the whole nature for God is Spirit (John 4:24), and the Lord is the Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:17). Thus God is one person in three persons in the sense of the perichoresis, each of which is only in and through the others. This apparent contradiction that the several persons should be one and have their full personality only in this unity, is solved by the principle of love (Liebner). Sartorius distinguishes between the love which begets and the love which blesses the Son—the love of the well-pleased Father and the answering love on the Son's part. The breath of that blessing and answering love is the Spirit. But were He only breath, and not a person, the glorification of the Father and the Son would be egoistical. This egoistical element is removed only if the Spirit who glorifies the Father and the Son is Himself a person. Christlieb gathers up the sentiment of the above as follows: "Love always includes delight in the object loved. If this object be an entirely separate person, the purity of my love is not sullied by my delight. But this is not the case with God. The object of His love is not a Person outside of Him, but His second Self. Here, therefore, the delight in another is at the same time delight in Himself. In order, therefore, that this delight may not appear as self-seeking egoism, God has committed this delight in Himself to a Third Person, which represents the mutual delight of Father and Son in each other; and this Person is the Holy Spirit. When the Father uttered Himself, he begat the Son, the eternal Word. But no speech can take place without breathing, and the breath of that spoken Word was hypostatized in the Spirit, which represents the delight of the Divine Love.—CHRI5Th1~, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief, p. 273 loved me And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:22-23; John 17:26)

Dr. Summers closes his discussion on this subject with a quotation from the ever memorable John Hales, who became professor of Greek in Oxford in 1612, and whom Bishop Pearson mentions as a "man of as great a sharpness, quickness, and subtility of wit as ever this or perhaps any nation bred; . . . . a man of vast and iilimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment." Dr. Tigert in an attached note says that he went to the Synod of Dort a Calvinist and left it an Arminian. "At the well-pressing of John 3:16 by Episcopius there," he says, "I bid John Calvin good night, as he has often told me." The following is from the Golden Remains (London 1673) and is a "Confession of the Trinity" by John Hales:

"God is one; numerically one; more one than any single man if unity could suscipere magis et minus: yet God is so one that He admits of distinction; and so admits of distinction that He still retains unity

“As He is one, so we call Him God, the Deity, the Divine Nature, and other names of the same signification; as He is distinguished, so we call Him Trinity:

Persons; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost

“In this Trinity there is one essence; two emanations; three persons or relations; four properties; five notions: a notion is that by which any person is known or signified

“The One essence is God with this relation, that it doth generate or beget, maketh the Person of the Father: the same essence with this relation, that it is begotten, maketh the Person of the Son: the same essence with this relation, that it proceedeth, maketh the Person of the Holy Ghost The two emanations are, to be begotten and to proceed or to be breathed out: the three persons are Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: the three relations, to beget, to be begotten, and to proceed, or to be breathed out The four properties are: the first inascibility and inemanability; the second is to generate—these belong to the Father: the third is to be begotten; and this belongs to the Son: the fourth is to proceed or be breathed out; and this belongs unto the Holy Spirit. The five notions are: the first, inascibility; the second is to beget; the third, to be begotten; the fourth spiratio passiva, to be breathed out; the fifth, spiratio activa or, to breathe: and this notion belongs to the Father and Son alike; for Pater et Filius spirant Spiritum Sanctum.” The word emanation as used above is not the oriental concept of finiteness proceeding from infinity, but an accommodated use of the term in the Christian sense. But we are ever brought back to the thought that the Being of God is by St. Paul termed a mystery (~ivo-n~ptov), and we are commanded to worship the “Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity” not necessarily to understand it. “The Bible Doctrine of the Trinity,” says Ralston, “is one of those sublime and glorious mysteries which the mind of man, at least while shrouded in clay, cannot penetrate. We may study and meditate until lost in thought, yet never can we comprehend the mode and nature of the divine being” (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, p. 65). Dr. Pope cautions us concerning the scientific terminology of the doctrine that “it is well to be familiar with the terms that express the relation of the One to the Three-in-One. No thoughtful student will either discard or undervalue them. The Deity is the divine essence or substance or nature; the three are subsistences, hypostases and persons Nowhere is precision more necessary than in the ordering of the phraseology of worship. The mind and the tongue must be so educated as to recoil from such language as is tinctured with either the Tritheistic, or the Sabellian, or the Arian error. One of the results of careful and reverent study will be the discipline that shall make every word faithful to the equal honor of each of the three adorable persons in the unity of the other two, and in the unity of the Godhead; adoring and praying to each with this sacred reservation. But, after all, we must remember what the ancient Church was never weary of enforcing in relation to this subject; the nature of God is d~j313t7rog ineffable, unsearchable and unspeakable; the Godhead can be known only by him who is OEo6I8wcroç, taught of God; and that knowledge itself is and will eternally be only ~ic pApovc in part” (POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology, I, p. 286). Is it any wonder, then, that the Church has not only given us a statement of the Trinity in the creed, but set its teaching to music in the matchless Gloria? Here is summarized all its teachings concerning the Trinity as they are to be used in the service of worship. “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.”

15. Chapter 16 – COSMOLOGY

Chapter 16 - COSMOLOGY The study of Cosmology may embrace the entire universe in its scope, or as commonly treated it may be divided into (1) Cosmology, as applying to the kingdom of nature apart from man; and (2) Anthropology, as dealing with the science of man. Even though man from the physical standpoint belongs to the animal kingdom, the wide divergence between personality and the non-personal orders is sufficient to warrant this division. Within the science of Anthropology as treated in theological study, a further division is made, Anthropology being limited to man in his original state, and Hamartiology treating of man in his fallen or sinful state The Meaning of the Term "World."By the term "world" in the philosophic sense, we mean everything which is extrinsic to God, whether animate or inanimate, whether rational or nonrational. Ancient peoples had little conception of the world as such, and in the dawn of the reflective period, generally regarded it as existing by chance or by necessity. There was no single term which could be used to express the universe. With the development of the period of reflection men first turned their attention to the earth upon which they lived, and to the heavens which they saw above them. Thus "the heavens and the earth" became the earliest expression for the created universe (Cf. Genesis 1:1; Genesis 2:1, Psalms 115:15). Those nations, however, which lived near the sea coast frequently spoke of "the heaven, earth and sea" (Cf. Psalms 146:6, also Acts 17:24 which is evidently a quotation and implies but does not mention the word sea). This was the dominant Greek conception also. Homer regarded the world as divided into three portions, heaven, earth and sea. In the process of time other words came into use. The Hebrews, the Chaldeans and the Syrians used a term which corresponded to the Greek aion (aiwn) which referred more especially to the duration or age of the world rather than to its creative aspect. The Greeks later spoke of the world as cosmos (kosmoV) because of its beauty and orderliness. The Latin equivalent of this term is mundus The Eternity of Matter.The ancient people found difficulty in explaining the origin of the first material. This was due largely to the fact that they insisted on the principle ex nihilo nihil fit, or from nothing, nothing comes. They could not, therefore, admit that the world was created out of nothing. Consequently, they accepted almost universally, the belief in two eternal principles, God and self-existent matter, neither being dependent upon the other. The principle may indeed be true as it applies to material causes, but it is not applicable to an efficient cause of which omnipotence is predicated. Before this truth, materialism, whether ancient or modern, must of necessity vanish. Plato taught that God voluntarily united Himself with matter, and thereby produced the world; and while both God and matter were regarded as eternal, the world which resulted from the conjoining of the two might be said to be created. Aristotle on the other hand taught, as did also Zeno the Stoic, that the union of God with matter was necessary and therefore the world must be regarded as eternal. Epicurus at the other extreme held that God was entirely separate and apart from the world. Generally the ancients believed that primordial matter was of the nature of thin air, or an ether, fluid and movable. The word chaos,is derived from either caw or cew because of this fluidity. The Latin word for that which is confused and unarranged is silva. Plato’s conception of matter ’mgh’ involved both silvaand materia. The Greeks supposed that from this fluid and fermenting mass the earth was formed. The Hebrews, however, with a different temper of mind, regarded the

universe more after the pattern of a building, of which God was the creator of the materials as well as the structure THEORIES OF CREATION The Church was very early forced to attempt an explanation of the universe, in order to bridge the chasm between the finite and the Infinite. With the advance of modern science, many of its discoveries apparently, came into conflict with the scriptural account of creation. However, this conflict was only apparent, for as scientific theory has become more exact there has been a closer approach to the biblical positions. The subject demands only brief attention The Mechanical Theory.This theory holds that the world was formed in a purely external and formal manner. It stresses the thought of transcendence and wholly disregards the divine immanence. This was never the theory of the early Church. It arose only in modern times, and came as a protest against the extreme rationalism of the critico-historical movement. Irenaeus speaks of creation in this manner. "But He himself after a fashion which we can never describe nor conceive predestinated all things and formed them as He pleased." "Thou createst heaven and earth," says Augustine, "things of two kinds; one near to Thee, the other near to nothing." Again he says, "Thou createst heaven and earth; not out of Thyself, for they should have been equal to Thine only begotten Son, and thereby equal to Thee also." Athanasius taught that creation was through the Logos or the Divine Word The Physical or Materialistic Theory of Creation.This theory is closely related to dualism in that it presupposes the eternity of matter. It rejects, however, the architectonic idea of a creator, in the sense of a demiurge or fashioner of this material into the created forms as we know them; and substitutes instead the theory of spontaneous generation. It holds that matter has in itself the power of taking on new functions, and under proper conditions of developing into organic forms. It therefore assumes that all things may be explained on the basis of material changes. The theory is merely an application of materialistic philosophy to the idea of creation, and arose out of the rationalism of the early nineteenth century. It was held by Feuerbach, Vogt, Moleschott, Buchner, Bastian and Owen. Closely related to this is the revival of ancient Greek hylozoism which acknowledges a formative principle in the world, but regards this principle as confined within matter itself and a characteristic of its true nature. Matter it regards as imbued with life as in a plant which unfolds from a seed, and intelligence pertains to it in at least some of its combinations. In so far as God is acknowledged, He is merely the universal life of nature. The theory must therefore end in either pantheism or materialistic atheism. "If the soul of the world is an unconscious one," says Van Oosterzee, "how is the order and design in creation to be explained? If it is a conscious one, wherefore not, at the same time a free Agent? and if a free Agent, how does it become and remain so inseparably bound to its gigantic material raiment?" The Emanation or Pantheistic Theory.At the other extreme is the theory of emanation which holds that the world was neither created nor fashioned out of preexistent material, but is to be regarded as an extension of the divine substance. It flows from God as a stream from a fountain, or as rays of light from the sun. This was the theory held by the ancient Gnostics, and in modern times has been revived as a consequence of the renewed emphasis upon idealistic philosophy. Lotze distinguished between emanation and creation by saying that creation necessitates a Divine Will, while emanation flows by necessary consequences from the being or nature of God. On this theory the world would either become in nature like God, or the cleavage in the substance of God would destroy the divine unity. The objections to this theory were presented in our discussion of pantheism and need not be repeated here The Theory of Eternal Creation.This theory arose as an attempt to guard against dualism and yet preserve the emphasis upon the eternity of God. Origen held to creation by the will of God and yet taught the theory of eternal

creation. According to him, this world was not the first world God created; there never was a first and there never will be a last. The schoolmen revived the theory on the ground that the thoughts of God were necessarily creative. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast (Psalms 33:9). But to say that God’s word must of necessity issue in creation, would be to identify the purpose of God with the creative fiat. This would be but another form of pantheism. It did, in fact, take this form in the teachings of Scotus Erigina, but others of the medieval school-men avoided the pantheistic tendencies by maintaining that the world was in essence different from God, though eternally dependent upon Him. In so far as creation is independent of time, and the "birth of time" is regarded as taking place in the creative fiat, we may hold that creation took place in eternity. By this, however, it is not meant that the world had no beginning but that time began with creation. It rejects the idea that time was pre-existent, and that the creation of the world occupied merely a moment in that time scheme The Theory of Natural Evolution.This theory is similar if not identical with that of spontaneous generation, but has assumed a more philosophical form. When presented by Darwin and his school the evolutionary hypothesis was received with great applause. However, it could hardly be expected to hold its ground against the Christian belief in creation. It does not solve the problem. It merely pushes it back into time and therefore must rest ultimately in either creation or emanation. Naturalistic evolution breaks down at three vital points: (1) it has not been able to bridge the chasm between the inanimate and the animate; (2) it cannot pass from the diffused life of the vegetable realm, to the conscious somatic life of the animal kingdom; and (3) it cannot pass from the irrational life of animals to the rational self-conscious life of man. Only the creative activity of God could have originated vegetable, animal and personal life. The theory of the differentiation of species breaks down further in the case of the sterility of hybrids. The declaration in the Genesis account that each shall bring forth after its kind is an acknowledged fact, both in the realm of science and in the world of experience The Theory of Continuous Creation.In recent times, the idea of creation as an event, immediate and complete, has been challenged in favor of creation as a continuous process. The theory is the outgrowth of the renewed emphasis upon the divine immanence, and due to the influence of the evolutionary hypothesis, took the form of theistic evolution. While closely related to the theory of spontaneous generation, it regards the divine immanence as the basic reality in contradistinction to the eternity of matter. It insists that organic development is due, not to the spontaneity of the materialistic or hylozoistic principle, but to divine power working within the organism. The divine activity is sometimes identified with the entire process, and sometimes limited to merely the points of crisis in development THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF CREATION The scriptural doctrine of creation maintains that the universe had a beginning, that it is not eternal in either matter or form, that it is not self-originated, and that it owes its origin to the omnipotent power and the unconditioned will of God. This is the Christian conception. It involves, first, a belief in the Almighty God, whereby the world once began to be out of nothing, solely through the divine will; second, the concept of God in the Trinity of His essence; third, a display of the attributes of God-omnipotence, wisdom and love; and fourth, belief in creation through the Divine Word as a Mediator, the Logos forming the connection between the finite and the Infinite, between God and the world

Creation and the Trinity.The very idea of Fatherhood which constitutes the Christian conception of God, suggests creatorship. It is, however, the love and not the creatorship which forms the essence of the Divine Fatherhood. In the act of creation God brings forth that which before had no existence, and which is different in essence from Himself. While creation originates in the love of

God and is made effective by the divine will, the Scriptures specifically state that in this work both the Son and the Spirit are associated with the Father. Hence we read, that to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him (ICor. 8: 6). The Scriptures record also, that in the dawn of creation, the Spirit moved upon the waters, that is, brooded over the waters in the sense of bringing order and beauty out of chaos (Genesis 1:2) ; and the psalmist said, Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created (Psalms 104:30). The Trinity, therefore, is revealed in creation as it is revealed in redemption, is in fact, the ground of the whole redemptive process. Love as the originating cause of redemption has its source in the inner freedom of the Trinity, which, existing there in infinite perfection, is expressed by the term blessedness. The love existing between the Father and the Son is ad intra, expressed in the Holy Spirit as the "bond of perfectness"; while that same love ad extra, is the originating cause of both creation and redemption. The Son is the "exact" or "express" image of the Father, and therefore under one aspect, the pleromaor the infinite range of possibilities existing in the Father, the kosmoV nohtoV or world of ideas which form the archetypes of creation. St. Paul sums up the relation of the Trinity to the created universe in these words, For of him [as the originating cause], and through him [as the mediating or efficient cause], and to him [as the final cause or purpose], are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen (Romans 11:36). But Christ as the Logos is more than the spoken word or revelation of God, He is the speaking Word or the efficient cause of creation. To the Word or Logos as the mediating cause of creation we must later direct our attention

Creation and the Attributes o f God.Creation as we have shown, has its origin in the love of God and not in mere metaphysical necessity. It is the consequence of the overflowing fullness of love which seeks new objects upon which to expend itself. If the fundamental principle of theology is the self-revelation of God as we have all along maintained that it is, then creation may be regarded primarily as designed to display the perfections of God. The world is what it is because God is what He is. It is the ground for the manifestation of those attributes which can arise only out of a relation existing between the Creator and the creature. By this means only can they be brought within the range o£ means comprehension. Here love manifests itself most prominently in omnipotence and omniscience as connected with primary creation; and in wisdom and goodness as associated with secondary creation. It is the divine omnipotence which furnishes the ground of causality and efficiency, and the divine omniscience which gives reason, order and purpose to the universe

It is the wisdom and goodness of God which have adapted all things to the promotion of happiness and enjoyment on the part of His creatures. It has been aptly said that there are no devices in nature for the promotion of pain for its own sake, but the manifestations of design for the production of happiness are beyond computation. O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches (Psalms 104:24)

Creation and the Logos. By what means did God create all things? To this the Scriptures give answer, "By the word of his power." By the word of the Lord’ were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth (Psalms 33:6). He sendeth forth his commandment upon earth: his word runneth very swiftly (Psalms 147:15). But this word must not be thought of as impersonal. It is rather, the Logos, the word and wisdom of the Father. It is an essential element in Christian belief, that Christ as the Logos or Word is the Mediator in creation, without which He

could not have been the Mediator of Redemption. This is clearly taught by both St. John and St. Paul. In the beginning was the Word [Logos], and the Word was with God, and the Word was God..... All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made (John 1:1; John 1:3). But to us there is but one God, the Father, o f whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him (1 Corinthians 8:6). For 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 (Colossians 1:16-17). "That which many a philosopher dimly conjectures," says Van Oosterzee, "namely, that God did not produce the world in an absolutely immediate manner, but some way or other, mediately, here presents itself to us as invested with the luster of revelation, and exalts so much more, the claim of the Son of God to our deep and reverential homage."

It is just here that the thought of the Logos is so compelling. Without a mediating cause, the idea of creation must lead directly to dualism with its eternity of matter, or to pantheism as a mere extension of the divine essence. This would be an emanation rather than a creation. There must be, both for thought and for reality, an intermediate idea; and as the Christian doctrine of creation maintains an essential difference between God and the world, so also it maintains a distinction between the eternal idea of creation, and the creative Word or Logos. It is by the latter as the efficient Agent, that the idea of creation becomes a reality in actual existence. Otherwise, to maintain that the divine purpose and the execution of this purpose are necessarily simultaneous, resolves the absoluteness of God into physical necessity, and cannot therefore escape its logical issue in pantheism. God is not merely the Father of the idea of creation, but the Father of the Logos which is the vehicle of the idea. Jewish thought as represented in the Alexandrian school, regarded the Logos as merely a cosmos noetus(kosmoV nohtoV) or world of ideas, as we have previously indicated. St. John makes bold to affirm that the Logos is not an idea only, but a Person, and as such the vehicle of the idea by which the world is given reality. Thus the Logos becomes the sole link between the Infinite and the finite, between the realm of ideas and the realm of actual existences. Here, then, is the mystery hid from the ages but made manifest in the incarnation, namely, that the Logos or creative Word is Himself God. The Word veiled in the Old Testament in the expressions "God said," and "Let there be" is now seen to be not only the spoken Word but the speaking Word. It is through Him that God’s word of wisdom passes into created reality. Creation, therefore, demands a Mediator, both for thought and reality. It was because the Logos was the Mediator of both purpose and efficiency in the work of creation, that the Logos incarnate as the Son, became the Mediator of both the revealing and the enabling grace of redemption THE HYMN OF CREATION The Book of Genesis opens with an inspired Psalm, sometimes known as the "Hymn of Creation," and sometimes as the "Poem of the Dawn." By this it is not meant that the account is an allegory or fiction, but a true historical description, poetically expressed. It is fitting that the harmony of creation, at which the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy, should be revealed to us in the harmonies of poetical description. Dr. Miley denies the poetical form of the chapter, and quotes Dr. Terry as saying that "every thorough Hebrew scholar knows that in all the Old Testament there is not a more simple, straightforward prose narrative than this first chapter of Genesis" (MILEY, Syst. Th., I, 298). We may admit that it is not cast in poetical form, but the balanced rhythm, the stately movement, the recurrent refrains and the blend of beauty and power, all indicate that it is of the nature of poetry.

"The rhythmical character of the passage," says Dr. Whedon, "its stately style, its parallelisms, its refrains, its unity within itself all combine to show that it is a poem." Dr. Cocker holds that it contains the same unity as the 104th Psalm, or the Lord’s prayer or the Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. Dr. Thomas C. Porter says that "to him who could grasp the mighty idea and take in the whole at one view, ;he entire creation would appear like a solemn hymn, like some grand oratorio which, starting on a few low, faint notes, gradually gains strength and fullness, and swelling louder and louder, rolls on from harmony to height of harmony until it reaches its loftiest outburst and expression, the diapason closing full in man." Dr. Pace maintains that the whole Book of Genesis has a typical metrical octad style which he calls the metric composition of the Holy Spirit

Exordium In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth

I Now the earth had become waste and wild (or formless and empty) And darkness was on the face of the abyss (or roaring deep) But the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the deep (waters or vapors) (I) And God said, Light be (or Light exist) And light was First Refrain: And God saw the light that it was good And God divided the light from the darkness, And called the light, day But the darkness, called he night So there was evening and there was morning: one day

II (II) And God said, Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, And let it be a division of waters from waters (or vapor) And it was so And God made the expanse, And it divided the waters which were below the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse So there was evening and there was morning: a second day

III (III) And God said, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered into one place, And let the dry ground appear And it was so And God called the dry ground, Land, But the gathering together of the waters, called he, Seas Second Refrain: And God saw that it was good (IV) And God said, Let the land put forth vegetation (shoot forth shoots) Herb yield seed after its kind, And tree bearing fruit, after its kind, Wherein is the seed thereof, upon the land. And it was so And the earth brought forth vegetation (desche, tender grass) Herb yielding seed after its kind, And tree bearing fruit wherein is the seed thereof after its kind, Third Refrain: And God saw that it was good So there was evening and there was morning: a third day

IV (V) And God said, Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heavens, To divide between the day and the night, And let them be for signs and for seasons, And for days and for years, And let them be for luminaries in the expanse of the heavens To give light upon the earth And it was so And God made two great luminaries (places or instruments of light) The greater luminary to rule the day, The lesser luminary to rule the night (He made) also the stars And God set them in the firmament of the heaven (or expanse) To give light upon the earth, And to rule over the day and over the night, And to divide the light from the darkness Fourth Refrain: And God saw that it was good So there was evening and there was morning: a fourth day

V (VI) And God said, Let the waters swarm forth swarming things, living souls And let birds fly over the earth, Over the face of the expanse of the heavens And it was so (Septuagint translation) And God created the great leviathans (sea-monsters) And every living soul that moveth, Which the waters swarmed forth after their kind, And every winged bird after its kind Fifth Refrain: And God saw that it was good And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in

the seas, And let the birds multiply in the land So there was evening and there was morning: a fifth day

VI (VII) And God said, Let the land bring forth living soul after its kind, Cattle (dumb or tame beasts) and creeping things, And land-animals after their kind. (Wild as opposed to tame on account of vital energy.) And it was so And God made the beast of the land after its kind, And the cattle after their kind And everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind Sixth Refrain: And God saw that it was good (VIII) And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, And over the fowl (or birds) of the air, And over all the land (W. Syriac, wild beasts of the land) And over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the land And God created man in his own image, In the image of God created he them Male and female created he them And God blessed them (IX) And God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, And have dominion over the fish of the sea, And over the fowl of the air, And over every living thing that moveth upon the earth (X) And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, And every tree wherein is seed-inclosed fruit To you it shall be for food And to every living thing of the land, And to every bird of the heavens, And to every thing that moveth upon the land, wherein is a living soul, (I have given) every green herb for food And it was so Seventh Refrain: And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good So there was evening and there was morning: a sixth day

Epode Thus were finished the heavens and the earth, And all the hosts of them And on the seventh day, God finished (put period to) his work which he had made, And he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made; And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it:

Because that therein he rested from all his work, Which God by creating had made.

It will be noticed that at the beginning of each work of creation there the formula "And God said." If we include the two providential formulas found in verses 28, 29, the expression occurs ten times, giving rise to the Jewish dictum, "By ten sayings, the world was created" (ABOTH, 5: 1) The three terms used to express the idea of vegetation cover the broad divisions. (1) The term desche is rendered tender grass (2 Samuel 23:4) and tender herb (Job 38:27) (2) "Herbs" refer to the larger plants (Genesis 3:18) and (3) fruit trees with seed-enclosed fruit, this expression intending to convey the idea of self-propagation The words "And it was so" found in Verse 7 are misplaced and should be placed at the end of Verse 6 as in the Septuagint translation. We have so placed them in the above Hymn of Creation

There are seven refrains in the Hebrew text, but the Septuagint translation has an additional refrain, "And God saw that it was good" at the end of verse 8. The refrains found in the Hebrew text are in verses 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31. Those in vs. 28, 29 are usually regarded as providential rather than creative refrains The writer states the threefold purpose of the luminaries as follows: (1) to divide day from night, or the light from the darkness (5: 18). (2) For signs and for seasons, and for days and years. Signs refer to the cardinal points of the compass and the help which the stars give in finding these points. Seasons refer to the fixed times for migration of the birds (Jeremiah 8:7), seedtime, flowering and harvest-practically what we mean by the four seasons. It refers also to fixed religious festivals. The "days and years" are fixed as to their length by the

heavenly bodies. (3) To give light upon the earth, the expression doubtless having reference to the furnishing of the necessary conditions for the existence and progress of the race

Living souls is an expression which has reference to individualized somatic life. The term soul (nephesh) in Hebrew psychology is not peculiar to man, but represents the principle of life and sensibility in any animal organism. It is therefore, frequently transferred to the sentient organism itself (Cf. Ezekiel 47:9, Leviticus 24:18) The expression "Let the earth bring forth" is not intended to convey the idea of spontaneous generation, but represents merely the adaptation necessary to the next stage of development. It emphasizes the fact that all life originated at the command of God, whether immediate or mediate.

THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY The Hymn of Creation which furnishes the basis of the Mosaic cosmogony has been interpreted in various ways. (1) The Mythological Interpretation. Modern critics regard the first chapter of Genesis as a mythological account written by a highly cultured Israelite who gives his reflections concerning the origin of all things. But neither the tone nor the contents warrant this construction. Both Jesus and the apostles treat the chapter as sacred history (Cf. Matthew 19:4). (2) The Allegorical Interpretation. Due to the influence of the Alexandrian School, many of the earlier Christian writers adopted the allegorical method of interpretation. To modern thought, however, with its scientific background, this method is scarcely less objectionable than the mythological interpretation. As late as the nineteenth century, Herder defended the method, regarding the creation account as an optical representation of the beginning of all things which reappears every morning at sunrise. (3) The Vision Hypothesis. This theory was advocated by Kurtz, Keerl and others, who regarded the account as being made known in a series of retrospective visions, given in such a manner that the objective truth of revelation blended with the subjective conception of the seer. While this form of revelation is of course possible, it finds no support by other instances of retrospective vision, and has never been an accepted theory in the Church. (4) The Historical Interpretation. This account was a portion of the Scriptures which existed in the time of our Lord, which He pronounced holy and appealed to as divine. It is therefore authoritative. Interpretations may vary, but for us, this account is the truth concerning the origin of the world The Days of Creation.The Genesis account of creation is primarily a religious document. It cannot be considered a scientific statement, and yet it must not be regarded as contradictory to science. It is rather, a supreme illustration of the manner in which revealed truth indirectly sheds light upon scientific fields. The Hebrew word yom which is translated "day" occurs no less than 1,480 times in the Old Testament, and is translated by something over fifty different words, including such terms as time, life, today, age, forever, continually and perpetually. With such a flexible use of the original term, it is impossible to either dogmatize or to demand unswerving restriction to one only of those meanings. It is frequently assumed that originally orthodox belief held to a solar day of twenty-four hours, and that the church altered her exegesis under the pressure of modern geological discoveries. This as Dr. Shedd points out is one of the "errors of ignorance." The best Hebrew exegesis has never regarded the days of Genesis as solar days, but as day-periods of indefinite duration. The doctrine of an immense time prior to the six days of creation was a common view among the earlier fathers and the schoolmen. Only with the scholastics of the middle ages and the evangelical writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was this idea current. Previous to this a profounder view was taught by the acknowledged leaders of the Church. Thus Augustine says, "Our seven days resemble the seven

days of the Genesis account in being a series, and in having the vicissitudes of morning and evening, but they are multum in pares. He calls them naturae(natures or birth), and morae(delays or solemn pauses). Hence they are God-divided days in contradistinction to sun-divided days; they are ineffable days (dies ineffabiles) as in their true nature transcendent, while the sun-divided days (vicissitudines coeli) are due merely to changes in planetary movements. He affirms, therefore, that the word day does not apply to the duration of time, but to the boundaries of great periods. Nor is this a metaphorical meaning of the word, but the original, which signifies "to put period to" or to denote a self-completed time. Origen, Irenams, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen taught the same doctrine during the patristic period, as did also many of the learned Jewish doctors outside the ’Christian Church. Later writers holding this view are Hahn, Hensler, Knapp, Lee, Henry More, Burnett and others. Of the more recent writers we may mention Hodge, Pope, Miley, Cocker, and Stearns. Some writers, recognizing that the word for "day" as found in the Hebrew text may mean either a definite or indefinite period of time, leave the question open. Dr. Wakefield holds to the theory of solar days, while a number of theologians regard the subject of creation as belonging to the field of science rather than theology, and mention it but briefly or omit it altogether

Creation and Cosmogony.The Genesis account of creation establishes a distinction between the first production of matter in the sense of origination, and secondary creation, or the formation of that matter by subsequent elaboration into a cosmos. These distinctions are usually known as primary and secondary, or as immediate and mediate creation. While primary creation is a direct origination, secondary creation is always indirect, that is it is accomplished by means of a Law behind other laws. The term mediate creation better expresses the thought, and conveys the idea that God creates through creation itself. Bishop Martensen points out that it is involved in creation that God brings forth not something dead, but something alive, and consequently able to reproduce itself. There is therefore a certain autonomy in the created universe, derived and dependent, indeed, but nevertheless an autonomy, with the capacity of being set up in opposition to God himself. St. Paul recognizes this limited creaturehood when he says, that the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now (Romans 8:21-22). When, therefore, God created the vegetation He did not say, "Let there be vegetation" but "Let the earth put forth vegetation"; when He created somatic life He said, "Let the waters swarm forth swarming things," and again, "Let the land bring forth living soul after its kind." This is mediate creation. As previously pointed out in a note on the Hymn of Creation, these expressions are not intended to convey the idea of spontaneous generation, but to emphasize a truth that all things either immediately or mediately were created at the command of God. Each of the new days was ushered in solely by virtue of the omnipotent word spoken by the Creator, and was therefore creatura; but each new day dawned only when the time was full and the conditions perfect, and was therefore, natura. There is here, also, a suggestion that the progress of the entire creation depends upon the progress made by the creatures in their natural development. The idea of creation dominant among the Hebrews was that of creatura; that among the Greeks, natura. The former was a direct creative act, an origination; the latter an unfolding or development in time. It is evident that the tendency of the former is toward Deism, while that of the latter is toward Pantheism. It is the glory of Christianity that it presents both the transcendent and the immanent aspects of creation in their balanced harmony. Thus St. John in his teaching concerning the Logos, regards the world (1) as a production through the Word, an origination of that which before

had no being; and (2) as a transition from not-being to being through the Logos. Through it everything was done [gegonen]; and without it not even one thing was done, which has been done (John 1:3, Emphatic Diaglot). The word ginomai(ginomai) occurs in the New Testament more than seven hundred times, and fifty-three times in this Gospel; and as the Emphatic Diaglot points out, is never translated create, but signifies to be, to become, to come to pass; also to be done or transacted. It is translated "made" in the sense of "to be born" in Romans 1:3 and Galatians 4:4 which gives the true import of the word as a birth or a becoming. The word for create is ktizo(ktizw). It is clear then that according to the teachings of the Scriptures there has been both a creative and a cosmogonic beginning-the one supernatural and infinite, the other relative and finite, both being comprehended in any true Christian concept of the origin of the world THE ORDER OF CREATION In considering the order of creation as given in the Genesis account, three things demand attention, first, Primary Creation or Origination; second, Secondary Creation or Formation; and third, Gradual and Cumulative Creation

Primary Creation or Origination.The word "created" is used three times in the Genesis account, and is a translation of the word bars, which signifies origination, or creation de novo. This word occurs in the three following verses: In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1:1). And God created great whales (leviathans or sea monsters) (Genesis 1:21). So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him (Genesis 1:27). Dr. Cocker makes the statement that a careful study of this and the following chapter led him to the conclusion that there was something fundamental and distinctive in the word barawhich did not attach to the words yetsarand aysah. "It is in reality," he says, "the distinction between origination de novo, and formation out of pre-existing materials. There are three instances in which baraoccurs in Genesis 1:1-31. We are fully convinced that in each case it denotes the origination of a new entity-a real addition to the sum of existence (COCKER, Theistic Conception of the World, p. 157). Dr. Miley questions this position and cites Isaiah 43:7 where all three words occur and are applied to the same divine act. It is not that he denies that the primitive act of creation was the origination of matter itself, but insists that there is no conclusive proof of it on purely philological grounds (Cf. MILEY, Systematic Theology, I, p. 283). Dr. Adam Clarke throws the weight of his authority on the side of the former position. He interprets the word baraas causing that to exist which, previous to this moment, had no being. He says, "The rabbins, who are the legitimate judges in a case of verbal criticism of their own language, are unanimous in asserting that the word baraexpresses commencement of the existence of a thing: or its egression from nonentity to entity. It does not in its primary meaning, denote the preserving or new forming things that had previously existed, as some imagine: but creation, in the proper sense of the term, though it has some other acceptations in other places (CLARKE, Commentary,Genesis 1:1) . If then we examine the three instances where this word occurs, we shall find each of them an origination of a new entity The first origination was that of material substance, or the prima materia of all physical existences. Dr. Adam Clarke’s rendering of this verse is, God in the beginning created the substance of the heavens, and the substance of the earth, 1:e., the prima materia, or first element out of which the heavens and the earth were successively formed. He substantiates his position by referring to the Hebrew word eth which is usually regarded as a particle denoting that the word following is in the accusative or oblique case, but which the rabbinical literature uses in a more extensive sense. "The particle eth," says Eben Ezra, "signifies the substance of a thing." Kimchi, in his Book of Roots, gives a like definition. It is used by the Cabbalists to signify the beginning and

the end as the words alpha and omega are used in the Apocalypse. Dr. Clarke states further that "it argues a wonderful philosophic accuracy in the statement of Moses, which brings before us, not a finished heavens and earth as every other translation appears to do, though afterward the process of their formation is given in detail, but merely the materials out of which God built the whole system in the six following days" (ADAM CLARKE, Commentary,Genesis 1:1) . The first origination therefore, was that of matter in its chaotic or unformed state The second origination was that of somatic or soul life. And God created the great leviathans [or sea monsters], and every living soul [nepheshor soul of life] that moveth (Genesis 1:21). Here is the appearance of a new entity. The diffused life found in the vegetable realm is individualized and separated from the universal life of nature. It is called somatic life (from soma, a body), in that the individualized life is given a body separate and distinct from diffused life; and it is a nepheshor soul of life, in that the soul is the individualized center of force and the body is immediate field of activity. This soul is an immaterial entity, having sensation, feeling and will. It is therefore properly expressed by the word tiara, in that a new power or principle was infused into the then existing nature The third origination was that of spirit or personal being. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them (Genesis 1:27). As the second origination was that of individualized life characterized by consciousness, so the third origination is a further individualization which may be characterized as self-consciousness. If then we understand by the soul, that principle which individualizes life, the soul must take on the character of the life thus individualized. We may regard the soul of an animal, therefore, as consciousness dominating a field of instinct; while the soul of man, is a self dominating a field of consciousness. Man not only knows, but he knows that he knows, and thus becomes responsible for his actions. It is this quality which constitutes man a free moral agent and thus makes him Godlike. This is the image of God in man

We may say, then, that the three created entities expressed by the word tiara are matter, soul and spirit, or matter, life and mind. They may be equally well expressed by the words matter, consciousness and self

Secondary Creation or Formation.Deep as is the mystery of creation in the primary sense, it is no less so in the secondary sense of formation. God does not originate the material of creation, and then in an external manner form it into individual objects with no relation to each other, except that of a common fashioner or architect. He creates through creation itself. He creates that which has life in itself and consequently the power of self-propagation. Thus the world has both a supernatural and a natural beginning. It is a cosmos in which all the parts which compose one whole are arranged in order and beauty. They are not disconnected, but one emerges out of the other at the command of God so that all things are related both in nature and as a consequence of their supernatural origin. There is no place in the account for the theory of spontaneous generation. This is the fallacy of the evolutionary hypothesis. If now we note the various stages which are introduced by the creative fiat, Let there be, and concluded with the refrain, And God saw that it was good, we shall have before us the seven formative acts of God as found in Genesis account. These will constitute the sevenfold series of natural beginnings or births out of pre-existent and prepared material which through the Divine Word or Logos transformed the world from chaos to cosmos and united the universe in a true cosmogony

(1) Let there be light (Genesis 1:3). This is the formation of cosmic light, sometimes regarded as radiant heat and light. The Hebrew word is our and is translated "fire" in Isaiah 31:9 and Ezekiel 5:2; it is translated "sun" in Job 31:23 and "lightning" in Job 37:3. (2) Let there be an expanse (or firmament) (Genesis 1:6), and Let the waters under the heaven be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear (Genesis 1:9). It will be noted that here there are two fiats included in the one refrain. In the Septuagint a refrain follows verse 6, but the best Hebrew exegesis holds that this formative period was not completed on the second day, and therefore the refrain was added only after the creation of the seas and land which began with the formation of the firmament. Dr. Cocker holds that the firmament represents a mechanical combination of chemical elements, while the sea and land represent chemical compounds and their molar aggregation. (3) Let the land put forth vegetation (Genesis 1:11). Here there is an introduction of a new force within matter, a vital element giving rise to vitalized germinal matter, and making possible the organic realm. (4) Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heavens (Genesis 1:14). It is a significant fact that the organic realms as well as the inorganic begin with the introduction of light. Here the light is an adjustment of the cosmical relations, furnishing the conditions for the further development of the organic realm. (5) Let the waters swarm forth swarming things, living souls, and let birds fly over the earth (Genesis 1:20). This fifth formative act or birth out of the waters and the atmosphere can refer only to the material organisms which embody the living souls, for conjoined with this formative act there is the use of the word tiara as the origination of living soul which forms the second entity. (6) Let the land bring forth living soul after its kind (Genesis 1:24). The sixth formation is the emergence out of the earth of the material organisms of the animal, by the fiat of God. This appears to be the last of the purely emergent acts of God’s mediate creation, for the next following combines with it the introduction of a new formative as well as a new creative element. (7) Let us make man (Genesis 1:26). Of the creative statement, this portion only refers to the formation of the material organism of man. But the formative act is not entirely mediate as in the former instances, for the word is not "Let the earth bring forth man," but Let us make man. Hence in the word "made," we find the formative act which relates man’s body to the cosmos, while in the word "create" (tiara) as previously indicated, we find the origination of man’s spiritual being in the image and likeness of God. Thus each stage of development is the condition for each succeeding stage in orderly arrangement, until all are gathered up in a final refrain, And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good (Genesis 1:31) The Creative Periods.Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the Mosaic cosmogony is the orderly arrangement in stages and periods known as creative days. In the sense of origination, creation is instantaneous; but as formation it is gradual and cumulative. There is a progressive revelation in an ascending scale of creative acts. Each stage is preparatory to that which succeeds it, as well as a prophecy of that which shall follow. The study of the Genesis account reveals certain facts which take on added significance with each new scientific discovery. First, there are two great eras mentioned, each with three creative days-the Inorganic and the Organic. Second, each of these great eras begins with the appearance of light-the one with the creation of cosmic light, the other with light emanating from created luminaries. Third, each of these eras ends with a day in which a twofold work is accomplished, the first the completing or perfecting act of that which precedes it, and the second a prophecy of that which is to be. This arrangement may be set forth in schematic form as follows: The Inorganic Era 1st Day-Cosmical Light 2nd Day-The Firmament water and atmosphere 3rd Day-Dry Land (or the outlining of land and seas) Creation of Vegetation

(transitional and prophetic) The Organic Era 4th Day-The Luminaries 5th Day-The lower animals-fishes and birds 6th Day-Land animals Creation of Man (transitional and prophetic) The creation of vegetation, which for physical reasons belongs to the third day, is the culmination of the Inorganic Era and the prophecy of the Organic Era which immediately follows. We may say also that man, the culmination of the work of the sixth day, is likewise prophetic of another aeon, the new age in which the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven With the rapidly increasing discoveries of science, the Genesis account was soon called in question by men who appeared to be authorities in their fields of investigation. But Christian men, eminent in science also, after prolonged study and research declared that not only is there no conflict between Genesis and modern science but that there is a remarkable parallel between them. Hugh Miller, eminent in geology, found no misplacement of facts in the Genesis account. Professors Winchell, Dana, Guyot and Dawson, among the earlier men of science, maintained that the order of events in the Scripture cosmogony corresponds essentially with the discoveries of modern science. One of the earlier parallels between Genesis and geology is that of Professor Dana who gives the following geological order (Cf. DANA, Manual of Geology, HODGE, Syst. Th., I, p. 571):

1. Light 2. The dividing of the waters below from the waters above the earth 3. The dividing of the land and water on the earth

4. Vegetation, which Moses, appreciating the philosophical characteristics of the new creation, distinguishes from previous inorganic substances, and defines as that which has seed in itself 5. The sun, moon and stars 6. The lower animals, those that swarm in the waters and the creeping and flying species of the land 7. Beasts of prey

8. Man

Later discoveries in science demand new statements of these parallels, but we may believe, with James Ward, that there is not and never can be any opposition between science and religion, any more than there can be between grammar and religion. Sir William Ramsey once said, "Between the essential truth of Christianity and the established facts of science there is no real antagonism." We are indebted to Dr. L. A. Reed for the following parallels between the Genesis account of creation, and the more recent discoveries of modern science "When the Nebular Hypothesis was advocated in the early part of the nineteenth century by Pierre Simon

Laplace, French mathematician and astronomer, it was quite universally received by the scientific world. Almost any one of Laplace’s original researches is alone sufficient to stamp him as one of the greatest of mathematicians. Some of his accomplishments are the discovery of the invariability of the major axes of the planetary orbits; the explanation of the great inequality in the motions of Jupiter and Saturn; the solution of the problem of the acceleration of the mean motion of the moon; the theory of Jupiter’s satellites and many other important laws including this Nebular Theory, which was an attempt to explain the development of the solar system. `This theory supposes that the bodies composing the solar system once existed in the form of nebulae; that these had a revolution on their own axis from west to east; that the temperature gradually diminishing, and the nebulae contracting by refrigeration, the rotation increased in rapidity, and zones of nebulosity were successively thrown off in consequence of the centrifugal force overpowering the central attraction. These zones being condensed, and partaking of the primary rotation, constituted the planets, some of which in turn threw off zones which now form their satellites. The main body

being condensed toward the center, formed the sun. The theory afterward was extended so as to include a cosmogony of the whole universe' (Cf. WINSTON, Encyl., Vol. VII, Neb. Hypoth.)

"Many objections were raised to this hypothesis, because it did not satisfy the demands of the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. With the discovery of the spectroscope, much in the above hypothesis was proved fact, for now nebulous matter is recognized to be in existence all through the universe. It was also discovered that much of the nebulae is black and dark, and it was further discovered that the spiral nebulae have a planetesimal organization. This brought forth the theory that the solar system was formed from nebulae consisting of planetesimals. These formations still may be found in the universe. Hence, quite a change is noted from the old Nebular Hypothesis and instead of the blazing nebulous mass of 'Laplace,' we have the dark nubulae building up a universe of planets, planetoids, asteroids* and meteors. As formally stated, this building process may still be discovered going on in the universe. Thousands of meteors fall on the earth each year and the magnetism of the various spheres builds them up by attracting the planetesimals to them. All this fits in beautifully with the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis, which says, And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face o f the deep. And so the planets were formed from these shapeless masses. The smaller the nebulae the quicker the contraction, hence this would explain why the earth is mentioned as being created before the sun, for it would not have begun to function until the earth was fairly well formed as a sphere. The earth also preceded the moon, for satellites were supposed to have come into existence through centrifugal force and it was mentioned in relation with the sun as being a `lighter of the earth.' Thus in the first day this nebulous light was the universal illumination. The character of this light is somewhat of a mystery, but astronomers think it was electrical and phosphorescent. Suffice it to say that in the treatment of the planetesimal explanation (or hypothesis), the account of light being given before the mention of the sun and the moon, substantiates scientifically the claim of the creation story."

*About six hundred asteroids have their orbits between Mars and Jupiter, the largest of them, Ceres, having a diameter of not more than 500 miles When one orients himself as to the first day of creation, then the other days follow in exact scientific order. These periods of time have never been arranged by scientists in any other manner than the first chapter of Genesis arranges them. Paleontological evidence substantiates the order and arrangement of life as laid down in Genesis. The creative fiat, in its triple expression in the first chapter of Genesis, is sufficient explanation for being, both inanimate and animate, and with the increasing discoveries of science is being verified each day by earth's greatest minds The Restoration Theory.In order to account for the great geological periods, it has been held more or less extensively in the church, that the first verse of the creative account is an introductory statement without reference to a time order; and that between this and the following verses an immense interval of time elapsed. Thus Dr. Shedd makes the assertion that between the single comprehensive act of the creation of the angels and of the chaotic matter mentioned in Genesis 1:1 an interval of time elapsed; and he further declares that this was a common view among the fathers and the schoolmen. In this way the long creative periods which geology demands are accounted for without regarding the days of Genesis as other than solar days of twenty-four hours each. Modern writers such as John W. McGarvey and G. Campbell Morgan take this position, setting aside the two introductory verses as expressive of an immeasurably long period of time. This was followed by a great catastrophe in which everything

upon the earth was destroyed. After this God recreated the earth and revivified it in a week of six solar days. In substantiation of this the words of Isaiah are cited, God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain [1:e., He created it not a waste], he formed it to be inhabited (Isaiah 45:18). Dr. Coggins calls attention to the Hebrew words tohu wabohu as implying such a catastrophe, the former meaning "wasteness" and the latter "voidness" or "emptiness."

Whether St. Paul meant only to summarize the various orders of the animal creation, or whether he meant to teach distinctions in kind, the following verse is worthy of study. All flesh, he says, is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, another of birds (ICor. 15:39).

THE PURPOSE OF CREATION

We have considered the world as cosmos, it remains now to direct our attention to the world as aeon. By this we mean that succession of epochs and periods running throughout the course of the ages, and involving both the physical and ethical aspects of the world. One such aeon is past, the second eon is the present age, and we have the promise of an age to come. What is beyond this we cannot know, although St. Paul refers to the ages to come (Ephesians 2:7). The first aeon on the physical plane is that indefinite formative age which antedates the present heavens and earth (Genesis 1:1). The second aeon is the present economy. As the prehistoric aeon was superseded by the action of persistent forces, which at the command of God issued in the current aeon, so both the observations of naturalists and the words of divine revelation teach, that there are now mighty agencies held in check, which anticipate tremendous convulsions, and which when the fullness of time shall have come, will break forth into a new heavens and a new earth. But 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. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved[luqhsontai],what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved [luqhsontai], and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (IIPeter 3:10-13). In one sense therefore the present world will come to an end and pass away to make room for a different organization; but in another sense it will not come to an end, for at the command of God, all that hinders its progress, all that links it with the curse of man, will be melted away or dissolved, and it will then emerge into the heavens and the earth which are to be. For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind (Isaiah 65:17). And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away (Revelation 21:1) But the aeons cannot be understood on the physical plane alone. There are ethical and spiritual realms which closely parallel them, and reveal in clearer light the purpose of God in creation. (1) The first aeon on this plane is the prehuman realm of created spirits which is given only brief mention in the sacred Scriptures. A part of this world of spirits apostasized, thus bringing moral disorder and spiritual confusion into the universe. What the chaos of the geological ages was to the present material universe, that the prehistoric spiritual disorder is to the present moral and spiritual economy. The one answers to the other. (2) The second aeon opens with the creation of man as an ethical and

spiritual being and will extend to the final consummation of the present world order. Two decisive epochs may be observed. First, the fall of man into sin, which the Scriptures seem to indicate was the direct consequence of the defection of angels; and second, the incarnation or advent of the Second Man as the Lord from heaven. The first man was of the earth, earthy, by which we are to understand that he was the full complement of all the subhuman kingdoms. The Second Man was a quickening spirit which marked a new beginning in the human race-a beginning which can come to its perfection only with the return of the Son of man in His glory. While conditioned by the first Adam, the last Adam will be the full spiritual complement of all the essential demands implicit in the original constitution of the Adamic race, and of all the accidental demands due to man's depravity and sin. We may say, then, that the physical universe came to its triumph in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and its ethical and spiritual triumph in the return of the Holy Spirit. Thus the physical universe finds its meaning in the ethical, the ethical in the spiritual, and the spiritual in the glory of God. (3) The third aeon will open with the advent of Christ and usher in the new age which is to be. Then the world-idea which had been struggling through the ages will come to its perfection. This is the mystery, which according to St. Paul has been hidden from the ages and generations, but which is now made manifest. Christ is both the mystery and the manifestation. The new aeon from the physical aspect will find its expression in a new heaven and a new earth; on the ethical and moral plane, it will be an age in which righteousness dwells--an age free from sin and all moral disorder The Kingdom of God.We may say then, that theology finds the purpose of creation in the kingdom of God. This kingdom is at once a present possession and a future hope. Jesus was Himself the Perfect embodiment of the principles upon which the kingdom rests. Through His redemptive work men may now be delivered from sin; with the full fruition of this work, His people will be delivered from the consequences of sin. The complete realization of this ideal requires other conditions than those which obtain during the present aeon. Here there is an inner redemptive experience of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost (Romans 14:17) ; then at the appearance of the Lord in glory, the kingdom shall be ushered in as the full realization of man's highest ethical and spiritual ideals, and the perfect medium for the realization of all his aspirations and hopes

There are three historical interpretations of the kingdom of God, each of which contains some truth which should be conserved. These concepts of the kingdom are, first, the Millennial; second, the Ecclesiastical; and third, the Individualistic. They demand only brief mention at this time The Millennial Concept of the Kingdom.This is a term used to describe that class of theories which look for the kingdom to be ushered in by a sudden trans formation of the present order, at the coming of Christ. Since according to this theory the advent precedes the millennium, believers in this theory are commonly known as pre-millennialists. The term used in the early Church to express this concept was "Chiliasm." The Latin equivalent of the Greek ciliaV is mille, or a thousand, from which our word millennium is derived. The beginnings of this doctrine lie far back in the eschatological ideal of later Judaism, and were revived and strengthened in the early Church through a study of the Jewish apocalyptical literature. While this teaching was not universal in the early Church, it was nevertheless the dominant theory, as may be confirmed by a study of the ante-Nicene Fathers The Ecclesiastical Concept of the Kingdom.With Augustine thought was diverted into different channels. The dying out of the expectation of the immediate re turn of Christ led to a reinterpretation of the teachings of our Lord. Augustine interpreted the millennium to mean the spiritual reign of the Church, and therefore, in large measure identified the kingdom with the

visible Church. The extension of the Church meant the extension of the kingdom. The term, therefore, is applied to those theories which seek by social and ecclesiastical organization to mold the social structure after a Christian pattern. The theory finds its clearest expression, for the Roman Catholic Church at least, in Augustine's City of God The Individualistic Concept of the Kingdom.Against the social organization of the Roman Catholic Church, Protestantism reacted, and consequently developed the individualistic conception of the kingdom. According to this theory, the kingdom is an inner spiritual kingdom-the rule of Christ over His people through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. It has taken different forms, as for instance, the elective grace of Calvinism and the individual probation of Arminianism. Luther stressed the idea of justification by faith, and John Wesley pressed the matter still further, insisting that as we are justified by faith, so also we are sanctified by faith. But whether Lutheran, Reformed or Arminian all agreed in denying the mediatorial offices of the Church, and insisted upon a direct relation of man to God through the Spirit The element to be conserved in the first theory is the necessity of a new order as a ground for the full expression of the Christian ideal. In the second theory, we must insist that the inner spiritual principles have their counterpart in an outward social structure; while the necessity of grace in the transformed lives of individual persons must ever give character and quality to the ideals of the kingdom ANGELS AND SPIRITS The Scriptures clearly teach that there is an order of intelligences higher than that of men; and further asserts that these intelligences are connected with man both in providence and in the redemptive economy. These intelligences are called Spirits to denote their specific nature; they are called Angels to denote their mission. Nothing can be known of them other than that which is revealed in the Scriptures. They are created spirits but the time of their creation is not indicated. Dr. Miley holds that such creation must have been included in the statement found in Genesis 1:1, and therefore preceding the six days' formative period. Dr. Stump, on the other hand, states that this creative act must have followed the formative period, for at its close God pronounced everything that He had made as "very good." The Nature and Attributes of Angels.Angels are frequently described as pure spirits, 1:e., incorporeal and immaterial beings. The Scriptures do not attribute bodies to them; but on the assumption that a world of spirits could not function in the material realm apart from the media of bodies, a council held at Nicea (A.D. 784) decided that angels had ethereal bodies, composed of either light or ether. In substantiation of this they quoted such verses as Matthew 28:3 and Luke 2:9, as well as other passages which spoke of their luminous presence. The Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) reversed the former decision and declared that angels were incorporeal. This has been the general opinion of the Church since that time. Dr. Pope, however, takes a different position. He holds that the angels, while less closely connected with the material universe than man, must not be regarded as pure spirits. "God alone," he says, "is pure, essential Spirit; these created spirits are clothed with ethereal vestures, such as Paul describes when he says, There is a spiritual body (1 Corinthians 15:44). Thus our Lord tells us that the children of the resurrection are [isaggeloi], equal unto the angels (Luke 20:36). Having a more subtle organization than man, they are at present higher in their range of faculties; greater in power and might (2 Peter 2:11), and angels that excel in strength (Psalms 103:20). But what their faculties are, what organs they use, and what is the bond between their psychology and our own, we know not" (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 409). That angels have assumed human bodies, either in appearance or reality, in order to converse with men is evident from the Scriptures. (Cf. Genesis 18:2 the appearance to Abraham, and Genesis 19:1; Genesis 19:10 the appearance to Lot.)

Bishop Martensen maintains that the angels or spirits represent general rather than specific powers, and therefore bear the same relation to man that the universal bears to the microcosmical. While the angel is the more powerful spirit, man’s spirit is nevertheless the richer and more comprehensive. "For the angel in all his power," he says, "is only the expression of a single one of all those phases which man in the inward nature of his soul, and the richness of his own individuality, is intended to combine into a complete and perfect microcosm." He further asserts that "it is precisely because the angels are only spirits, but not souls, that they cannot possess the same rich existence as man, whose soul is the point of union in which spirit and nature meet. The high privilege, which man enjoys above the angels, finds expression in the Scriptures, where it is said that the Son of God was made not an angel, but a man (Hebrews 2:16). "He was willing to unite Himself with nature alone, which is the central point of creation. As man is that point in which the spiritual and corporeal worlds are united, and as humanity is the particular form in which the Incarnation has taken place, it follows that men are capable of entering into the fullest and most perfect union with God, while angels, on account of their pure spirituality, can be made only partakers of the majesty of God, but cannot, in the same immediate manner as man, be made partakers of His revelation of love, the mystery of the Incarnation, and the sacramental union connected with it" (Cf. MARTENSEN, Chr. Dogm., p. 132ff). It is for this reason that St. Peter speaks of those that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into (1 Peter 1:12) ; while St. Paul speaks of the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom o f God (Ephesians 3:9-10). Here it is expressly stated that the angels and spirits in heavenly places are merely witnesses to the redemptive glory of man, but that they themselves cannot partake of Christ in the same real manner. Hence St. John in the Apocalypse hears redeemed men singing a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou vast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. The-angels, however, say with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing; while the created universe was heard to say, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever (Revelation 5:9; Revelation 5:12-13) The attributes ascribed to angels usually include indivisibility, immutability, illocality and agility. Being indivisible and immutable, angels may be described as invisible, incorruptible and immortal. Their relation to space is that of illocalitas, 1:e., they are not omnipresent, but always somewhere present. The attribute of agility refers more especially to the power of angels to move with the greatest celerity. Angels must also be regarded as individuals and not as composing a race. It is expressly stated that they are not male and female and do not propagate their kind (Matthew 22:30). However there appear to be grades or ranks among the angels, such as cherubim (Genesis 3:24) seraphim (Isaiah 6:2), thrones, dominions, principalities, powers (Colossians 1:16, Ephesians 3:10, Romans 8:38), and archangels (1 Thessalonians 4:16, Jude 1:9). It is interesting to note that in the lower orders of creation, the species predominates and the individual is nothing, in man the species and the individual are blended, while in the upper world the species is lost and the individual is alone before God. Whether in church or state, the social structure is divinely intended to care for and preserve the individual, but ultimately the individual must himself appear

before God to answer for the deeds done in the body The Ministry of Angels.The highest exercise of angels is to wait upon God. The expression, "Lord of hosts," refers to the Lord attended by His angels. When it is said that all the sons of God shouted for joy (Job 38:7) the reference is to the angels as sons. Their chief duty is to minister to the heirs of salvation. They were present at creation, at the giving of the law, at the birth of Christ, after the temptation in the wilderness, in Gethsemane, at the resurrection and the ascension. Hence the author of Hebrews inquires, Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? (Hebrews 1:14). For this free service they were prepared by a probationary period. Both Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Pope regard the cherubim as symbolical rather than descriptive forms, and signify the forces of the created universe as attendant upon God. The seraphim likewise represent the creature before God and are the watchers, burning with divine love. The schoolmen divided the angels into three hierarchies; (1) Thrones, cherubim and seraphim which attended immediately upon God; (2) Dominions, virtues and powers, which operated in nature and in warfare; and (3) Principalities, archangels and angels, which fulfilled special missions and ministered to the heirs of salvation

Good and Evil Angels. The angels in their original estate were holy beings, endowed with freedom of will and subjected to a period of probation. They were meant to choose voluntarily the service of God, and thus be prepared for the free service of ministering to the heirs of salvation. They did not all keep their first estate, but some fell into sin and rebellion against God. Hence we read of the condemnation of the devil (ITim. 3:6) who we gather from the Scriptures was at the head of that portion of the angels which fell away. Satan for this reason is called the prince of the power of the air (Ephesians 2:2), and his hosts are referred to as spiritual wickedness in high places (Ephesians 6:12). We may believe also that following their probationary period, the good angels were confirmed in holiness and admitted to a state of glory - a state of indefectibility wherein they always behold the face of God (Matthew 18:10). The wicked likewise were confirmed in their state of misery. Their fall was not due to any necessity from within, or any compulsion from without, but may be regarded as voluntary apostasy. It is surmised that their sin was pride (1 Timothy 3:6). As a consequence of their sin they have been brought under the condemnation of God (2 Peter 2:4), and shall be punished eternally (Matthew 25:41). Since God is a God of love, we may infer that the angels were not salvable, or He would have made provision for their salvation. Their disposition toward God is one of enmity, this malignant purpose being centered in Satan who stands at their head

Satan. Satan is a personal being, the head of the kingdom of evil spirits. He is the essential anti-Christ. Two names chiefly, are applied to him, both of which ex press his character. He is Satan, or adversary, and devil (diabolus) or calumniator. Our Lord describes him as sowing the seeds of error and doubt in the Church (Matthew 13:39), and as being both a liar and a murderer (John 8:44). He is able also to transform himself into an angel of light. The rationalists have always denied a personal devil, regarding Satan as a personification of the principles of evil. Even Schleiermacher combatted the idea of a personal Satan. The later mediating theologians, however, such as Martensen, Dorner, Nitsch and Twesten held firmly to the view of Satan as a personal being. This subject must be given further attention in connection with the origin of evil.

Four archangels are named in the Scripture: Michael (Daniel 10:13; Daniel 12:1; Jude 1:9, Revelation 12:7) ; Gabriel (Daniel 8:16; Daniel 9:21, Luke 1:19; Luke 1:26) ; Raphiel (Apocrypha,

Tob 3:17; Tob 12:15) and Uriel (2Es 4:1). Three others are named in Jewish tradition: Chamuel, Jophiel and Zadkiel.

PROVIDENCE The God of creation is also the God of providence. He sustains and cares for the world which He has made, and His tender mercies are over all His works. Providence involves the attributes of God, His goodness, wisdom and power being the most prominent. It involves the Trinity with its various missions and economies. Providence is ascribed to the Father (John 5:17), to the Son (John 5:17, Colossians 1:17, Hebrews 1:3), and to the Holy Spirit (Psalms 104:30). As Father, God rested from His work of creation but continues it in providence. The Divine Sabbath is therefore a perfect rest filled with perfect activity-not in a new creative work, not even in continuous creation, but in the preservation and upholding of all things by the word of His power. There is also a special economy of providence which belongs to the Son in the administration of redemption-that of the kingly office of the mediatorial economy (Matthew 28:18, Ephesians 1:22, Hebrews 1:2-3). There is a further economy of the Holy Spirit as the Lord and Giver of life. He is especially the God of Christian providence in the administration of redemption. Providence, however, is conventionally ascribed to the Father. Since God as Creator is both transcendent and immanent in His relation to the world, we are under the necessity of guarding against the errors of Deism and Pantheism in any discussion of the subject. These positions have been previously discussed and need only brief mention here

Providence may be defined as that activity of the Triune God by which He conserves, cares for and governs the world which He has made. The subject may be broadly divided into General Providence by which is meant God’s care for the world as a whole and everything in it; and Special Providence which refers more particularly to His care for the human race. In the strictest sense of the term, providence can be revealed only in history, and is concerned with the exigencies arising from the freedom of man’s will. Since the subject of creation in the sense of the aeon necessitated a discussion of God’s purpose in creation, we need now to direct our attention only to a consideration of the administrative phases of this subject. Here we find another classification, that of Ordinary Providence, by which is meant the general exercise of God’s care through established principles and laws; and Extraordinary Providence, or God’s miraculous intervention in the ordinary course of nature or history. It is with the former that we are now specially concerned. Providence further involves the twofold idea of a conserving and a ruling Agency, but in its application to the objects of providence, the threefold division is more comprehensive and appropriate. We shall, therefore, treat the subject of Providence under the following main divisions, first, Conservation as referring to inanimate nature; second, Preservation as referring to animate nature and the creaturely wants of the subhuman kingdoms; and third, Government in its application to man in his probationary state

Conservation.Conservation is God’s preserving providence in the realm of the physical universe. It is concerned with the relation of God to the world. The question immediately arises, Is there no further relation of God to the world than the primary fact of creative causality? Have the laws of God as found in nature a real efficiency, so that His immediate presence and agency are no longer required? Or, is God still immanent in nature, upholding all things with the word of His power? (Hebrews 1:3). The Scriptures are explicit in their statements: He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things (Acts 17:25) ; For in him we live, and move, and have our being (Acts 17:28); And he is before all things, and by him all things consist (Colossians 1:17); For of him, and through him, and

to him, are all things (Romans 11:36). Mr. Wesley sums up the evangelical belief concerning conservation in the following clear and concise statement. He says, "God is also the supporter of all the things which He has made. He beareth, upholdeth, sustaineth all created things by the word of His power; by the same powerful word which brought them out of nothing. As this was absolutely necessary for the beginning of their existence, it is equally so for the continuance of it; were His almighty influence withdrawn, they could not subsist a moment longer" (Sermon on Providence) As to the mode of this relation existing between God and the world, three theories have been advanced. (1) "Continuous Creation. Admitting that creation is by the power of God, and that continued existence is due to the unceasing conservation of His Power, the notion of constant dependence easily passes over into the error of continuous creation. If conservation requires momentarily the same divine energizing as was required for its original existence, the transition is easy. In this form the doctrine appeared early in the Church. Augustine taught that the created universe is ceaselessly and absolutely dependent upon the omnipotent power of God, and were He to withdraw from the world His creative power, it would straightway lapse into nothingness (Cf. De Civitate Dei, 12: 25). So also, Thomas Aquinas held that preservation is an ever-renewed creation, and that all creaturely causes derive their efficiency directly and continually from the First Cause (AQUINAS, Summa Theologica, pt. 1, P 104, art. i; pt. 1, P 105, art. 5). This theory of continuous creation, however, as it relates to conservation, is essentially different from the theory of continuous creation as a theory of origination. The former insists upon a creative act and a continuation of these creative acts in conservation; the latter, as previously discussed would supersede any creative act and substitute in its place an emergence or continuous becoming. Among modern theologians, Jonathan Edwards is the best representative of this position

Another theory is (2) Concurrence. By this is meant that activity of God which concurs in second causes, and co-operates with living creatures. The term came into prominence with the Lutheran theologian Quentedt (1617-1680), and was used by the earlier theologians to express what, in more recent theology, is known as divine immanence. The theory, however, must be understood to mean, not merely that God conserves certain powers in nature as second causes, but that there is an immediate co-operation of God with the action and effects of these second causes. Dr. Pope rejects the theory, stating that it disguises "under the term concursus the idea of such co-operation between the First Cause and second causes as makes the resultant action equally that of God and that of the immediate agent." He admits, however, that outside the sphere of moral action, we may adopt Quentedt’s position. Dr. Stump admits also that the doctrine of concurrence raises some difficulties in connection with the sinful acts of men, but points out that the older dogmaticians solved this problem by declaring that God concurs in the effect but not in the defect of a sinful act. Dr. Strong holds that God concurs with the evil acts of His creatures, but only in so far as they are natural acts and not evil (Cf. STUMP, Christian Faith, p. 80, STRONG, Syst. Th., II, p. 418). The theory of concurrence appears to be closely related to what is known in philosophy as the Occasionalism of the Cartesians, and is so treated by Dr. Miley

There is still another theory, that of (3) Absolute Dependence,which makes all things depend upon the immediate agency of God to the exclusion of second causes. This theory shows the influence of an idealistic philosophy of the Berkeleyan type, and tends directly towards pantheism in theology. In the moral realm it has had the same effect as the Fatalism of the ancient Stoics, and by Dr. Pope is considered the ground of rigid predestinarianism in modern theology (Cf. POPE,

Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 447) In the scientific realm, certain theories have also been advanced as solutions of this perplexing problem. Here may be mentioned: (1) The Hypothesis o f Natural Law, which holds the inseparability of matter and force, from which spring all forms of energy in nature, whether inorganic or organic. The theory denies the necessity of the Divine Will and is atheistic in its tendencies. Its chief representative was Tyndall. (2) The Theory of a Supramaterial Physis or Nature. Another school of scientists of which Owen and Huxley were representatives denied likewise the distinction between matter and force but held that both were phenomenal manifestations of an underlying substratum. This Divine Substance was in some sense identical with the natura naturans of Spinoza. The whole theory tended toward pantheism of the Spinozan type, but was in another sense the ground of the modern Evolutionary Hypothesis. (3) The Theory of a Plastic Nature. This theory holds that there is an intermediate nature between God and the world, as does the former, but instead of regarding this as an unknown substratum, it regards it as an unconscious organizing intelligence. This appears to differ in name only, from the world-soul or anima-mundi of Platonic physics. All these theories are attempts to explain the world by means of secondary causes and to dispense with the immediate agency of God. Attempts have been made by later theologians to Christianize at least one of these theories under the name of Theistic Evolution. The scientific discoveries of the present are becoming more and more an apologetic for the biblical teaching concerning creation and conservation

We may then, summarize the theological position concerning Conservation as follows, (1) Divine Cooperation (concursus Dei generalis) which is a concursus amounting almost if not entirely to continuous creation. This theory was held by Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Jonathan Edwards and in an accommodated sense by Hopkins and Emmons. (2) The Divine Intermediate Impulse (impulsus non cogens) as advanced by Luther; (3) The Divine Sustentation (sustentatio Dei) as held by the Arminians; and (4) The Theory of Divine Superintendence and Control-a theory which Dr. Cocker approved in a measure, as approximating the ever-present and pervading energy which he advocated (Cf. COCKER, Theistic Conception of the World, p. 176). It is evident that the truth of conservation lies somewhere between the extremes of thought, which on the one hand would eliminate all second causes, and on the other deny the necessity of a First Cause. Not only the theological writers, but the religious life of the Church generally, has ever maintained a belief in the immediate presence of God in the conservation of the material universe, and has likewise regarded the laws of nature as the observed principles of the divine activity. Dr. Miley admits that this is the position commonly held in the Church, but questions the application of Conservation to anything but mediate or secondary creation. It does not, he thinks, apply to original or primary creation. The doctrine, however, was held by John Wesley who declares that "all matter of whatever kind is absolutely and totally inert. It does not, cannot in any case, move itself. Neither the sun, moon, nor stars move themselves. They are moved every moment by the Almighty hand that made them" (Cf. WESLEY, Sermons, II, pp. 178, 179). Other writers which have defended this view are Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dugald Stewart, Nitzsch, Mueller, Chalmers, Harris, Young, Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Whewell, Bascom, Tullock, Herschel, Wallace, Proctor and Cocker (Cf. CROOKS and HURST, Cyclopaedia, Art. Providence). However, all of these recognized laws, principles, and secondary causes in the conservation of the world, but they did not hypostasize them into active agencies which would supersede God and banish Him from the universe

Preservation.As we use the term preservation, we do not identify it with conservation, but employ it in an accommodated sense to designate the work of providence in the animate realm. Its scope includes all animate nature, whether impersonal or personal. It may be difficult to tell when the line between the inorganic and organic realm is passed, such is the mystery of life; but we may be sure that down to the lowest cell structure, there is need for providential care if the organism is to expand into its predetermined forms. Plant life has many ingenious ways of providing for its propagation or seeking its nourishment from the soil. God governs the lower orders of the animal kingdom principally by appetites and instincts. The ants are a people not strong, yet they prepare their meat in the summer (Proverbs 30:25); The stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle and the crane and the swallow observe the time o f their coming; but my people know not the judgment of the Lord (Jeremiah 8:7). The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givett them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing (Psalms 145:15-16). He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry (Psalms 147:9). This providential care extends to man also as a creature of God, although as a free moral agent man must be considered as under the providential government of God. In this broader division of providential care, we have the words of our Lord who declared that the Father maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust (Matthew 5:45)

Government.When we pass to the realm of responsible, voluntary action, there is a new relation which subsists between the purpose of God and the manner in which this purpose is realized. Here God’s relation is not properly causative as in Conservation and Preservation, but moral, that is, it must be exerted in the form of a motive, and not in the sense of compulsion. The finite will is interposed between the will of God and the consequences of that will in free activity, so that the resulting action is not properly the work of God, but that of the creature to whom the act belongs. Hence while God has given the power of freedom to the creature and permitted its exercise, a sinful action on the part of the creature cannot be said to be God’s act. The older theologians distinguished four different modes of the divine government. (1) Permissioor Permissive. "When we say that God permits any event," says Wakefield, "we are not to understand the term to indicate that He allows it, or consents to it; but rather that He does not exert His power to prevent it. God permits sin but he does not approve of it; for as He is infinitely holy, sin must always be the object of His abhorrence. Accordingly, He testifies against the very sins into which He permits men to fall, denouncing His threatenings against them, and actually punishing them for their crimes" (WAKEFIELD, Chr. Th., p. 266). (Cf. 2 Chronicles 32:31, Psalms 81:12-13, Hosea 4:17, Acts 14:16, and Romans 1:24; Romans 1:28.) (2) Impeditio, or Preventive. This is the restraining act of God by which He prevents men from committing sin. There are many instances of this grace in the Scriptures: Behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths (Hosea 2:6). The thorns and the wall evidently refer to the restraining grace of God (Cf. Genesis 20:6, Genesis 31:24, Psalms 19:13). (3) Directio, or Directive. God overrules the evil acts of man, and brings out of them consequences which were unintended by the evil agencies. This is sometimes referred to as an overruling providence. As for you, said Joseph to his brethren, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive (Genesis 50:20). (Cf. also Psalms 76:10, Isaiah 10:5, John 13:27, Acts 4:27-28, Romans 9:17-18.) (4) Determinatio, or Determinative. By this is meant the control which God exercises over the bounds of sin and wickedness. And the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, all that

he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand (Job 1:12) . (Cf. also Job 2:6, Psalms 124:2; 1 Thessalonians 2:7.) One of the best known and most frequently quoted passages of Scripture comes under this general head. God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it (1 Corinthians 10:13) The root idea of the Christian doctrine of Divine Providence in this sphere is, that God rules over all in love. This reaches its triumphant expression in St. Paul who declares that we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose (Romans 8:28). As to the mode of Providence, its events are as supernatural as the miracles but have no open manifestation. Miracles have a distinct office in attesting the authority of prophets or apostles, but as Dr. Miley points out, providential events have no such office and therefore need no such manifestation. It is evident that the question of Divine Providence is far-reaching in its scope, involving as it does, not only the government of the world generally, but also such questions as the existence of evil in the world, the place and importance of miracles, the efficacy of prayer, and the whole problem of theodicy. These subjects will be considered in their proper place

One of the best summaries of this subject of Divine Providence is that found in Dr. Pope's Compendium of Christian Theology (Vol. I, p. 456). He says, "A few general observations are still necessary to complete this view of Providence. It is obviously the most comprehensive term in the language of theology; the background, mysterious in its brightness or darkness, of all the several departments of religious truth. Rather, it penetrates and fills the whole compass of the relations of man with his Maker. It connects the Unseen God with the visible creation, and the visible creation with the work of redemption, and redemption with personal salvation, and personal salvation with the end of all things. There is no topic which has already been discussed, none which awaits discussion, that does not pay its tribute to the all-embracing, all-surrounding doctrine of Providence. The word itself - let it be once more impressed - in one aspect of it carries our thoughts up to that supreme purpose which was in the beginning with God, and in another carries our thoughts down to the foreseen end or consummation of all things; while it includes between these the whole infinite variety of the dealings of God with man. It silently accompanies theology, therefore, into all its regions of study and meditation; touches it literally at every point, and sheds its glory, oppressive to reason but invigorating to faith, over all the branches of its investigation. It ought to be the grand reconciler of the contending advocates of predestination and conditional election. The former claim must have all the legitimate rights of the prothesis(proqesiV); the latter should not be defrauded of the rights of the prognosis (prognwsiV) ; while both must rejoice in the pronoia(pronia) that comes between

All theological truths are rounded out by this unfathomable word. But for the very reason that it is, in its widest compass, so literally boundless and universal, we find it necessary to give it only a scanty treatment as one distinct department."

You say, you allow a general providence, but deny a particular one. And what is a general, of whatever kind it be, that includes no particulars? Is not every general necessarily made up of its several particulars? Can you instance me any general that is not? Tell me any genus, if you can, that contains no species? What is it that constitutes a genus, but so many species added together? What, I pray, is a whole that contains no parts? Mere nonsense and contradiction. Every whole must, in the nature of things, be made up of its several parts; insomuch that if there be no

parts, there can be no whole.-JOHN WESLEY, Sermon on Providence A general and a special providence cannot be two different modes of divine operation. The same providential administration is necessarily at the same time general and special, for the same reason, because it reaches without exception equally to every event and creation in the world. A general providence is special because it secures general results by the control of every event, great and small leading to that result. A special providence is general because it specially controls all individual beings and actions. All events are so related together as a concatenated system of causes and effects and conditions, that a general providence that is not at the same time special is as inconceivable as a whole which has no parts or a chain which has no links - A. A. HODGE, Outlines of Theology, p. 266

"It follows from what has been observed," says Edwards, "that God's upholding created substance, or causing its existence in each successive moment, is altogether equivalent to an immediate production out of nothing, at each moment; because its existence at this moment is not merely in part from God, but wholly from Him, and not in any part or degree from its antecedent existence. For the supposing that its antecedent existence concurs with God in efficiency, to produce some part of the effect, is attended with all the very same absurdities which have been shown to attend the supposition of its producing it wholly. Therefore the antecedent existence is nothing, as to any proper influence or assistance in the affairs; and consequently God produces the effect as much from nothing as if there had been nothing before. So that this effect differs not at all from the first creation, but only circumstantially; as in first creation there had been no such act and effect of God's power before; whereas, His giving existence afterward follows preceding acts and effects of the same kind in an established order.-EDWARDS, Works, II, p. 489

Dr. Miley states that it is the sense of Scripture that life was to be perpetuated through a law of propagation, but it does not mean that life itself as thus initiated should be sufficient for all the future of this realm. We should rather find in the facts the proof of a divine agency than the intrinsic sufficiency of life itself for such a marvelous outcome.-MII.EY, Syst. Th., I, p. 326.

16. Chapter 17 – ANTHROPOLOGY

Chapter 17 - ANTHROPOLOGY The term Anthropology, as its composition indicates, is the science of man - fromanthropos,man, andlogos,science. It is used in both a scientific and a theological sense. As a science, anthropology deals with the problems of primitive man, the distinction of races, their geographical distribution and the factors which enter into man's development and progress. In a theological sense the term is limited to the study of man in his moral and religious aspects. It may be said, however, that the two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive. The creation of man must of necessity be the subject, both of scientific study and religious meditation; and such theological subjects as the fall and original sin cannot be understood without a careful and scientific study of man's original state. Anthropology, then, in the truest sense, should be regarded as a study of man in the widest sense possible; and its theological usage should form the foundation for the several doctrines dependent upon it

Apart from revelation, man has had only vague, mythological theories as to his origin. These have taken the form of poetry or religious mythology, and have generally been related to the materialistic or pantheistic conceptions of ancient philosophy. Men frequently regarded themselves asterrigenoor earth-born, springing from the earth, the rocks, the trees, or from wild animals. Comparatively few of the ancient nations supposed that the human race sprang from the gods. Modern scientific and philosophical theories concerning the origin of man are in some sense merely a repetition of the ancient teachings couched in scientific terminology. Naturalistic evolution is but a revamping of the ancient materialism. Theistic evolution, whatever faults it may have, makes a place at least for divine intervention in the inception of the living orders, and frequently recognizes the divine power in a continuous creative agency The Preparation of the World for Man. Before considering the final step in the creation of man, we must take into account the providence of God which marked the preparatory stages. Man is the crowning work of creation.The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men(Psalms 115:16) The geological ages represent long periods in the preparation of the world as the habitation of man. "There has been," says Agassiz, "a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the globe. This progress consists in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and among the vertebrates especially, in the increasing resemblance to man. But this connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the faunas of different ages. The fishes of the Paleozoic era are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the Secondary Age, nor does man descend from mammals of the Tertiary Age. The link by which they are connected is of an immaterial nature, and their connection is to be sought in the thought of the Creator himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to pass through the successive changes which geology has pointed out, and in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce man upon the face of the globe. Man is the end toward which all the animal creation has tended." Not only has the providence of God laid up in the strata of the earth vast resources of granite and marble, coal, salt and petroleum, but also the useful and precious metals so necessary to man's highest existence. Dr. Cocker points out that physical

geography indicates, "not only a state of preparation for man, but also a special adaptation of the fixed forms of the earth's existence for securing the perfect development of man according to the divine ideal. And as the land which man inhabits, the food he eats, the air he breathes, the mountains and the rivers and seas which are his neighbors, the skies that overshadow him, the diversities of climate to which he is subject, and indeed all physical conditions, exert a powerful influence upon his tastes, pursuits, habits and character, we may presume that not only are all these conditions predetermined by God, but continually under His control and supervision" (Cf. Cocker,Theistic Conception of the World, p. 257). St. Paul declares that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us (Acts 17:26-27)

Anthropology, as we shall further consider it, involves a study of (I) The Origin of Man; (II) The Constituent Elements of Human Nature; (III) The Unity of the Race; (IV) The Image of God in Man; and (V) The Nature of Primitive Holiness THE ORIGIN OF MAN The divine revelation as found in the Holy Scriptures must ever be our authority concerning the origin of mankind. (Two accounts are recorded in Genesis. The first is brief, and is found in connection with the account of the animal creation on the sixth day (Genesis 1:26-30); the second is more extended and stands by itself (Genesis 2:4-25). There is no discrepancy in the accounts. Brief as they may be, we have here the only authoritative account of man's origin. The new order of being involved, and its pre-eminence over the animal creation are indicated by a change in the form of the creative fiat. No longer do we have the words "Let there be," which involve the immediacy of the creative fiat in conjunction with secondary causes; but "Let us make man in our image. after our likeness" - an expression which asserts the power of the creative word in conjunction with deliberative counsel. This counsel, involving as it does the doctrine of the holy Trinity, becomes explicit only as read in the light of added revelation. Man therefore, is the culmination of all former creative acts; at once linked to them as the crown of creation; and distinct from them a new order of being In him the physical and the spiritual meet. He is at once a creature and a son. It is evident, therefore, that in the first account the author introduces man as the crowning act of the creative process; while the second is intended to be the starting point for the specific consideration of man's personal history The Origin of Man as an Individual. The twofold creative act, or if one prefers, the two stages of the one creative act by which man came into being as a new and distinctive order, is expressed thus,And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,[plural, lives];and man became a living soul(Genesis 2:7). This statement apparently returns to the creative fiat of the first chapter in order to show that the body with the earth: while the origin of his being as Man was due to the divine inbreathing which constituted him a living soul. The first step, then, in the origin of man was the formation of his body from the dust of the earth, and the chemical elements which compose it. The word formed," as here used, carries with it the idea of creation out of pre - existent material. Nor are we to infer that this formation was indirect, through the gradual or instantaneous transformation of another previously formed body into that of the body of man. We are to understand that when the dust ceased to be such it existed in the flesh and bone constituting the human body. It is true that the lower animal creation was also formed from the earth and the same ingredients entered into its composition as in the body of man, but there is no place in the Genesis account for the naturalistic evolution of man from the lower animal kingdom. The Scripture account also precludes the idea of man asautochthonic, or springing from

the soil, as the Greeks, especially the Athenians maintained. The Scriptures do teach us, however, that man in one aspect of his being is linked to nature; and that on his lower side he is the culmination of the animal kingdom, and represents its perfection in both structure and form But the distinctive feature in the creation of man is to be found in the concluding statement - Hebreathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. Here there is creationde novo,and not mere formation. In the creation of man God communicated to him a life which did not enter into that of the lower animals. He made him a spirit - a self - conscious and self - determining being aperson. While it was by the divine inbreathing that man was made a spiritual being, we are not to believe that the human spirit was a part of God by pantheistic emanation. God’s spirit is unique, and so is man’s - the one infinite, the other finite. We may use the term "impartation of life" but only in the sense of a higher creation. The son is of like essence with his father from whom he receives life, but he is not thereby identical with him. Of Christ alone, the "only begotten Son," may it be affirmed that He is of the same essence with the Father. Dr. Pope thinks that "the same divine act produced both body and soul, without any interval." Even if this be granted, it is evidently the purpose of the writer to mark off distinctly the difference between the formation of the body out of the earth and the inbreathing of the divine life which made man a living soul. Dr. Knapp, on the other hand, maintains that the body was created lifeless, and that "God vivified the previously lifeless body of man" by the divine inbreathing, or the breath of lives. If so, we may suppose that one of these lives was the natural life in common with the brute creation, and the other, the distinctive characteristic of man - an immortal spirit. This brings before us immediately, the question of thedichotomousortrichotomousnature of man, which must form the subject matter of a later discussion. If, on the other hand, Adam was created with that form of somatic or soul life which characterized the animal creation, then the first of these lives must have constituted man a living and immortal spirit; while the second would represent a spiritual endowment of divine grace, eitherconcreatedas the Protestants maintain, or adonum superadditum,as held by the Roman Catholic Church. This subject, also, will be given further consideration in our discussion of the nature of primitive holiness The Generic or Racial Aspect of Man’s Origin. Man was created not only as an individual, but also as a racial being. The Hebrew word translated man, is not a proper noun, and is not so used until the second chapter. Had we only the account given us in the first chapter of Genesis, we may well have supposed that the male and the female of the species were created simultaneously. The second account is more specific.And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man(Genesis 2:21-23)) This statement has been a source of perplexity to commentators, and the theories suggested in its interpretation have been many and varied. It is evident, however to the unprejudiced reader is intended to teach that the creative act referred to man generically while the second deals not so much with the original creative act, as with the formative process by which generic man was elaborated into the two sexes. The word used does not signify creationde novo,but merely the formative act. Hence the Apostle Paul declares that Adam was first formed, then Eve (1 Timothy 2:13). By this he appears to mean that the male was first brought to perfection, and from him the Lord God took that, out of which He made ["Enossignifies man, not as Adam does; which also signifies man, but is used in Hebrew indifferently for man and woman; as it is written, ’male and female created he them; and

blessed them, and called their name Adam,' (Genesis 5:2), leaving no room for doubt that though the woman was distinctively called Eve, yet the name Adam, meaning man, was common to both. ButEnosmeans man in so restricted a sense, that Hebrew linguists tell us it cannot be applied to woman." - Augustine, City' of God, 15: 17

St Paul declares that "the man is not made out of (ek) the woman, but the woman out of (ex) the man" (1 Corinthians 11:8).]

Woman. This fact was recognized by Adam when he said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man The translation of the Hebrew word here rendered "rib" is unfortunate. The original word is found forty - two times in the Old Testament, and in no other instance except this, is it translated "rib." In the majority of cases it is translated "side" or "sides," and in some instances "corners" or "chambers." President Harper translated the verse as follows: "He took from his sides, and closed the flesh of it"; while Canon Payne - Smith says that woman comes from the flank of man, "so curiously from ancient times rendered 'rib'." In the Septuagint Version, the word "pleura" is used, which by the Greek writers, Homer, Hesiod, and Herodotus is invariably rendered "side," as it is also in the Greek of the New Testament. Thus the Genesis account teaches that every individual member of the race, including the first mother, has its antitypal representative in the first Man; and that in this way only could the Scriptures declare that God hath made of one blood all nations of men (Acts 17:26) The generic aspect of the creation of man is presented not only from the physical viewpoint, but as forming also, the basis of the social structure. The occasion of the formation of woman is said to have grown nut of Adam's necessity.It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him(Genesis 2:18). Here it is evident that the formation of Eve and her separation from Adam contemplates the social virtues as a factor in the development of the race. This is not only recognized by Adam, but reinforced by an injunction later quoted by our Lord,Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh(Genesis 2:24; cf. Matthew 19:4-5). Hence St. Paul argues that the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.At the same time he grants that the man is theimage and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man(1 Corinthians 11:7-9); that is, man as a generic being was created by God, and is therefore, the image and glory of God; but woman was formed from man by a subsequent act, and hence is regarded as the glory, or outshining of the race. Viewing the relation of man and woman from the standpoint of ethics, the apostle argues futher, that woman's duty to man is that of reverence on the ground of existence; mans duty to woman, that of devoted love as the foundation of the social structure

St. Paul likewise builds upon this Genesis account, the symbolism of Christ and His Church.Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything(Ephesians 5:24); and for this he assigns the reason that we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones (Ephesians 5:30). That this relationship should not be abused, as frequently it has been through too narrow an interpretation of the scripture, the apostle follows immediately with the injunction,Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;that is; the love of the husband for the wife must be of an abiding and vicarious nature - a love that will sacrifice every selfish purpose and devote every human power to the furtherance of her best interests, whether physical social, or religious.So ought men, he says,

to love their wives as their own bodies; and for this he gives the reason thatHe that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones(Ephesians 5:28-30). This mystery of Christ and the Church He sums up in an ethical injunction,Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband(Ephesians 5:31-33). This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband(Ephesians 5:32-33) THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OF HUMAN NATURE The twofold position of man, at once a part of nature, and a free spirit transcending nature, gives rise to perplexing questions concerning the constituent elements of his personality. Chief among these may be mentioned the theories of Dichotomy and Trichotomy which regard man under a twofold or threefold aspect, and which lay the foundation for widely divergent opinions in later theological study The Theory of Dichotomy. Dichotomv holds that man is composed of two kinds of essence - a material portion (the body), and an immaterial portion (the body), and an immaterial portion (spirit or soul). The body is material as formed from the earth. The spirit or soul as a consequence of the divine inbreathing, constitutes the immaterial portion of man. The dichotomist, therefore, holds that man consists of two, and only two distinct elements or substances - matter and mind, or the material and the spiritual. There is notertium quid, or third substance which is neither matter nor mind. However, a distinction is frequently made between substance and powers - the one immaterial substance being considered as spirit under one aspect, and soul under another. Thus Godet says, "Spirit is the breath of God considered independent of the body;

[God formed man’s body of the dust of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul. This has been understood to teach that there are two, and only two, elements in the human constitution - one material and the other spiritual - the one matter and the other mind. These two are substances, entities, actually existing things, united in a manner to human thought, inscrutable, mysterious, incomprehensible, yet really united, and so united as to constitute one nature - a nature individualized, one, and yet both material and spiritual. It is only by the actuality of such union that certain facts of consciousness can be conceivably possible, such as pain from a fleshly wound. A spirit cannot be punctured by a pin, and though a dead body be punctured, pain is not produced. Matter is indispensable to the phenomenon, and mind to the consciousness produced by it Man is not materialized mind, nor spiritualized matter, nor is he somewhat that is neither - or a somewhat between the two; but he is both, material as to his body, spiritual as to his mind, mysteriously united during his earthly existence in one individual person. - RAYMOND,Syst. Th.,II, p. 24.] soul, that same breath, in so far as it gives life to the body" (GODET,Bib. Studies of the 0.T.,p. 32). Dr. Pope takes the same position. "The high distinction of human nature," he says, "is, that it is a union of the two worlds of spirit and matter, a reflection of spiritual intelligences in the material creation. The immaterial principle is the soul or yuch as connected with matter through the body, and the spirit or pneuma as connected with the higher world. There is in the original record a clear statement as to the two elements of human nature" (POPE,Comp. Chr. Th., I, p. 422). Perhaps the simplest definition of soul is to regard it merely as spirit in relation to body. Thus Hovey says that soul is spirit as modified by union with the body; while A. A. Hodge says that "by soul we mean only one thing, that is, an incarnate spirit, a spirit with a body. Thus we never speak of the souls of angels. They are pure spirits having no bodies

(A. A. HODGE, Pop. Lect., p. 227). This simpler position seems to be [The spirit of man, in addition to its higher endowments, may also possess the lower powers which vitalize dead matter into a human body] that the soul begins to exist as a vital force, does not require that it should always exist as such a force or in connection with a material body. - Porter, Human Intellect, p. 39

Brutes may have organic life and sensitivity, and yet remain submerged in nature. It is not life and sensitivity that lift men above nature, but it is the distinctive characteristic of personality. - Harris,Philos. Basis of Theism, p. 547 The importance of these questions to theology is thus pointed out by Dr. Charles Hodge. "The scriptural doctrine of the nature of man as a created spirit in vital union with an organized body, consisting, therefore, of two and only two, distinct elements or substances, matter and mind, is one of great importance. It is intimately connected with some of the most important doctrines of the Bible; with the constitution of the person of Christ, and consequently with the nature of His redeeming work and of His relation to the children of man; with the doctrine of the fall, original sin and regeneration; and with the doctrines of the future state and of the resurrection. It is because of this connection, and not because of its interest as a question of psychology, that the true idea of man demands the careful investigation of the theologian. - Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p. 48 The scriptures used in support of the dichotomous position are the following: (1) Genesis 2:7 where the body is stated to be formed of the earth, and the soul by the inbreathing of the divine Spirit, that is, vitalized by a single principle. (2) Genesis 41:8 cf. Psalms 42:6; John 12:27; cf. John 13:21. These scriptures and many others use the terms soul and spirit interchangeably. Matthew 10:28 cf. 1 Corinthians 5:3; 1 Corinthians 6:20 where soul and body are mentioned together as composing the entire man

[Dr. Miley states that the dichotomic view is clearly given in the Scriptures, but since it is not the manner of the sacred writers to be always analytic, such subjects should be considered only on broad lines and the more prominent distinction made. Cf. Miley,Syst. Th., I, p. 400.] more in harmony with the scriptural representations of the constituent elements of man than the more elaborately worked out hypotheses The Theory of Trichotomy. There is another class of scriptures, in the New Testament Epistles, which seem to indicate that man is of a threefold or trichotomous nature. This usage grew out of the Platonic Philosophy which the church inherited, and which regarded man as of a threefold essence. Pythagoras, and following him Plato, taught that man consists of three constituent elements, the rational spirit (nou" or pneuma, Latinmens), the animal soul (yuch Latinanima), and the body (swma Latincorpus). This classification was so generally accepted by the later Greek and Roman philosophers that its usage came to be stamped upon popular speech as expressive of the entire nature of man. When, therefore, St. Paul would stress man in the totality of his being, he prays that the whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless (1 Thessalonians 5:23). In emphasizing the penetrative power of the word of God, he speaks of it as piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow (Hebrews 4:12). "The use made of these terms by apostles," says Dr. A. A. Hodge, "proves nothing more than that they used words in their current popular sense to express divine ideas. The word pneuma designates the one soul emphasizing its quality as rational. The word yuch designates the same soul emphasizing its quality as the vital and animating principle of the body. The two are used together to express popularly the entire man" (Hodge,Outlines, pp. 299, 300). This is the generally accepted position, especially in Western theology The Eastern church in general, held to the theory of trichotomy, the Western church to dichotomy. But trichotomy in the

East led the church into a number of grievous errors, and this served to strengthen the West

[The scriptures used in support of the trichotomous theory are 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12. In addition the argument is drawn from those scriptures which refer to spirit and soul separately, and to the characteristic manner in which they appear.] in its dichotomous position. We may summarize these errors as follows: (1) The Gnostics regarded the spirit of man as an emanation from God and, therefore, a part of the divine essence. Hence they maintained that the spirit of man was incapable of sin. (2) The Apollinarians applied their tripartite conception of man to Christ, maintaining that in assuming human nature, He partook only of the body (swma and soul (yuch) but that the spirit in man was in Christ replaced by the divine Logos. Thus according to this theory Christ had only a deficient human nature. (3) The Semi-Pelagians greatly embarrassed the controversy concerning original sin, by maintaining that it was transmitted through the soul. (4) Placæus whose name is generally associated with the theory of mediate imputation taught that the pneuma only, was directly created by God. He regarded the soul as mere animal life, created with the body; and therefore perishing with it. (5) Julius Mueller taught that the yuch is derived from Adam, but he regarded the pneuma as being pre-existent. He explains the doctrine of depravity by supposing that these pre-existent spirits which are embodied at birth had previously been corrupted. (6) There is the doctrine of the later annihilationists who hold that the divine element; breathed into man at his creation; was lost in the fall. Death is interpreted to mean annihilation of the soul, which can be restored to being only by regeneration. Immortality, therefore, is conditional and is the possession of the regenerate only

We must conclude, then, that the Scriptures bear out the theory of dichotomy, in so far as the essential elements of man are concerned, that is, he is body and

[In the early history of the Church trichotomy flourished mostly in the school of Alexandria, and was introduced into Christian Theology through the Platonic philosophy. For awhile it seemed fairly on the way to a common acceptance, when adverse influences checked its progress and brought it into disrepute. Tertullian strongly opposed it; and his influence was very great. Even the seeming indifference of Augustus was indirectly against it; for his influence was so great on all doctrinal questions that nothing without his open support could hold a position of much favor in the more orthodox thought of the church. - Miley,Syst. Th., I, p.399.] spirit, a material and an immaterial essence conjoined to form one person. But we may admit, also, a practical trichotomy in both ordinary speech and in scriptural terminology. "It will be obvious, however, to those who weigh well the utterances of Scripture, that, provided the original constituent elements of human nature are only two, the whole religious history of man requires a certain distinction between soul and spirit; his one personality being connected by soul with the world of sense, and by his spirit with the world of faith. Yet soul and spirit make up one person" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., I. p.435). While man is composed of a material and an immaterial portion, the latter in exact Scripture terminology is viewed in a twofold manner. When viewed as the power of animating a physical organism it is called yuch or soul; when viewed as a rational and moral agent, this same immaterial portion is known as pneuma or spirit. In the usage of St. Paul, the pneuma is man’s higher part in relation to spiritual things; the yuch is that same higher part in relation to bodily things. Hence the spirit or pneuma is man’s higher part looking Godward. It is therefore capable of receiving and manifesting the Holy Spirit (pneuma agion) and of becoming a "spiritual" man. The soul or yuch is man’s higher part descending to lower things, and hence absorbed in worldly

interests. Such a person is called "soulish" in contradistinction to the "spiritual" man. Dr. Strong compares the immaterial portion of man to the upper story of a house, but having windows looking in two directions, toward earth and toward heaven. The element of truth in trichotomy then appears to be this, that the soul has a triplicity of endowment, bearing a threefold relation to matter, to self and to God

[The first part, the spirit, is the highest, deepest, noblest part of man. By it he is fitted to comprehend eternal things, and it is, in short, the house in which dwell faith and the word of God. The other, the soul, is this same spirit according to nature, but yet in another sort of activity, namely, in this, that it animates the body and works through it; and it is its method not to grasp things incomprehensible, but only what reason can search out, know and measure. - Luther.] THE UNITY OF THE RACE

There are two points involved in any proper consideration of the of the unity of the race, (I) the Community of Origin, and (II) the Unity of Species. Both are essential to a right understanding of the subject. When plants or animals are derived from a common stock they are regarded as being of the same species. But if, as the Scriptures seem to declare, God by a single fiat created at one time the vegetation of the whole earth, and at another the myriads of animals, these, too, would be regarded as belonging to the vegetable or animal realms, though not of a common parentage; The first subject, therefore, must be considered from the historical standpoint, the second is more philosophical in nature

I The Scriptures affirm both the unity of the human race and its community of origin. We have previously pointed out that the creation of man carried with it both the individualistic and generic aspect. The word "Adam" was at once the name of an individual and of a family - the personal name of the first man and the generic name of mankind. The divine record declares that man is one, and that he sprang from a common origin (Genesis 1:27).This is further confirmed by the Pauline statement that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth(Acts 17:26); This, as we have shown, the Genesis account teaches to the extent that Eve herself was taken from Adam to become the "mother of all living." The race, therefore, did not start originally from a single pair, but from generic Adam. With the establishment of the first pair we are to believe that all the races of mankind have descended from this common parentage (Genesis 3:20)

Arguments for the Community of Origin. For a time science disputed the claims of the Scriptures concerning the unity of the race, especially its community of origin. However, with the further advances in scientific discovery, the evidences in favor of the biblical position have steadily increased. The Genesis account has the following considerations in its favor. (1) The unity of the race is confirmed by the similarity of physical characteristics found in all peoples, such as the identity of vertebrate formation, the temperature of the body, length of pregnancy, the fertility of the races and the average number of years of life. (2) There are similar mental characteristics, tendencies and capacities in the various races as shown by a common body of tradition. (3) Closely allied to the above argument is that drawn from a common language origin. Philologists are generally agreed that the principles underlying the different languages are the same. Sanskrit seems to be the connecting link between the various Indo-Germanic languages. In the old Egyptian some parts of the vocabulary are Semitic and at the same time Aryan in grammar. (4)

There is a common basic religious life. Man is universally religious, and the traditions found among the most widely separated people indicate a common dwelling place and a unity of religious life. There are traditional accounts in many nations, of a common origin, of a primeval garden and a golden age of innocence, of the serpent, the fall of man and the flood. Zockler thinks that these myths of the nations have been handed down from the time when the families of the earth had not separated, and that the changes are due to corruption of the accounts in transmission. It may also be argued at this point that the gospel makes an appeal to all peoples and finds a response among all nations The Primitive State of Man. The Scriptures teach that the primitive state of man was not one of barbarism, from which, by a gradual process of social evolution, he was brought to a state of civilization; but that man was originally created in a state of maturity and perfection

[The doctrine of the original unity of the human race is by no means a matter of indifference for religious and moral life. By it the high nobility of mankind is proved (Acts 17:28), by it the original equality and duty of brotherly love is shown (Matthew 7:12, Luke 10:30-37), by it the origin and complete universality of sin is declared (Romans 5:12), by it the harmony between the domain of Creation and Redemption is announced (1 Corinthians 15:21-22), and by it is secured the truth that the kingdom of God will come to all, since the gospel without distinction must be brought to every human being (Ephesians 1:10, Matthew 28:19) - Von Oosterzee,Chr. Dogm., I, p.364.] This perfection, however, must not be so interpreted as to preclude any further progress or development, but should be understood in the sense of a proper adaptation to the end for which he was created. As to the question of maturity, the Scriptures are opposed to the teaching of naturalistic evolution which regards early man as of crude physical constitution and low mentality, slowly developing for himself a language, and awakening only by gradual stages to moral and religious concepts. The oldest records furnish us with evidences of a high degree of civilization, even in the earliest periods of human history. Barbarism, as we have previously pointed out, is rather a degenerate civilization than a primitive state. The Scriptures are clear in their teaching on this subject, and for Christians this is decisive The Antiquity of the Race. The conflict of science with the scriptural account of man’s origin, could but involve, also, the question of the antiquity of the race. Ussher’s chronology makes the origin of man to precede the advent of our Lord by 4,004 years, reckoned on the basis of the Hebrew Scriptures; while Hales, on the ground of the Septuagint, reckons the number of years as 5,411. It is well known that the received chronology

[Dr. Miley thinks that the intellectual grade of primitive man must be judged by a rational interpretation of relative facts. He regards the extreme views of man’s intellectual state as being patterned after the extravagances of Milton, rather than after the moderation of Moses. He quotes Robert South as declaring that "an Aristotle was but the rubbish of a man," judged by the exalted position of man in his state of integrity. He points out also, that Mr. Wesley supposed that Adam in his unfallen state reasoned with unerring accuracy, if he found it necessary to reason at all (Miley,Syst. Th., I, p. 403). Dr. Charles Hedge also takes the position that "it is altogether probable that our nature, in virtue of its union with the divine nature in the person of Christ, and in virtue of the union of the redeemed with their exalted Redeemer, shall hereafter be elevated to a dignity and glory far greater than that in which Adam was created or to which he ever could have attained." - Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p. 92

We do not say that the faculties of man are in the same state now that they were before the fall, or the same that they would have been in if he had never fallen. Without doubt they are deteriorated,

under the blighting and stupefying influence of sin. The understanding is enfeebled and darkened; the sensibilities are weakened and deranged; conscience has, in a measure, lost its power. Our faculties may have been all of them more or less impaired. Still it does not appear that any of them have been lost. In number and kind they remain the same that they were in Paradise - Pond,Chr. Th., p. 354.] of the Bible has never been regarded as wholly accurate; and estimates such as that of Hales, which have been considered perfectly orthodox, increase the number of centuries sufficiently to allow for all racial and linguistic developments. The uncertainty of biblical chronology is due to the various methods of reckoning genealogies. The line is not always traced to the immediate ancestors. Thus the sons of Zilpah were two, Gad and Asher (Genesis 35:26); while later (Genesis 46:18) after recording the sons, grandsons and great - grandsons, the statement is made that the sons she bare unto Jacob were sixteen souls. Other instances of a similar nature are recorded in the same chapter. In the genealogy recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel, Josias is said to have begotten his grandson Jechonias, and Joram his great - grandson Ozias (Matthew 1:8; Matthew 1:11). It is evident, therefore, that the genealogies are not always traced immediately from father to son; and consequently it is impossible to reach an exact chronology from the genealogical tables The unduly long periods of time which many scientists have affirmed as necessary for the development of the races, and for linguistical changes, are not supported by the facts. The known laws of population would account for the present number of the world's inhabitants, it is estimated, in six or seven thousand years. Furthermore, it is well known that linguistic changes occur very rapidly where there is no substantial body of literature. There is, therefore, no valid reason for supposing that the race is older than is commonly acknowledged by the received chronologies of the Bible

II But the unity of the race involves more than the community of origin; it involves also the unity of species, and leads immediately to the question as to the nature of genus and species. This is both a scientific and a philosophical problem. Agassiz maintained that the species does not depend merely upon outward characteristics as to color, form or size, but to what he calls the "immaterial principle." It is upon this that the constancy of the species depends. "All animals," he says, "may be traced back in the embryo to a mere point upon the yolk of an egg, bearing no resemblance whatever to the future animal. But even here an immaterial principle which no external influence can prevent or modify, is present and determines its future form; so that the egg of a hen can produce only a chicken, and the egg of a codfish only a cod" (AGASSIZ,Prin. of Zoology, p.43). Dana takes the same position. "When individuals multiply from generation to generation," he says, "it is but a repetition of the primordial type - idea; and the true notion of the species is not in the resulting group, but in the idea or potential element which is at the basis of every individual of the group. Later scientific discoveries with a knowledge of genes and chromosomes, have confirmed the position of the earlier scientists; and now it is well understood that the parents are but the transmitters of a divided life - stream which when united gives rise to a new individual of the species

Philosophically, the problem is much older than that represented by science. Christianity inherited Platonic realism which was the dominant philosophy during the period of the early church. The church of the middle ages was greatly influenced by the philosophy of Aristotle. Both philosophical systems were forms of realism. The formula of the first wasUniversalia ante rem, or the universal before the species; the latterUniversalia in re, or the universal in the species. According to the first,

genera and species are real substances, created prior to individuals and independent of them; while individuals are such only by virtue of their partaking of the original

[In the ancient discussion between the realists and nominalists the question arose whether there is not in the divine mind, and in human thought reflecting the divine mind, a reality of human nature, of which every living man is an expression and representative. As there is an abstract qeoth", of which the Three Persons are representatives, so there is a human nature which the Second Person represented in the Incarnation, rather than as becoming a personal, individual man. Granting the truth of this mysterious principle - not the less true because we cannot fathom it - very man descended of Adam presents his own personal individualization of a generic character impressed by its Creator on mankind; and receives into himself the generic evil of original sin, which is the sin of the race in Adam. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 436.] essence. According to the latter, the universal while real, exists only in the individual. In modern theology, Dr. Shedd represents the position of Platonic realism, while Dr. Charles Hodge opposes it. The realism of Dr. Shedd, however, is not of an extreme type. He holds that whether or not the universal is prior to the individuals depends upon what individuals are meant. If the first two individuals of a species are in mind, then the universal is not prior to the species but simultaneous with it. The instant God created the first pair He created the human nature or species in and with them. But following this, he maintains that in the order of nature mankind exists before the generation of mankind; the nature is prior to the individual produced out of it. God created human nature in Adam and Eve and the millions of their descendants who now inhabit the earth are but individualizations of that original human nature. Dr. Shedd, however, is careful to make a clear distinction between "nature" and "person." As in the Trinity there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in one nature; and as in Christ there is one Person in two natures - divine and human; so also in man there is one person in two natures - spiritual and material. The distinction between "person" and "nature" so vital in Trinitarianism and Christology, is equally important in Anthropology. Men as "persons" are separate and distinct from each other, and must ever be; but each is possessed of a common human nature and together they form a living organism which as such, constitutes the human race. But regardless of the philosophical explanations offered, whether realism, nominalism, or conceptualism, the fact remains that man is both an individual and a racial being. He is like the fruit which must have a tree upon which to grow, and to which it is organically related. So also the race must be regarded not merely as an aggregation of individuals, but as an organism of vitally related and interacting parts, which are reciprocally means and ends in the attainment of that which is the good of the whole. The race is under the law of solidarity; it is bound up in a common life. Here is the basis of Paul’s great metaphor. As the body is composed of many members, which by a common life are bound together into a living organism, so the Church, as the body of Christ, is composed of many members, all of whom have been baptized into one body by the one Spirit. They are thereby constituted a spiritual organism under the direction of their living Head. This solidarity of the human race forms the basis of the Pauline doctrine of redemption. Nor can the teaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom of God which forms the very core of the gospel be understood unless we view the human race as a unity of species. This unity regards each person, not only as a self-conscious, self-determining individual, but as an individual who is also a member of an organic race to which he is related both metaphysically and ethically. The relation of the individual to the race, then, becomes at once a theological as well as a philosophical problem. The body is admittedly propagated by the race through parentage, but what shall be said as to the

origin of souls. Three theories have dominated the thought of the church - Pre-existence, Creationism and Traducianism

Pre-existence. The doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul was inherited from Platonism, and was productive of a number of heretical opinions in the early church. Plato held to an ideal or intelligible world which existed previous to the present universe and furnished the archetypal forms for it. The universe, therefore, was simply these ideas in the mind of God clothed with material bodies and developed in history. Some of the more philosophically minded theologians of the early church identified this realm of ideas in the mind of God with thegeneralorspecies, which they therefore regarded as existing previous to the individual. It was in this manner that they explained the possession of ideas by the soul, which could not be derived from the sense world. Priscillianus was accused by Augustine of taking over the entire system of the Platonists, including the belief that the soul was a part of the divine nature, and that the material body was essentially evil. Origen, who is the best representative of this theory, derives his doctrine only indirectly from Platonism. He was apparently concerned with the disparity of conditions under which men enter the world, and attempted to account for it by the character of their sin in a previous state. It will readily be seen that this doctrine is closely connected with his idea of eternal creation. It was immediately rejected by both Eastern and Western churches, and therefore has been said to begin and end with Origen. It has reappeared a few times in modern philosophy and theology. Kant advocated it, as did also Julius Mueller and Edward Beecher - the ground of their argument being the supposition that inborn depravity can be explained only by a self-determined act in a previous state of being

Creationism. The theory of creationism maintains that God immediately creates each human soul, the body being propagated by the parents. The origin of this theory is generally attributed to Aristotle; and with the rise of Aristotelianism in the middle ages, the schoolmen generally adopted it. Earlier than this both Jerome and Pelagius advocated the theory, as did also Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret in the Eastern church, and Ambrose, Hilarius and Hieronymus in the Western church. Creationism as a theory seems to be closely connected with the attempts to emphasize the importance of the individual as over against an emphasis upon racial continuity and solidarity. Thus the Roman Catholic Church, which makes little of native depravity and much of individual freedom in spiritual things, has generally adopted the position of the schoolmen and accepted the theory of creationism. The Reformed Church, likewise, with its emphasis upon the individual, has favored creationism, and for the past two centuries it has been the prevailing theory. Pelagius and the Pelagians used this theory to justify their position concerning the original state of man. They maintained that if God created the souls of men He must have created them either pure and holy, or impure and sinful. Since the latter supposition is inconsistent with the holiness of God, the doctrine of native depravity must be rejected

Creationism is sometimes associated with trichotomy and sometimes with dichotomy. In the former instance the spirit (pneuma) only is regarded as the direct creation of God; the soul (or yuch) being but the natural animal life, was held to be propagated with the body. When connected with dichotomy, the body alone was held to be propagated from the race, the spirit or soul being immediately created by God. Goeschel maintained that dichotomy leads necessarily to traducianism and trichotomy to creationism. Thus the family or racial name corresponds to the yuch; while the pneuma is the Christian name. The best representatives of creationism in modern

times are Martensen, Turretin and Hodge. Both Dr. Shedd and Dr. Strong oppose the position. Among the Arminian theologians no great importance is attached to the question concerning the origin of souls

Traducianism. Traducianism holds that the souls of men as well as their bodies are derived from their parents. The word is derived from the Latintraducerewhich means to bring over as a layer of a vine for purposes of propagation. It is therefore an analogy with living things and supposes that new souls develop from Adam’s soul like the shoots (traduces) of a vine or a tree. The theory appears to have been first propounded by Tertullian and is discussed by him in hisDe anima, where the word tradux is used frequently. It has been held widely in the Protestant church, Dr. Strong and Dr

[Dr. Minor Raymond states that "by far the larger portion of Christian thinkers have either entertained no opinion as to the origin of souls, not finding to their minds anything decisive in revelation, and not seeking to be wise above what is written, or have been divided between creationists and traducianists. It is conceded on the one hand, that if one can hold the doctrine of immediate creation, without affirming that God creates sinful souls, without denying inherited depravity, and without supposing that God in any way or degree sanctions every act of procreation with which His creative power is connected, his theory, though an error, will probably do him no harm. And on the other hand, it is conceded that if one can hold to the doctrine of traduction without affirming the numerical unity of the substance of all human souls, without affirming also the abscission and division of the essence of the human soul (that is, by asserting that the human person is only a part of the common humanity - an individualized portion of humanity), and without affirming the guilt and sinfulness of the humanity of Jesus Christ, then probably, though traduction be an error, it will as to him be harmless. - Raymond,Syst. Th., II, pp. 35, 36.]

Shedd being its most able representatives among theologians. The theory implies that the race was immediately created in Adam, both in respect to body and soul, and both are propagated by natural generation. The scriptural basis for this is usually found in the assertion that ""Adam begat a son in his own likeness," which is interpreted to mean that it is the whole man who begets and is begotten. The theory receives strong support theologically, in that it seems to furnish an explanation for the transmission of original sin or depravity. Dr. Smith thinks that on the whole traducianism has been the most widely spread theory THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN The distinctive note in the scriptural account of man’s origin, is to be found in this - that he is created in the image of God. It is this likeness to his Creator that distinguishes him at once from the lower orders of creation, and at the same time relates him immediately to the spiritual world. Since there was a declaration of the divine purpose for man before even the creative fiat was executed, this image must belong to his inmost creaturely constitution. ""As such it was essential and indestructible; the self-conscious and self-determining personality of man, as a spirit bearing the stamp of likeness to God - a reflection in the creature of the divine nature" (Pope,Comp. Chr. Th., I, p. 423). Ewald states that the Genesis narrative at this point is particularly strong in its

Turretin in his "Institutes," states that "Some are of the opinion that the difficulties pertaining to the propagation of original sin are best resolved by the doctrine of the propagation of the soul; a view held by not a few of the fathers, and to which Augustine frequently seems to incline. And there is no doubt that by this theory all the difficulty seems to be removed; but since it does not accord with

scripture or sound reason, and is exposed to great difficulties, we do not think that recourse should be had to it." This represents a strong creationist view, with the admission that it best explains the doctrine of original depravity

[Tertullian’s position as given by Neander is as follows: "It was his opinion that our first parent bore within him the undeveloped germ of all mankind; that the soul of the first man was the fountain head of all human souls, and that all varieties of individual human nature are but different modifications of that one spiritual substance. Hence the whole nature became corrupted in the original father of the race, and sinfulness is propagated at the same time with souls. Although this mode of apprehending the matter, in Tertullian, is connected with his sensuous habits of conception, yet this is by no means a necessary connection."] joyful exultation, as if the thought of man’s peculiar excellence as a rational and moral being could not be expressed with sufficient vivacity

Historical Development. While it is universally accepted that the image of God is intended to express man’s general likeness to his Creator, the opinions of theologians have greatly differed as to the particular points of resemblance implied in the expression. In the earlier days of the Church there was a tendency to distinguish between the image (imago) and the likeness (similitude) of God, the former referring to the original constitution, or the innate powers of the human soul; the latter to the moral resemblance of the soul to God as manifested in the free exercise of these original powers. Some of the earlier fathers were inclined to regard the image as referring to the bodily form, and the likeness to the human spirit; but in general the ""image" was understood to mean the rational basis of man’s nature, and the ""likeness" its free development. Thus Augustine relates the image to the intellectual faculties (cognitio veritatis), and the likeness to the moral faculties (amor virtutis). Tertullian places the image of God in the innate powers of the soul, especially in the freedom of choice between good and evil. Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Leo the Great were of the same general opinion as Tertullian, and held that the image of God consisted chiefly in the freedom and rectitude of the will. In general, the Eastern theologians stressed the rationalistic basis as the ground of the divine image, while the Western theologians gave greater emphasis to the moral aspects of this image

Later writers have usually followed one of three positions. First, they find the image of God in the rational soul, apart from moral conformity. Thus the schoolmen, following Augustine, distinguished between image and likeness, referring to the former, the powers of reason and freedom - or the natural attributes; and to the latter, original righteousness - or the moral attributes. But in this separation they held that the image only, was a part of the original constitution of man, and that moral conformity or original righteousness was adonum super-additum, or superadded grace which alone was lost in the fall. Second, another type of rationalists, represented chiefly by the Pelagians and the Socinians, held that the image of God was to be found in man’s dominion over the creatures of the earth, since this is mentioned in its immediate connection (Genesis 1:26). In modern times support is given this position by the advocates of rationalistic evolution, who view the primitive state of man as one of barbarism and savagery; and who regard the moral nature, not as an original endowment, but as the consequence of struggle and attainment. Third, and at the other extreme, are those who hold that the image of God is to be found in man’s original constitution alone, and therefore was totally lost in the fall. Lutheranism, in its reactionary position, had a tendency to emphasize moral conformity to the disparagement of the rational basis, but

extreme positions were the exception rather than the rule

Protestantism generally rejects any distinction between the image and the likeness of God, regarding the one term as merely explanatory of the other. Thus Dr. Charles Hodge says that ""image and likeness means an image which is like." The simple declaration of the Scripture is that man at his creation was like God (Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p.96). Calvin in his comments on Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24 makes the statement that ""in the beginning the image of God was conspicuous in the light of the mind, in the rectitude of the heart, and in the soundness of all the parts of our nature (CALVIN,Institutes1: 15). Wakefield says that "It is vain to say that this image consisted in some one essential quality of human nature which could not be lost; for we shall find that it comprehended more qualities than one; and that while revelation places it, in part in what was essential to human nature, it included also what was not essential, and what might be lost and regained" (Wakefield,Chr. Th., p.278). Almost all the Protestant confessions of faith hold that holiness was concreated in man, and that original righteousness was therefore included in the divine image. Protestantism is opposed to the rationalistic position, whether in the Pelagian form which admits only the possibility of holiness in the original creation of man; or the Roman Catholic position of original righteousness as a superadded gift. It is likewise opposed to the contrary view, which makes it amissible, and therefore lost in the fall. We are thus led to the more scriptural position which includes both the rational and moral elements, the former being commonly known as the Natural or Essential image of God; the latter as the Moral or Incidental image The Natural or Essential Image. By the Natural or Essential image of God in man, is meant his original constitution - that which makes him man, and thereby distinguishes him from the lower animal creation; while by the Moral or Incidental image is meant the use which he makes of the powers with which he was endowed at creation. The first may be summed up under the term personality; the second under moral likeness to God or holiness. By virtue of his personality, man possesses certain faculties, such as intellect, feeling or affection, and will; by virtue of his moral quality, he had certain right tendencies, or dispositions. Created in the image of God we may say then, that man was endowed with certain powers known as the natural image; and a certain direction was given these powers, which is known as the moral image of God. The natural image is uneffaced and ineffaceable, and exists in every human being; the moral image is accidental and amissible. The free spirit of man reflected the holiness of God in perfect conformity of mind, feeling and will, but this was lost in the fall and can be restored only through divine grace. There are three outstanding characteristics of the natural image of God which demand our attention - spirituality, knowledge and immortality

1.Spirituality. Spirituality is the deepest fact in the likeness of man to God. This is evident from the scriptural statement that God is "'the Father of spirits" (Hebrews 12:9). It appears also from another statement found in St. Paul’s address on Mars’ Hill.Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device(Acts 17:29). Here the apostle argues that if man possesses a spiritual nature as the offspring of God, then God himself must be spiritual and consequently cannot be represented by material substances such as gold, or silver, or stone. St. James speaks ofmen which are made after the similitude of God(James 3:9), thereby implying the indestructibility of the natural image of God in man. Spirit in man is like Spirit in God, the one finite, the other infinite. The spiritual nature, therefore, is the deepest fact in the image of God and the ground of all

other forms of likeness. Witsius points out that it is not to be considered in the light of a canvas upon which the image of God may be drawn, but that the spiritual nature is itself the likeness of God. Personality in man with its rational, affectional and volitional nature, is like personality in God; and this resemblance still obtains, although in the latter the attributes are infinite, and the essence altogether transcends the limitation of man's finite powers

2.Knowledge. Man's cognitive powers belong also to the original image in which he was created. This is evident, not only from the fact that consciousness is an inherent property of spirit as well as self - determination, but also by a direct statement of the Scriptures. In his letter to the Colossians, St. Paul asserts that theyhave put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him(Colossians 3:10). Here it is obvious that the original image in which man was created included knowledge, in both its intellectual and moral aspects; and having lost the moral image of God in the fall, this is to be restored by divine grace - a renewing in knowledge, after the image of God. The moral quality of the knowledge referred to here is found in the expression ei" epignwsin which means literally "unto knowledge." The renewal therefore is not merelyinknowledge, as a cognitive power; nor by knowledge, as a means to an end; butuntoknowledge - a restoration to moral likeness and spiritual fellowship. It is evident, then, that knowledge in its intellectual or cognitive aspect belongs to the natural image; while knowledge as an ethical and spiritual quality belongs to the moral image in which man was created. Thus as wisdom marked the transition from the relative to the moral attributes of God; so knowledge marks the transition from the natural to the moral image of God in man

3.Immortality. The church with few exceptions, has constantly maintained that man was created immortal, and that death entered solely as a consequence of sin. When, however, we refer to man's immortality as forming a part of the image of God in which he was created, we are concerned more specifically with the soul, although it is frequently asserted as applicable to the whole nature of man. Exceptions to man's immortality have been advanced by the rationalists of every age. The Pelagians and Socinians urged their objections on the ground, (1) that Adam's body as a corporeal organization was not designed for immortality; and (2) that the animal creation as well as mankind, were created male and female in order to propagate the species, and therefore the design of the Creator was the continuation of a succession of individuals, rather than preservation of the same individuals. Two factors, then, are involved in the question of man's immortality as it relates to the image of God, first, the immortality of the body; and second, the immortality of the soul The first question concerns the immortality of the body, or man's exemption from bodily death. Wakefield

[That God made man conditionally immortal cannot, I think, be reasonably doubted. Though formed out of the dust of the earth, his Maker breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul; and as there was then nothing violent, nothing out of its place, no agent too weak or too slow on the one hand; or too powerful or too active, on the other; so all the operations of nature were performed only in time, in quantity, and in power, according to the exigencies of the ends to be accomplished. So that in number, weight and measure, everything existed and acted according to the unerring wisdom and skill of the Omnipotent Creator. There could therefore be no corruption or decay; no disorderly induration nor preternatural solution or solubility of any portions of matter; no disorders in earth; nothing noxious or unhealthy in the atmosphere. The vast mass was all perfect: the parts of which it was composed equally so. As He created, so He upheld all

things by the Word of His power: and as He created all things, so by Him did all things consist; and among these man. - Clarke,Chr. Th.,p. 87.] and Ralston understand immortality as applying to man’s compound nature, the body as well as the soul. In this they follow Watson who states that "The Pelagian and Socinian notion, that Adam would have died had he not sinned, requires no further refutation than the words of the Apostle Paul, who declares expressly that death entered the world by sin; and so it inevitably follows that, as to man at least, but for sin there would have been no death. The opinion of those divines who include in the penalty attached to the first offense the very "fullness of death’ as it has been justly termed, death bodily, spiritual and eternal, is not to be puffed away by sarcasm, but stands firm on inspired testimony" (Watson,Institutes, II, p.386). In general two positions have been taken, (1) that the body is naturally mortal, and that the divine plan included counteracting agencies which effectually offset these death - working influences. This was the position of Martin Luther, who taught that the tree of life was intended to preserve the bodies of our foreparents in eternal youth. (2) The second position is, that man as such was immortal, but that provision was made in his original constitution for the gradual or sudden spiritualization of his bodily frame. Many of the earlier fathers taught that Adam was to pass a period of probation in the earthly garden, and if obedient would be translated to the heavenly Paradise of which the Garden of Eden was the earthly type. Among later writers, Dr. Sheldon thinks that the ""tree of life" may stand for the divine efficiency which would have mediated the human spirit, in its continued communion with God, and through the human spirit thus vitalized would have raised man’s sensuous nature, without the experience of any painful disruption, to the state of the glorified life (Sheldon,Syst. Chr. Doct., p.278). Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Pope take essentially the same position. Dr. Strong regards the body of man as itself mortal, and cites 1 Corinthians 15:45 as his proof from Scripture. He holds, however, that if Adam had maintained his integrity the body might have been developed and transfigured without the intervention of death. These positions seem to be based upon the statement of the Apostle Paul thatWe 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. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory(1 Corinthians 15:51-54). Dr. Charles Hodge argues that if St. Paul’s statement to the effect that those who have borne the image of the earthy shall also bear the image of the heavenly, is meant to infer that our bodies are like the body of Adam as originally constituted, then his body no less than ours, required to be changed to fit it for immortality (Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p. 116). Dr. Pope, emphasizing more especially the fact that man was made a " "living soul," while the Second Man is a ""quickening spirit" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 430) declares that ""the comparison of Genesis with St. Paul’s comment shows that there was a development of being, as it were, purposed and suspended in Adam: that he was to have enjoyed immortality through the gradual or sudden spiritualization of his bodily frame; but that it required the Last Adam to come to accomplish the design of creation. Through the fall the first Adam became the father of a dying nature: he bereft himself and us of the quickening Spirit who would have rendered the resurrection needless." The second question is concerned with the immortality of the soul in its relation to the divine image. It resolves itself into this - is everlasting life in its literal sense, the exclusive privilege of those who are saved in Christ; or, is the soul by its natural constitution immortal in all men? Tertullian (100:

220) and Origen (100: 254) while differing widely on many questions, agreed in this, that immortality belongs to the very essence of the soul. The spirit is itself the person, and human personality is undying. This has ever been the faith of the Church. Nemesis (100: 400) appears to have been the first to advance the notion of conditional immortality in the early history of the Church. The opinion was short-lived, but was revived again by Nicholas of Methone in 1089 A.D. In 1513 the Lateran Council pronounced the proper immortality of the soul to be an article of faith, and since that time this position has been held so firmly that contrary opinions have been regarded as heretical. The confusion of those who maintain the doctrine of conditional immortality is due largely to a lack of discrimination in terms. To identify life with existence and death with annihilation is both irrational and unscriptural. It arose primarily as a means of meeting objections to the doctrine of eternal punishment. Protestantism has uniformly maintained that eternal life as a gift of Christ, does not apply to existence as such, but to the quality of that existence. The soul of man may exist in a state of life, or in a state of death. Hence our Lord says,Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul(Matthew 10:28); and St. Paul declares thateven when we were dead in sinsGod by His great love,hath quickened us together with Christ(Ephesians 2:1; Ephesians 2:4-5). Thus the soul has existence regardless of the state or quality of that existence which we call life or death. It may exist in a state of sin and death, or a state of life and righteousness, whether in this world or in the next. The Protestant churches have generally embodied this doctrine in their confessions, either directly or indirectly The Moral or Incidental Image. We have already mentioned some of the distinctions between the natural and the moral image of God, and these need not be repeated. It is sufficient to say, that in addition to the powers of personality with which man was endowed at creation, he was given also, a certain responsibility for the right use of these natural abilities. Having the power of self - determination, he is responsible for the use of his freedom; having affections reaching out to the objects of his choice, he is responsible for the quality of those affections; having intellectual powers, he is responsible for the direction of his thoughts and the nature of the adjustments which intelligence demands. We may further summarize the two positions as follows: the natural image of God in man has reference to personality, by which he is distinguished from the lower animal creation; while the moral image refers to the character or quality of this personality. The first has to do with the constitution of man as possessing self - consciousness and self - determination; the second has to do with the rightness or wrongness of the use of these powers. The natural image gives man his natural ability and moral responsibility; the moral image gives him his moral image of God in man, is therefore closely connected with the idea of primitive holiness which furnishes us with our next subject for investigation. The older theologians were accustomed to discuss at length the question of the freedom of the will, in this connection, but the changed attitude toward the whole question of personality makes this unnecessary. This subject, however, will be given some consideration in connection with our discussion of the Atonement and Prevenient Grace

Christ as the Perfect Image of God.The doctrine of the divine image finds its perfect expression in the eternal Son as the second Person of the Trinity. He is the "express image of God," the outshining or effulgence of the divine glory. It was in the image of that image that man was created. In both his first and in his second creation, the Son was the archetype and pattern. It was this specific relation of the Son of man, and man to the Son, that made it possible for the Word to become flesh. Christ, therefore, preserved the full and exact image of

[Man was created a personal being, and was by this personality distinguished from the brute. By personality we mean the twofold power to know self as related to the world and to God, and to view the self in view of moral ends. By virtue of this personality, man could at his creation choose which of the objects of his knowledge-self, and world, or God-should be the norm and center of his development. This natural likeness to God is inalienable, and as constituting a capacity for redemption gives value to the life even of the unregenerate (Genesis 9:6, 1 Corinthians 11:7, James 3:9). This first element of the divine image man can never lose until he ceases to be man. St. Bernard well said that is could not be burned out, even in hell. Human nature, therefore, is to be reverenced.-Strong,Syst. Th., II, p. 515

God in man, thereby became the Redeemer of a fallen race, restoring man to the moral likeness of God in righteousness and true holiness THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE HOLINESS The different positions concerning the image of God in man which we have just indicted, led to widely divergent opinions as to the nature of primitive holiness. The two extremes were represented by Pelagianism on the on hand, and Augustinianism on the other. To review briefly, both Pelagius and Augustine distinguished between the "image" of God, which they limited to man’s natural constitution; and the "likeness" which they referred to his moral nature. But concerning the nature of this likeness they differed widely. Pelagius held that man was creasted only with the possibility of holiness; while Augustine maintained that holiness was a quality of man’s original nature. The Roman Catholic fathers held with Augustine, that man was possessed of primitive holiness; but since this was amissable or capable of being lost, they early came to the conclusion, that it could not, therefore, have been an essential element of man’s original constitution. Hence they regarded it as adonum superadditum,or a supernatural gift subsequent to his creation. The Roman Catholic Church in some measure, therefore, agreed with Augustine and Pelagius-with the former it held that primitive man was holy; with the latter it agreed that his holiness was not a part of man’s natural constitution. We may say, then that the contrast between Pelagianism and Augustinianism in the Roman

[Hence this image must belong to his inmost creaturely constitution. As such it was essential and indestructible: the self-conscious and self-determining personality of man, as a spirit bearing the stamp of likeness to God and capable of immorality, was the reflection in the creature of words, the question as to the existence and right of a natural knowledge the divine nature. While all creatures up to man reflect the perfections of their Creator, it is man’s distinction, made emphatic in the act of his creation, that he alone should bear His image. This, therefore is the ground of his dignity, and while that dignity belongs to his nature as a whole, it necessarily is found in that part which is imperishable. From beginning to end the record regards this image as uneffaced and ineffaceable, and still existing in every human being.-Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 423, 424

Catholic Church lay in this - that the former regarded holiness as a mere possibility; the latter as a supernatural gift At the time of the Reformation Protestantism reacted sharply against the Roman Catholic idea of holiness as a supernatural gift. Its theologians returned to the original teaching of Augustine, that holiness was

[To the superficial observer the whole of this question may seem of subordinate importance; but when more closely examined it is of preponderating theological and anthropological value. For it is in other words, the question as to the existence and right of a natural knowledge of God; or even if

this be put aside, it is at once apparent that, from the standpoint of the Romish Church, the fall becomes only more enigmatical, and in no case can be regarded as a properly so - called declension of human nature itself. Besides, the whole conception of such a "donurn superadditum" is foreign to Holy Scripture, and originates in the unbiblical conception that the first man alone bore the image of God and lost it through sin. - Van Oostehzee,Chr. Dogm., pp. 376, 377 The Tridentine anthropology is a mixture of Pelagianism and Augustinianism. God created man in "puris naturalibus," without either holiness or sin. This creative act, which left man characterless, God followed with another act by which he endowed man with holiness. Holiness is something supernatural, and not contained in the first creative act. Creation is thus imperfect, and is improved by an afterthought - Shedd,Dogm. Th., II, p. 96

Concreated holiness is one of the distinguishing tenets of Augustinianism. Pelagianism denies that holiness is concreated. It asserts that the will of man by creation, and in its first condition, is characterless. Its first act is to originate either holiness or sin . . . . Adam’s posterity are born, as he was created, without holiness and without sin... Semi-Pelagianism holds the same opinion; excepting that it concedes a transmission of a vitiated physical nature, which Pelagianism denies. So far as the rational and voluntary nature of man is concerned, the semi-Pelagian asserts that holiness, like sin, must be self-originated by each individual. - Shedd,Dogm. Th.,II, p. 96 In order to point out the importance of the doctrinal differences, we may in a brief preview say, that Pelagianism held to the indeterminism of the will, as over against the Augustinians who held to determinism; that is, the former regarded the will merely as the power of choice, while the latter regarded it as having a character which determined the choices. Pelagianism held that original sin was not transmitted by Adam to his posterity; while Augustinianism held that the descendants of Adam were not only born depraved, but that guilt attached to this depravity. Pelagianism held that souls are born pure, and that sin originates in the environment; Augustinianism held that man’s depravity is such, that he cannot either think or act right apart from divine grace. Grace, as Pelagius viewed it, was merely external instruction; while with Augustine it was closely allied with inward or effectual calling. Hence salvation with Pelagius was synergistic, or by means of co - operative grace; while with Augustine salvation was monergistic, that is, grace operated through predestination and election. Consequently Pelagius held to the idea of a universal atonement; Augustine to a limited atonement. Thus there arose two widely different systems of theology, solely as a consequence of certain fundamental doctrines being carried to extreme and unwarranted lengths. Arminianism arose as a mediating system of theology, and attempts to conserve the truth in each of the former systems.] concreated, and therefore an original quality of man’s being. But in attempting to guard against the error of Pelagianism, they frequently fell into the opposite error of regarding this subjective state as one of fully established ethical holiness. This is a distinction of great importance. Hence the contrast between Pelagianism and Augustinianism in the Protestant church took on a new form. No longer was it a contrast between the possibility of holiness and a superadded gift; but between the possibility of holiness and an ethical state having merit. Thus there arose in Protestantism two systems of anthropology, with widely different and sometimes contradictory doctrinal implications

Fundamental Distinctions of Primitive Holiness. There are two fundamental distinctions which must be observed in our discussion of primitive holiness.First, there is the distinction between a mere possibility of holiness, and holiness itself. The former is a negative state; the latter is marked by a

positive attitude of soul - a spontaneous tendency to obey the right and reject the wrong.Second, there is the distinction between created holiness and ethical holiness. The former is a subjective state and tendency without personal responsibility; the latter springs from moral choices, and depends upon the action of a free personal being. Both of these aspects must be given due consideration. while differing from each other, the latter does not make void the former, but confirms it and builds upon it. By the exercise of right choices in

[Thus we distinguish two aspects of holiness in Adam. First, there is that holiness which is the result of the creative act. The creative choice the creative process and the creative product were holy with a holiness' guaranteed by the absolute holiness of God. The creative product in the case of Adam was a holy being, sinless, in the image of God, a creature separate in kind from God but dependent upon Him and immortal in his duration. This was holiness as a result of creation Second there is the aspect of holiness resulting from Adamic moral choice With the first right exercise of moral choice, ethical holiness begins This does not void created holiness but as the major duty of human personality, it confirms created holiness and builds upon it By the exercise of moral choice in harmony with that holiness as a consequence of the divine choice and process, the created person strengthens himself m it and by that choice testifies that he is possessed of an understanding of moral values, and acknowledges the value of fright Thus the human development of holy character begins Through its continuance holy character is enlarged and confirmed m righteousness Rev. Paul Hill, The Man in the Garden, p. 18ff.] harmony with the tendencies of created holiness, man acknowledges the value of right and thereby testifies that he is possessed of an understanding of moral values. Thus the development of holy character begins; and if continued through right choices is strengthened and confirmed in righteousness

We are prepared now to point out the errors resulting from the extreme views of Pelagianism and Augustinianism. Both Pelagius and Augustine overlooked the distinction between holiness as a subjective state and holiness as a consequence of free moral choices, and therefore held only to the latter. Hence Pelagius maintained that the created subjective state could not be one of holiness, but only the possibility of holiness; while Augustine, insisting upon the created state as ethically holy, held that merit attached to it. Augustine therefore maintained that original sin meant native guilt and depravity; while Pelagius, holding to the impossibility of demerit apart from personal choices, denied native depravity altogether. Dr. Miley points out that ""With the proper analysis the former might have maintained the whole truth of native depravity without the element of sinful demerit; while the latter might have held the same truth of native depravity, and yet have maintained his fundamental principle that free personal conduct absolutely conditions all sinful demerit" (Miley,Syst. Th., I, pp. 416, 417). We are prepared, further, to note the distinction between the holiness of a nature, and the holiness of personal agency. In all human life, there is an inner realm of thought, desire and aspiration which tends to come to expression in outward activity. But this inner life is not passive - it, too, is in the realm of free personal choices and therefore supremely ethical. However, below this inner realm there is a nature, and it is in this

[Pelagianism is not so much the teaching of a single individual as a complete moral and religious system which took its name from Pelagius, a British monk, who came to Rome during the early part of the fifth century. By Augustinianism is meant that form of doctrine developed by the Reformers, and held mainly in the Calvinistic churches. Both the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformers assertedly built upon the teachings of Augustine, but developed vastly different

systems of theology.] nature that we find the determining law of life. It is to this that our Lord referred when He said,Either make the tree good and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit(Matthew 12:33). Thus the tree has a quality in itself distinct from the fruit. So also man was created with a subjective nature which underlies and gives character to both the inner realm of personal choices and the outward realm of personal activity

Mr. Wesley was strongly opposed to both Pelagianism and Socinianism. Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, a Unitarian of the first half of the eighteenth century, was one of the most learned and powerful defenders of Socinianism with which Mr. Wesley had to contend. The thoroughness of his position is seen in the following statement: "'Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness; because habits of holiness cannot be created without our knowledge, concurrence, or consent; for holiness in its nature implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness" (Watson,Institutes, II, p.16). In order to make clear the distinction between the Socinian position and that of the later Arminians, we give Mr. Wesley's reply to Dr. Taylor. He says, ""A man may be righteous before he does what is right, holy in heart before he is holy in life. The confounding of these two

[The statement of Dr. Taylor appears to have been influenced by the philosophy of John Locke, which held that the soul of a child is a "tabula rasa" or white sheet of paper, upon which must be written by personal choice that which makes it good or bad. This, it will be seen, is the basic assumption of much of the religious education of the present time - an assumption which overlooks the fundamental distinction between personal activity and that quality of nature which underlies it

[From the first book of Pelagius on free will Augustine quotes the following: "All good and evil, by which we are praise or blameworthy, do not originate together with us, but are done by us. We are born capable of each, but not filled with either. And as we are produced without virtue, so are we also without vice; and before the action of his own will there is in man only what God made." This, says Dr. Miley, denies all change in the moral state of the race as consequent to the Adamic fall. In his moral nature man is the same in his original constitution. Adam was endowed with freedom and placed under a law of duty, but was morally indifferent as between good and evil. This denial of primitive holiness is not merely a speculative error. The principle of this denial carries with it a denial of the Adamic fall and depravity of the race, and therefore leaves no place for evangelical theology. - Miley, Syst. Th.,I, p. 417.] all along seems the ground of your strange imagination, that Adam "must choose to be righteous, must exercise thought and reflection before he could be righteous.' Why so? "Because righteousness is the right use and application of our powers?' Here is your capital mistake. No, it is not; it is the right state of our powers. It is the right disposition of our soul, the right temper of our mind. Take this with you, and you will no more dream, that 'God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness'" (Wesley,Sermon on Original Sin). The reason for Mr. Wesley's strong opposition is not far to seek. When Pelagius taught that the ""good and evil, by which we are praise or blameworthy, do not originate together with us, but are done by us," he thereby denied any moral change in the race consequent upon the fall of Adam. Adam, being created characterless, his posterity would likewise be born without holiness or sin. Hence Pelagianism denied original sin as a corruption of man's nature through the fall, and held that saving grace was merely external instruction appealing to a nature wrong only through accident

and bad example. Mr. Wesley, therefore, opposed these positions as destructive of the entire system of evangelical theology The Nature of Holiness in Adam. If we observe the distinction mentioned above, it becomes evident that there may be created holiness as a subjective state, which is something more than a mere possibility on the one hand, and something previous to free moral action on the other. This created holiness consists in a spontaneous inclination or tendency toward the good - a subjective disposition which always answers to the right. It is more than innocence. Man was created not only negatively innocent but positively holy, with an enlightened understanding of God and spiritual things, and a will wholly inclined to them. When, therefore, we speak of Adamic

[The Pelagian position is expressed in the following statement: "At birth, each man's voluntary faculty, like Adam's, is undetermined either to sin or holiness. Being thus characterless, with a will undecided for either good or evil, and not in the least affected by Adam's apostasy, each individual man, after birth commences his voluntariness, originates his own character, and decides his own destiny by the choice of either right or wrong."] holiness, we mean thereby simply the spontaneous inclination, or positive disposition which belonged to him by virtue of his creation. If it be argued that this position differs but little from that held by the Pelagians, and later by the Socinians, we answer, there is a vast difference between the soul being produced with a nature free from either virtue or sin, and that soul being created with a positive direction toward the right. Then, too, the doctrinal implications are such as lead to widely different systems of theology. Pelagianism of necessity denied inherited depravity in the descendants of Adam; while Augustinianism with equal necessity, maintained that the descendants of Adam were not only depraved but guilty

Arminianism is not only opposed to the error of Pelagianism, but also to the opposite error of Augustinianism. While it holds that the newly created state of Adam was one of holiness, it nevertheless denies that this state, however excellent, had any true ethical quality. It could not, therefore, be accounted either meritorious or rewardable. Augustinianism as developed by the Reformers, held that holiness was concreated, as we have previously indicated, and was therefore, not something superadded, but a quality of man's original nature. Their error lay in this, that they regarded the original state of man as one of ethical righteousness as well as inward holiness. It was therefore an ethical holiness, or an obligation under moral law; and as a quality of man's original nature even before any personal action, it is regarded as having the moral worth of ethical righteousness. Thus Van Oosterzee states that we should not

[It may be well at this point to distinguish between innocence and holiness, though both of these were Adamic possessions at the beginning, and both the result of the divine act of creation. Innocence refers to blamelessness of wrongdoing; holiness refers to a positive attitude of soul favorable toward right and antagonistic toward wrong. Innocence does not require strenuous exercise of will; holiness presupposes the positive inclination of the will toward good and against evil. A new - born babe is innocent, but since the fall none are born holy. Childhood innocency remains until by act of disobedience the child definitely allies itself with sin, at which time innocence is forfeited. Adamic innocence was coupled with holiness. At creation it was connected first with created holiness, and later by the exercise of free choice became ethical. - Rev. Paul Hill,The Man in the Garden, p.19.]

"with the Romish Church, assume that the image of God in the first man was something merely additional (accedens) bestowed upon him in consequence of a supernatural communication; but not belonging to the essence of his nature. The Reformers most justly assert, in opposition to this mechanical view, thatjustitia originaliswas an original and actual element of our nature, as it came forth from the hand of the Creator." Luther was especially insistent that original righteousness was a quality of man's proper nature, and necessary to its perfection and completeness. Jonathan Edwards at a somewhat later period, took the same position. "Adam was brought into existence capable of acting immediately, as a moral agent, and therefore he was immediately under a rule of right action; he was obliged as soon as he existed to act right. And if he was obliged to act right as soon as he existed, he was obliged even then to be inclined to act right...And as he was obliged to act right from the first moment of his existence, and did do so till he sinned in the affair of the forbidden fruit, he must have had an inclination or disposition of heart to do right the first moment of his existence, with an inclination, or, which is the same thing, a virtuous and holy disposition of heart" (Edwards,Works, Vol. II, p. 385). Dr. Miley in his comment upon this statement points out that ""Not only is there here an overlooking of all distinction between purely spontaneous tendency and proper ethical action, but it is attempted to prove an original ethical holiness of Adam from its necessity to moral obligation which was instant upon his existence. The assumption of such instant obligation is a pure gratuity...We agree with the prevalent Augustinian anthropology respecting the reality of primitive holiness, but dissent respecting any proper ethical character of

[We may suppose a being, like Adam, created with soul perfectly right. His preferential feelings anterior to action accord with the divine law. His sensibilities are so under easy volitional control, his mind is so clear and pure, that all in its primitive undisturbed state is right. His will is able to hold his whole being in subordination to the moral imperative. He is, in his grade of being, perfectly excellent; and his excellence is not mechanical merely or esthetical, but ethical. It is moral excellence, and perfect in its kind, yet wholly unmeritorious. - Whedon,Freedom of the Will, p. 391.] that holiness, and also respecting its limitation to a mere quality of the Adamic nature. In that anthropology Adam often appears in the very beginning, and before any personal action, with the moral worth of ethical righteousness, with the activities of holy affection in the fear and love of God. We omit all this from the content of primitive holiness. The activities of holy affection may be spontaneous to the moral nature, but must be subsequent to its own constitution" (Miley,Syst. Th., I, pp. 411, 421)

Essential Elements of Primitive Holiness. In a brief summary, we may say that there are two essential elements in any true doctrine of primitive holiness. First, the moral rectitude of Adam's nature as a subjective state. We have shown that a thorough analysis distinguishes between the creation of a moral nature as a subjective state, and the activities of that moral nature in personal life. A true Arminianism thus distinguishes between the error of Pelagianism on the one hand, and that of Augustinianism on the other. These positions have already been given ample treatment. Second, the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit. This is necessary to a full understanding of the truth, and furnishes a basis, also, for discrimination against other forms of error. We have already pointed out the extreme position of the Roman Catholic Church in maintaining that holiness was a superadded gift, and therefore not a part of Man 1:5 original constitution. We have noted also the extreme position of the Reformers in opposition to this, maintaining that holiness was concreated, and therefore limited to a quality of man's primal nature. The truth lies midway

between these extreme positions. Arminianism has always objected to the papal doctrine that holiness is a supernatural gift, in that it involves a false

[A primitive Adamic holiness is not an impossibility because Adam could not, simply as created, be holy in any strictly ethical or meritorious sense. In the fundamental distinctions of holiness we found a sense which is applicable to a nature in distinction from a personal agent. It lies in a spontaneous tendency to the good. The subjective disposition answers to the good on its presentation. It answers as a spontaneous inclination or impulse toward holy action. This is all that we mean by the nature of Adamic or primitive holiness. - Miley,Syst. Th., I, p. 412.] position as to the nature of the fall and original sin. It has equally objected to limiting holiness to a mere quality of the Adamic nature. The truth involved is this, that to the holiness of man's nature by creation, must be added the immediate presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Even Augustine admitted that ""God had given man an assistance without which he could not have persevered in good if he would. He could persevere if he would, because that aid (adjutorium) did not fail by which he could. Without this he could not retain the good which he might will." Arminian theologians have always stressed this important aspect of primitive holiness, sometimes regarding the Holy Spirit as in close affiliation with man's estate and sometimes as acting more independently, but always present and operative. Thus Dr. Pope says, "This doctrine is incomplete without the addition of the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost, if that may be called supernatural which belonged to the union of God with His elect creature.... He did not add the moral image, but He guided the principles of action of man's soul created in that image. This solves the difficulty sometimes expressed as to the creation of a character

[But this doctrine is incomplete without the addition of the supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost, if that may be called supernatural which belonged to the union of God with His elect creature. The Holy Trinity must be connected with every stage of the history of mankind. As the Protoplast was formed in the image of eternal Image - a son of God after the likeness of the only begotten Son, so he was under the spiritual and natural government of the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son. He who brooded over the chaos, presided over all the successive dispensations of life in its advancing stages toward perfection, and was the supreme life inbreathed into the highest creature, took full possession of that new creature. He did not add the moral image, but He guided the principles of action of man's soul created in that image. This solves the difficulty sometimes expressed as to the creation of a character which, it is said, must of necessity be formed by him who hears it. Man was led of the Spirit, who was the power of love in his soul, already in his first estate, as now in his last estate. How long this holy discipline lasted we are not given to know; but we do know that the fall was its departure as a free and perfect education. This explains also the wonderful endowments of Adam, who reasoned and formed his language, and understood and gave names to his fellow creatures be - low him. The Lord God of the garden was the Holy Ghost in the human soul. The Spirit in man's spirit must not, however, be confounded with the image of God as such: the gift was distinct, but the true complement and perfection of every other gift. This is, as will be afterward seen, the secret of the trichotomy of body, soul and spirit in human nature. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., I, p. 427.] which, it is said, must of necessity be formed by him that bears it. Man was led of the Spirit, who was the power of love in his soul, already in his first estate, as now in his last estate" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., I, p.427). Dr. Raymond states the same truth but from a somewhat different aspect. He says, ""Others use the term original righteousness to

signify the influences and agencies of the Holy Spirit which man enjoyed in his primeval state. That man enjoyed communion with his Maker; that the divine Spirit revealed to man a knowledge of God, and was with man a power of moral suasion to holy affections and holy volitions cannot be doubted. But to call this the righteousness of the man is plainly a misnomer. The term, to be of any valuable service, to represent any actually existing trait in man's original character, or any characteristic of his primal nature, should be used to express the perfection, the completeness of the whole nature and character. Man was originally righteous, constitutionally right, considered as to the whole and the parts of his being. He was a perfect man by creation" (Raymond,Syst. Th., II, pp. 42, 43). Dr. Miley states the mediating position of Arminianism as follows: "We have previously dissented from the Augustinian limitation of that holiness to a mere quality of the Adamic nature. We have also dissented from the papal doctrine of its purely supernatural character; but the weighty objection, that it implies serious defects in the nature of man as originally constituted, is valid only against so extreme a view. The presence of the Holy Spirit as a constituent element of primitive holiness has no such implication. The Adamic nature could be holy in its own quality and tendency, and yet need the help of the Spirit for the requirements of a moral probation....Hence the divine plan might include the presence of the Spirit as an original and abiding element in the holiness of man. We need this truth for the proper interpretation of human depravity. The fall of man was not only the loss of holiness, but also the corruption of his nature. This corruption we may not ascribe to any immediate agency of God, but may interpret it as the consequence of the withdrawment of the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit. This is the doctrinal meaning of "deprivation'" (Miley,Syst. Th., I, pp. 421, 422)

We close this discussion with a reference to the Scripture account of creation which declares that Godsaw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good(Genesis 1:31). By no possible interpretation can this refer to creation apart from man and, therefore, must express the divine approbation of man's goodness. Another text frequently quoted in this connection is from the Preacher,Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.This cannot refer to man's conduct subsequent to his creation, and thus must refer to the rectitude of man's moral nature by creation. There are two texts in the New Testament, frequently quoted also, which have implications as to the original nature of man.And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness(Ephesians 4:24);And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him(Colossians 3:10). These texts will be discussed more at length in connection with holiness as a state of grace, consequently it is sufficient here to point out, (1) that the transformation of grace here declared is something deeper than the life of personal action, and must therefore include the renovation of the moral nature; (2) this transformation is said to take place by the operation of the Holy Spirit - a purification of the moral nature; (3) this renewal is said to be a restoration to the original image in which man was created; hence (4) man must of necessity have been created holy - this holiness being a part of the original image of God in which he was created. We shall consider in the following chapters, some of the implications of this teaching, for which we have so carefully laid the foundation in this chapter

17. Chapter 18 – HAMARTIOLOGY

Chapter 18 - HAMARTIOLOGY

Hamartiology, or the Doctrine of Sin, is frequently treated as a branch of Anthropology. In such cases the doctrine of man is usually considered under two main heads - the status integritas, or man before the fall; and the status corruptionis, or man after the fall. Because of the importance of this doctrine, we prefer to treat it under a separate head. The word Hamartiology is derived from one of the several terms used to express the idea of sin - that of hamartia (amartia), which signifies a deviation from the way or end appointed by God. The term is applicable to sin, both as an act and as a state or condition. As a doctrine it is closely interwoven with all the subsequent stages of theology, and therefore of fundamental importance to the whole system of Christian truth. ""In every religion," said the saintly Fletcher, there is "a principle truth or error which, like the first link of a chain, necessarily draws after it all the parts with which it is essentially connected." In Christian theology this first link is the fact of sin. Since Christianity is a religion of redemption, it is greatly influenced by the various views concerning the nature of sin. Any tendency to minimize sin has its consequences in a less exalted view of the person and work of the Redeemer. The

[In every religion there is a principal truth or error which, like the first link of a chain, necessarily draws after it all the parts with which it is essentially connected. This leading principle, in Christianity, distinguished from deism, is the doctrine of our corrupt and lost estate; for if man is not at variance with his Creator, what need of a Mediator between God and him? If he is not a depraved, undone creature, what necessity of so wonderful a Restorer and Saviour as the Son of God? If he be not enslaved to sin, why is he redeemed by Jesus Christ? If he is not polluted, why must he be washed in the blood of the immaculate Lamb? If his soul is not disordered, what occasion is there for such a divine Physician? If he is not helpless and miserable, why is he perpetually invited to secure the assistance and consolations of the Holy Spirit? And, in a word, if he is not born in sin, why is the new birth so absolutely necessary that Christ declares with the most solemn asseverations, without it no man can see the kingdom of God? - Fletcher of Madeley.] three great central themes - God, sin and redemption are so interrelated that the views held concerning any one of them profoundly affect the other two In this chapter we shall consider the following subjects: (I) The Temptation and Fall of Man; (II) The Origin of Sin; (III) The Doctrine of Satan; and (IV) The Nature and Penalty of Sin THE TEMPTATION AND FALL OF MAN The Historical Character of the Genesis Account. We regard the account of the probation and fall of man found in Genesis 3:1-24, as an inspired record of historical facts, bound up with a deep and rich symbolism. All attempts to prove the account a collection of myths without divine authority; or to consider it an allegory in the sense of a divinely given illustration of truth apart from historical fact, must fail before the evidence which insists that the account is an integral portion of a continuous historical narrative. To lift this portion from the entire account and treat it as allegory, when the balance of the narrative is admittedly historical, is a procedure contrary to all accepted rules of interpretation. Furthermore the account is assumed as historical throughout both the Old and New Testaments. It is true that our Lord did

[A large proportion of the church fathers, (for example, Justin, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Augustine and Theodoret) and also most of the older theologians even in the Protestant church, were united in the opinion that this passage should not be explained as an allegory, although they differed among themselves in the interpretation of particular expressions. They agreed, however, for the most part, in considering the serpent as something else than a mere natural serpent, as it was regarded by Josephus and other Jewish interpreters. Some affirmed that the serpent was simply the devil - an opinion justly controverted by Vitringa, on account of the great difficulties by which it is encompassed. Others, and the greater part of the older Jewish interpreters, supposed that the serpent here spoken of was the instrument which was employed by the evil spirit to seduce mankind. So it is explained by Augustine, who was followed in this by Luther and Calvin; and this, from their time, was the prevailing opinion of Protestant theologians until the middle of the eighteenth century. - Knapp, Chr. Th., p.267

We would not insist so strongly upon a literal exegesis as to say it is impossible that the account should be figurative, but on the other hand, we do insist that there is no necessity that we should consider it, and no advantage in doing so if we did. The Book of Genesis is historical in all its characteristics; it does not claim to be, nor does it appear to be, anything else than a literal record of actually occurring events. - Raymond, Syst. Th., H, pp.52, 53).] not directly refer to it; but if His words on divorce be weighed well, it will be seen that in sanctioning the Genesis account as historical, He must have indirectly included also, the account of the fall (cf. Matthew 19:4-5; John 8:44). St. Paul in his epistles frequently refers to the Genesis account as historical (cf. 2 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Timothy 2:13-14). There are also undeniable allusions to the fall in the Old Testament (cf. Job 31:33; Hosea 6:7) The Spiritual Meaning of the Paradisaical History. Both Bishop Martensen and Dr. Pope call attention to one of the aspects of the Paradisaical history which is overlooked by theologians in general, that is, ""That the scene of Paradise though introduced into human history, belongs to an order of events very different from anything that human experience knows or can rightly appreciate. While the narrative is true, and every circumstance in it real, there is not a feature of the Paradisaical history of man that is purely natural, as we now understand the term. The process of human probation, whether longer or shorter, was supernaturally conducted by symbols, the deep meaning of which we know now only in part, though our first parents perhaps understood them by express teaching. The garden enclosed; the sacramental Tree of Life, the nourishment of conditional immortality; the mystical Tree of Knowledge, the fruit of which would reveal the profound secret of freedom; the one positive precept, representing the whole law;

[It is precisely because Paradise lies outside the conditions of our present experience, that it is so easy a task for criticism to prove the impossibility of our forming for ourselves a picture of the first Adam. There is a certain analogy between the representation of Paradise, of the first conditions of human life; and the representation of the last conditions of human life, that is to say, of a future life. Both lie alike beyond the conditions of present experience; which is the reason why there are so many persons who esteem them as mere pictures of the fancy. But because we are not able to have any empirical intuition of the Paradise of our past or of our future, we are not on that account the less obliged to think of it, as we also see it in faith, as in a glass darkly. Although, therefore, the first Adam stands like a figure in the background of the human race, shrouded in a cloud, and with an undefined outline, a dim memory, as distinct as the recollection of the first awakening to

self-consciousness in each individual; yet does the consciousness of the species, when directed upon itself, necessarily return to this dim memory; because without it the consciousness of the species would be entirely wanting in unity and connection. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., pp.153, 154.] the symbolical serpent form of the Tempter; the character of the threatenings and their fulfillment on all the parties; the exclusion from the garden and the flaming defenses of the forfeited Eden; all were emblems as well as facts, which almost without exception recur at the close of revelation in their new and higher meaning. Both in Genesis and in Revelation they are symbols or signs with a deep spiritual significance." Thus "the purely historical character of the narrative may be maintained in perfect consistency with a full acknowledgment of the large element of symbolism in it" (Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp.10, 11)

Some of the more orthodox theologians of the last century in their efforts to defend the historical character of the Mosaic account, failed to do justice to its rich symbolism. This not only narrowed the range of spiritual truth presented, but the method itself was out of harmony with the general trend of the Scriptures. Thus St. Paul did not deny the historical character of Sarah and Hagar when he said, "Which things are an allegory (Galatians 4:24); neither did the author of Hebrews deny the historical facts concerning the giving of the law when he drew the parallel between Mount Sinai and Mount Sion (Hebrews 12:18-24). The earlier Arminian and Wesleyan theologians were not under the necessity of combating destructive criticism, and hence took a truer and more scriptural position. Wakefield says that "though the literal sense of the history is thus established, yet that it has in its several parts, but in perfect accordance with the literal interpretation; a mystical sense, is equally to be proved by the Scriptures." Earlier than this Richard

[Dr. Pope says concerning the two trees in the garden, that they are symbols or signs with a deep spiritual significance. "The remembrance of this serves two purposes. It suggests our first parents were bound to their Creator by a religion which made all things around them sacramental, and some things more especially such. And it protects the simple details of the garden from the contempt of unbelievers, who see in them nothing bat what appears on the surface of the narrative. The water of baptism and the eucharistic bread and wine are slight and common things in relation to the amazing realities they signify. But the infidel spirit finds nothing in these symbols to object against as such. Then why should it be thought a thing incredible that the two trees of Paradise should have borne sacramental fruit?" - Pope, Comp. Chr. Th., II p.11.]

Watson reckons himself among those, "Who, while they contend earnestly for the literal interpretation of every part of the history, consider some of the terms used, and some of the persons introduced, as conveying a meaning more extensive than the letter, and as constituting several symbols of spiritual things and spiritual beings" (WATSON, Dictionary, Art. "The Fall of Man"). Only as the historical account is given its spiritual interpretation are we able to approach the depth of meaning which it holds for mankind

Before taking up the study of the various events in the Paradisaical history, it may be well to mention the fact that the interpretation of these events has been the source of much controversy in the church. It is impossible, therefore, to give any thorough review of the literature on this subject. We shall note only the following:

(1) The Garden in Eden. We are told that the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed" (Genesis 2:8). It is evident from this that God provided

a special environment for the first pair, as a proper setting for their probationary trial. Dr. Shedd says that "the first sin was unique, in respect to the statute broken by it. The Eden commandment was confined to Eden. It was never given before or since. Hence the first Adamic transgression cannot be repeated. It remains a single, solitary transgression; the 'one' sin spoken of in Romans 5:12; Romans 5:15-19" (Shedd, Dogm. Th., II, p. 154). (2) The Tree of Life. This not only represents the communication of divine life to man, but symbolizes, also, man's constant dependence up9n God. If man but eat of the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the garden, then he is free also to eat of the other trees; for this act in itself, is a recognition of the divine sovereignty. It bears, therefore, a relation to the other trees in the garden, much as the bread of communion bears to bread as the staff of life. It is sacramental in that it gives meaning to the whole of life. Dr. Adam Clarke with others, held that the tree of life was intended as an emblem of that life which man should ever live, provided he continued in obedience to his Maker. And probably the use of this tree was intended as a means of preserving the body of man in a state of continual vital energy, and an antidote against death." (3) The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Here a distinction must be made between a knowledge about evil, and a knowledge of evil as a reality in personal experience. "Man therefore ought to know evil," says Martensen, ""only as a possibility that he has overcome; he ought only to see the forbidden fruit; but if he eats it, his death is in the act. If he attains the knowledge of evil as a reality in his own life, he has fallen away from his vocation, and frustrates the very object of his creation" (Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p.156). (4) The Serpent. This mystical figure has been the occasion of much speculation in theology, and the views have varied from the strictest literalism to the purest symbolism. Perhaps the most widely accepted view is that which holds that the serpent was one of the higher created animals which Satan used as an instrumentality in securing the attention and making possible the conversation with Eve. Whatever else this figure may teach, two things are clearly evident - first, man was tempted by a spiritual being external to himself

[Different opinions are held as to the agency of the temptation. Wakefield says, "The visible agent in man's seduction was the serpent, but the real tempter was that evil spirit called the devil and Satan. It is evident from the attributes and properties ascribed to the serpent, that some superior being was identified with it in the transaction....Here, then, without giving up the literal sense of the history, we must look beyond the letter, and regard the serpent as only the instrument of a superhuman tempter. In like manner and sentence pronounced upon the serpent, while it is to be understood literally as to that animal, must be considered as teaching more than is expressed by the letter, and the terms of it are therefore regarded as symbolical. The cursing of the serpent was a symbol of the malediction which fell upon the devil - the real agent in the temptation; while the prediction respecting the bruising of the serpent's head by the seed of the woman was indicative of man's redemption from the malice and power of Satan by our Lord Jesus Christ. The symbolical interpretation of the passage is confirmed by two considerations: (1) If the serpent was only a mere instrument employed by Satan, as was obviously the case, justice required that the curse should fall with its greatest weight upon the real seducer. But to interpret the history in a merely literal sense would confine the punishment entirely to the serpent, and leave the prime mover of the offense without any share in the malediction. (2) It would be ridiculous to suppose, under the circumstances, that the prediction respecting the bruising of the serpent's head was to be understood in no other than a literal sense.-Wakefield, Chr. Th., pp.285, 286.] self; and second, this mystical figure furnished the instrumentality through which the Tempter gained access to our

foreparents

[The extreme literalness of the account of the temptation by the serpent is best seen in the position of Dr. Knapp of Halle. He says, "The propriety and consistency of the account of the temptation by means of the serpent may be illustrated by the following remarks. The serpent was used by almost all the ancient nations as the symbol of prudence, adroitness, and cunning. Eve sees a serpent upon this forbidden tree, and probably eating of its fruits, which to a serpent might not be harmful. And it is very natural that this should be first observed by the woman....As to what follows, we very naturally understand that Eve reflected upon what she had seen, and expressed her thoughts in words. 'The serpent is a very lively and knowing animal, and yet it eats of the fruit which is forbidden us. This fruit cannot, therefore, be so hurtful, and the prohibition may not have been meant in earnest.' The same fallacies with which men still deceive themselves when the objects of sense entice and draw them away. The fact which she observed, that the serpent ate the fruit of the forbidden tree without harm, excited the thought which in verses 4 and 5 are represented as the words of the serpent, that it was worth while to eat this fruit. It did not seem to occasion death; and on the other hand, appeared rather to impart health, vigor and intelligence, as was proved from the example of the serpent, which remained after eating it, well and wise." "Consider me," the serpent might have seemed to say to her, "how brisk, sound and cunning I am." Now as she knows of no being who surpasses man in wisdom, excepting God only, she supposes in her simplicity, that if she became wiser than she then was, she would be like God. Meanwhile, the desire after that which was forbidden became continually more irresistible. She took of the fruit and ate. The man, who, as is common, was weak and pliable enough to yield to the solicitation of his wife, received the fruit from her and ate with her. - Knapp, Christian Theology, p. 269

Dr. Adam Clarke says, "We have here one of the most difficult as well as the most important narratives in the whole book of God." He calls attention to the word "nachash" which following the Septuagint is translated serpent. Through a labored argument he advances the theory that instead of the word "nachash" being translated serpent, it should have been translated ape. He comes to this conclusion on the ground that the Arabic word "chanas" or "khanasa" signifies, "he departed, drew off, lay hid, seduced, slunk away"; while the same root word "akhnas", "khanasa" or "khanoos" all signify an ape, or satyrus, or any creature of the simia or ape genus. "Is it not strange," he asks, "that the devil and the ape should have the same name, derived from the same root, and that root so very similar to the word in the text?" Hence he argues that the nachash whatever it was had the following characteristics: (1) It was the head of all the inferior animals; (2) it walked erect; (3) it was endued with the gift of speech; (4) it was also endued with the gift of reason; and (5) these things were common to the creature, so that Eve evinced no surprise

Richard Watson also argues along the same line. He says, "We have no reason to suppose, as is strangely done almost uniformly by commentators, that this animal had the serpentine form in any mode or degree at all, before his transformation."

Dr. Miley, and most Arminian theologians take the position that the serpent as an animal was merely the instrument in the temptation, and that the fact of intelligence connected with it evinces the presence of a higher agency.] The Probation of Man Necessary. If God was to be glorified by free creaturely service, man must be placed on probation, subjected to temptation, and this at the inevitable cost of the possibility of sin. Temptation, therefore, was permitted, because in no other

way could human obedience be tested and perfected. The question immediately arises, How could a holy being sin? We must view this question as growing out of a misapprehension concerning the original nature of man. It implies that either man's will was not created free. or that it was created free in the Edwardean sense of being under the control of dominant motives. This latter, however, is after all only a necessitarian theory under the guise of freedom. Adam was indeed created holy, but not indefectibly so; that is, his will though conformed to the moral law was mutable because it was not omnipotent. Thus in God, as an infinite Being, voluntary self-determination could not be so reversed as to be considered a fall; while in finite beings such as men or angels, such a fall is possible. We may say with Dr. Shedd, that ""A will determined to good with an omnipotent energy is not subject to change; but a will determined to good with a finite and limited force is so subject. By reason of the restricted power of his created will, Adam might lose the righteousness with which he was created, though he was under no necessity of losing it. His will had sufficient power to continue in holiness, but not so much additional power as to make a lapse into sin impossible" (cf. Shedd, Dogm. Th., II, p.149). The Protestant position is ably stated in the Westminster Confession as follows: "God created man male and female, with righteousness and true holiness, having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it: and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject to change." The schoolmen arranged the possible views concerning the will of Adam in its relation to sin as follows: First, if Adam's will was to move at all, it must of necessity result in sin. This is the non posse non pecare (not possible not to sin) view of the fall, and is held by those who find sin in the metaphysical imperfection of man, as did Leibnitz; or those who hold that sin, is necessarily connected with the law of progress. Thus Kant and Schiller interpret the first transgression as a necessary transition of the reason from a state of nature to a state of culture; while Schleiermacher, Ritter and others, make sin the consequence of the superiority which the sensuous life had acquired over the spiritual. Second, Adam's will was neither holy nor unholy. It had no bias toward either the right or the wrong, and hence being in a state of equilibrium was free to move in either direction according to its own determination. This is the posse pecare (possible to sin) view which was held by the Pelagians, and which must be given much attention later. Third, Adam's will was holy, and therefore created with a tendency in the right direction, but not indefectibly so; that is, it had the power of reversing its course and moving in the opposite direction, and this solely through its own self-determination. This is the posse non pecare (possible not to sin) view and is generally accepted as the orthodox position. Fourth, it is conceivable that man might have been created holy, and free to forever advance in holiness, but not free to determine to the contrary. This is the non posse pecare (not possible to sin) view of the will but has never been held as an accepted doctrine in Christian theology

We may now examine the account of the temptation in the light of the above statements, and in doing so, attempt to answer the question, "How can a holy being sin?"

1. Man by his very constitution is a self-conscious, self-determining being. He is a free moral agent, and hence has a capacity for performing moral action. Moral action in turn demands a law by which character is determined - a law which may be either obeyed or disobeyed by the subject. Otherwise there would be no moral quality, for neither praise nor blame could be attached to either obedience or disobedience. This would destroy the character of the moral agent. It is evident, therefore, that the power to obey or disobey is an essential element in a moral agent, and hence

God could have prevented the fall only by the destruction of man’s free agency

2. Man was created holy, with spontaneous tendencies toward the right. But he was not created indefectibly so - that is, his holiness was not a fixed state. His will was not omnipotent, and therefore liable to change; his knowledge was not omniscient, and therefore deception was possible. We may say, then, that while man was created holy, nevertheless there existed in him certain susceptibilities to sin

3. These susceptibilities lay in two directions - a lower and a higher. Man as composed of soul and body, becomes susceptible to the gratification of physical desires, which though lawful in themselves become the occasion of sin. From the higher or spiritual side of his being man may become impatient with the slow process of divine Providence, and become susceptible to suggestions which would seem to hasten the accomplishment of God’s purpose. The use of false means in the attempt to attain good ends is a part of the deceptiveness of sin

[The probationary statute was a positive precept and not a moral command. The difference between the two lies chiefly in this, that In a positive command, the reason for it is hidden, while the very nature of a moral command embraces something of its propriety. Dr. Shedd in a reference to Anselm calls attention to this fact and points out that the Eden statute was thus a better test of implicit faith and obedience than a moral statute would have been, because it required obedience for no reason but the sovereign will of God. At the same time, this disobedience also involved a violation of the moral law, in that it was a contempt of authority, a disbelief of God and a belief of Satan, discontent with the existing state, impatient curiosity to know; pride and ambition. - cf. Shedd, Dogm. Th., II, pp. 153, 154 The one absolute law had a negative and a positive form, as connected with the two symbolical trees of the garden: the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge. The eating of the one was a positive condition of continued life and every benefit of creation; abstinence from the other was the negative condition. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 14

Concerning the prohibition against eating the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Dr. Adam Clarke says, "The prohibition was intended to exercise this faculty in man, that it should constantly teach him this moral lesson, that there were some things fit and others unfit to be done; and that, in reference to this point, the tree itself should be a constant teacher and monitor. The eating of this would not have increased this moral faculty, but the prohibition was intended to exercise the faculty already possessed. There is certainly nothing unreasonable in this explanation: and, viewed in this light, the passage loses much of its obscurity. Vitringa strongly contends for this interpretation." - ADAM CLARKE, Comm., Genesis 1:9.]

4. The occasion of the temptation was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which the Lord God placed in the midst of the garden. The fruit of this tree was prohibited, doubtless as a positive instead of a moral commandment. However, if the opinion of Vitringa be allowed, the tree was intended to serve as a constant reminder that some things were fit and others unfit to be done, and that man is under the necessity of constantly exercising wise choices

5. The agent in the temptation was the serpent, who as a deceptive spirit, presented God’s good gifts in a false and illusory light. This was possible as an overemphasis, an underemphasis, or an otherwise perverting of the truth so as to place it in a setting of unrighteousness. Satan has nothing of his own to offer, and hence must tempt man solely through a deceptive use of God’s

gifts. It is for this reason that Bishop Martensen says that "The two moments here described occur in every act of sin. No sin is committed without the presence of both fruit and serpent, an alluring phenomenon which attracts the sense, and an invisible tempter who holds up before man an illusory image of his freedom."

6. The deceitfulness of sin immediately appears. Presented in an illusive coloring, the temptation appeared good for food, pleasant to the eyes and a tree to be desired to make one wise. Led by the desire to think of its possible gratification, the good appeared to be that which God would wish to bestow; and since wisdom was desirable in intelligent beings, its increase would make man more like God. Hence a susceptibility was created for a false conclusion, into which Satan immediately

[It must not be supposed that the trees had any inherent virtue: the one to sustain life forever; the other to poison and corrupt the nature of man. The solemn eating of the fruit of the tree of life was only a sacrament of immortality; it was to the eating of every tree of the garden what the Christian Supper is to all other food. The fatal eating of the tree of knowledge was only the outward and visible sign of a sin which, by the divine law inwrought in human nature, would have been followed by shame and guilt and fear had no such tree existed. 'Through eating its fruit man came to the actual knowledge of good and evil, to the knowledge of his misery: a knowledge which made him acquainted with his own power over his destiny - as if he were his own god - and at the same time taught him that this power, independent of God, was his ruin. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.14.] injected the doubt, "Yea, hath God said." In the false glamor of the glittering fruit the truth was obscured - did God really mean to forbid its use; would He fulfill His threats, or could He even have intended them to be effective in prohibiting its use? The consequence is told in one brief sentence, She took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat (Genesis 3:6) The Fall of the Race. The external stages in the temptation we have endeavored to outline, but the internal reactions of the human spirit must forever remain a secret. There are two questions upon which Revelation gives us no special light - the mysterious point where temptation finds, because it creates, something to lay hold on, and thereby passes over into actual sin; and the manner in which the pure desire for knowledge passes into a desire for evil knowledge, or the sensibilities of the soul merge into evil concupiscence. Any knowledge of these matters must be gained indirectly from the scriptural account. However, there is considerable unanimity of opinion concerning the following points: (1) Sin began in the self-separation of the will of man from the will of God. Consequently the first formal sin is to be found in the entertainment of the question, ""Yea, hath God said?" (2) Up to this point, the appetencies awakened were purely spontaneous, and the sensibilities innocent and entirely consistent with primitive holiness. (3) The only subjective susceptibility which Satan could address was the natural and innocent desire for the fruit of the tree of knowledge considered as good for food and pleasant to the eyes

(4) With the injection of the doubt, the desire for legitimate knowledge passed into a desire for illegitimate knowledge - of being wise like the gods. Such forbidden desire is sin (Romans 7:7). This desire was originated by Adam himself, as something not previously existing in his submissive heart and obedient will. (5) With the severance of the self from God, the outward act was the look of concupiscence toward the tree, which had in itself the guilt of partaking, and was followed by the partaking as an act. These are the stages in the decline and fall of man as generally held by Protestant theologians

One of the most frequent and outspoken questions concerning the fall is this, ""Why did God permit man to sin?" Stated in the form of the earlier objection to Christian theism, we have the familiar dilemma, ""If God was good and failed to prevent sin, He must have been lacking in power. If He possessed the power and refused to prevent it, He was lacking in goodness." There are two factors which enter into a consideration of the permissibility of the fall. First, the divine permission can in no wise be considered as a consent to the fall, or a license

[The above paragraph is compiled from references to Pope, Shedd and Miley, but other theologians could also be cited as holding the same views. The positions mentioned are substantiated by the following references

Separation from the supreme Will was consummated within before it was exhibited in act. The inmost principle of sin is the severance of the self from God: the entertainment, therefore, of the question "Yea, bath God said?" was the beginning of human evil. This was the first formal sin, though not alluded to in the Scripture as such. The outward act was the look of concupiscence toward the tree, which had in itself the guilt of partaking, and was followed by the partaking itself. Hence in all New Testament references to the original sin its principle of disobedience is made prominent. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.15 The only subjective susceptibility in Adam which Satan could address was the natural and innocent desire for the fruit of the tree of knowledge considered as "good for food, and pleasant to the eyes" (Genesis 3:6). The other desire for the fruit as "making wise like the gods" was forbidden desire, and forbidden desire is sin....Adam was not created with a desire for that knowledge of good and evil which would make him like the "gods"; that is, like Satan and his angels. Such a kind of knowledge as this is falsehood, not truth, and to desire it is wrong and sinful This kind of rebellious, disobedient desire required to be originated by Adam himself, as something not previously existing in his submissive heart and obedient will. God had not implanted any such wrong desire as this. This proud and selfish lust for a false and forbidden knowledge had to be started by Adam himself, as something entirely new and original.Shedd, Dogm. Th., II, p. 155 In the sensibilities of primitive man there was a ground of temptability. Through these sensibilities there could be solicitations, awakened appetencies, not directly toward sinful action as such, but toward forms of action which might be sinful, and even if known to be such. We have an illustration in the case of Eve. Appetencies are awakened for the forbidden fruit as it is set forth in the false light of the temptation. So far as purely spontaneous, these active sensibilities were innocent and entirely consistent with the primitive holiness. Sin could arise only as their solicitations were unduly entertained or followed into some voluntary infraction of the law of probation. But as purely spontaneous, and while yet within the limit of innocence, they could act as an impulse toward a voluntary infraction. - Miley, Syst. Th., I, p.435.] to sin. The only sense in which it can be allowed is that God did not by His sovereign power effectually intervene to prevent it. This brings us immediately to the scriptural position that man fell solely because of his own free determination to sin. Temptation was permitted because in no other way could the moral life be developed and perfected. Man sinned against the holiness of his own nature and in an environment which made it easier not to sin. The heinousness of the first sin is thus summed up by Dr. Fisher in his Catechism. "This sin was aggravated in being committed when man had full light in his understanding; a clear copy of the law in his heart; when he had no vicious bias in his will, but enjoyed perfect liberty; and when he had a sufficient stock of grace in his hand to withstand the tempting enemy; in being committed after God had made a covenant of

life with him, and given him express warning of eating the forbidden fruit." Sin belongs solely to man, and thus the goodness of God is vindicated. Second, if God had not placed the tree of knowledge in the garden, man would have been under the necessity of choosing in other ways. A personal being cannot escape the necessity of making decisions, either right or wrong. The placing of the tree in the garden was in reality an act of kindness, intended to warn man against wrong choices and to serve as a constant reminder of his obligation to choose wisely. Consequently any question as to the propriety of man's probationary trial must grow, either out of ignorance concerning the nature of Adam's sin, or out of a rebellious heart of unbelief

There is another aspect of the fall which needs only brief mention at this time - the so-called passive aspect, which is concerned with its nature and extent. The immediate consequences of man's sin may be summed up in two general propositions; externally, it was an alienation from God and an enslavement to Satan; internally,

[In my folly often I wondered why by the great foreseeing wisdom of God the beginning of sin was not letted: for then methought, all should have been well....But Jesus answered by this word and said, "Sin is behovable, but all shall be well and all manner of thing shall be well." - Julian of Norwich.] it was the loss of divine grace by which man became subject to physical and moral corruption. If now we examine the fall in its external relations, we shall find that man no longer bears the glory of his moral likeness to God. The natural image in the sense of his personality he retained, but the glory was gone. From his high destination in communion with God, he fell into the depths of deprivation and sin. Having lost the Holy Spirit, he began a life of external discord and internal misery. In his domestic relations there was a deprivation of their intended perfection. No longer in the truer and best sense was the woman the glory of the man. In his relations with the external world of nature he found the earth cursed for his sake. No longer was he graciously provided with the abundance of the garden, but compelled to earn his bread by the sweat of his face. If we examine the fall from its internal aspect, we discover the birth of an evil conscience and a sense of shame and degradation. Having lost the Holy Spirit as the organizing principle of his being, there could be no harmonious ordering of his faculties, and hence the powers of his being became disordered. From this disordered state there followed as a consequence, blindness of heart, or a loss of spiritual discernment; evil concupiscence, or unregulated carnal craving; and moral inability, or weakness in the presence of sin. But even the heinousness of his sin and the shame of his fall did not result in the utter destruction of his being. The unseen hand of the promised Redeemer prevented it. Thus the mystery of sin and the mystery of grace met at the gate of Eden

Having considered the origin of sin in the human race, we must now pursue the subject still further in a brief review of the philosophical theories concerning the origin of sin in the universe

[The effect of the sin or lapse of Adam was to bring him under the wrath of God; to render him liable to pain, disease and death; to deprive him of primeval holiness; to separate him from communion with God, and that spiritual life which was before imparted by God, and on which his holiness alone depended, from the loss of which a total moral disorder and depravation of his soul resulted; and finally to render him liable to everlasting misery. - Watson, Dictionary, Art. The Fall.] THE ORIGIN OF SIN

Christian Theology, as rooted in the Scriptures and the dominant thought of the Church, maintains that neither in a positive nor a negative sense is God the author of evil. The historical commencement of sin in our race was not due to an evil state, but to a sinful act, which in turn became inherent as both an evil and a sinful state. Evil existed previous to the fall of man, and in the person of Satan tempted man to sin. Thus in Protestantism the Confessio Augustana declares that "The cause of evil is to be found in the will of the devil and the godless who, immediately they were abandoned by God, turn from God to the Wicked One." So also the Formula Concordio and the Variata further confirm this position in the statement that ""sin comes from the devil and the evil will of man." Philosophy, however, cannot rest content short of an attempt to explain the universality of sin by seeking for a common cause of its ultimate existence. These theories are commonly classified under two main heads - first, the Necessitarian Theories which either deny sin, or regard it as in some sense involved in the progress of the race; and second, the Libertarian Theories which find the origin of sin in the abuse of human freedom. To these there is sometimes added a third, or the Mediating Theories, which attempt a reconciliation of the above principles. These, however, are not of sufficient importance to demand attention. Since the question of the origin of sin is vitally connected with the next subject, that of Original Sin or Inherited Depravity, we shall give only a brief review

[The Confessio Augustana mentioned above has sometimes been interpreted to mean that God is negatively the author of sin by the withdrawal of His hand, or the withholding of the "donum perseverantiæ." This as will be readily seen, is closely related to the donum superadditum previously discussed. If righteousness is a supernatural gift, then it is dependent upon the continuance or perseverance of that gift. If God withdraws it, then man falls into sin. But this is not a true interpretation as is shown by the later creeds mentioned above. The withdrawal of God’s presence must be regarded, not as a cause but an effect of sin

Melanchthon’s first edition of the Augsburg Confession is known as the Invariata and his three subsequent editions of 1531, 1535-1540, and 1540-42 are called the Variata.] of the philosophical explanations here, and reserve our theological treatment for the later discussion The Necessitarian Theories. The necessitarian theories either deny sin by obliterating the distinction between good and evil, as in the various forms of pantheism; by some form of finite limitation which admits the fact of sin but denies its reality; by maintaining an antagonism between the lower sensuous nature of man and his higher spiritual being, as in the evolutionary theories; or by a dualism which insists upon a necessary antagonism between the principles of good and evil, either temporary as in some of the dualistic forms of philosophy; or eternal, as in the case of ancient Persian dualism

1. The pantheistic theories with their various modifications must either deny sin altogether, or make God its author. God is the absolute, and what seems to be the finite creature is only the Infinite in phenomenal exhibition. In the process of development there is either less or more of the element of Being. If less, then there is what men call evil; if more, it is correspondingly nearer perfection. Thus the transitory appearance is subject to metaphysical limitation, and this is considered sin. This, it will be readily seen, is simply the denial of sin as a reality

2. The theories of Finite Limitation are closely related to the foregoing. (1) There is the theory that the finite or limited is as such, evil. Hence sin springs from the limitation of knowledge and power.

The finite can approach the good only by passing into the infinite. This it will be seen is closely related to pantheism. (2) Another theory holds that sin is a mere negation. It is the simple absence of good, a deficiency rather than a matter of positive content. This theory is commonly attributed to Augustine, who held that if sin be regarded as a nonentity, theology would be under no necessity of seeking an efficient cause for it. Dr. Dickie points out that although this theory was in a measure accepted by Augustine, it was " "the Neo-Platonist in him, and not the Christian that did so." It was this error which formed the philosophy underlying the theodicy of Leibnitz, in the early modern period. In more modern times it was advocated by Dr. C. C. Everett of Harvard, in his Essays Theological and Literary. In every case, however, it may be said to be merely an expedient adopted by philosophy, in an attempt to defend the divine character for permitting evil in the world. (3) Still another theory, of even a more superficial character is held by those who view sin as appearing to be such, only because of our limited intelligences. We see only the fragments of the universe, it is said, never the whole. Seen at too close a range, it is like the daubs of paint on a canvas, which with perspective becomes a beautiful landscape. While this theory has been advanced with no little attractiveness in poetic disguise, it nevertheless fails to do justice to the fact of sin In reply to the above theories of sin we may say, (1) that sin cannot be defined as ignorance, because, it involves by its very nature the conscious choice of evil instead of good. It is further evident to all, that growth in knowledge is not necessarily a cure for sin. (2) Sin cannot be regarded as mere negation. Sin is a fact in the world and has phenomenal reality. Furthermore, sin must be regarded as a positive force which is both malignant and aggressive. For this reason the Scriptures use leaven as an emblem of its permeating power. (3) These facts also answer the theory that sin is merely a lack of perspective, due to limited finite intelligence. The philosophical answer, however, to all the above theories, is that they are forms of idealistic pantheism, which, traced to their logical conclusion, would find all finite forms of experience swallowed up in the experience of an Absolute. This philosophical Absolute is self-contradictory because it becomes at once holy and sinful,

[Dr. Everett in the work mentioned above, says that "the most profound theologians have insisted that sin is a lack rather than a presence. Nothing is sinful in itself. The sinful act is such because it fills the place of a higher and better act. No tendency is wrong; it becomes so only when it is left alone by the failure of other tendencies which should complement it, and on occasion overpower it. Sin, then, is negative and not positive." It is evident that this fails to do justice to the scriptural ideas of sin. Sin, as Dr. James Orr views it, is "a power, a tyranny, which defies all man’s efforts in his natural strength to get rid of it."] omniscient and ignorant. The answer to these theories, therefore, is to be found in the answer to all pantheism

3. The evolutionary theories, or those which find the origin of sin in the sensuous nature of man, depend upon the error that there is an essential antagonism between spirit and matter. In its earliest forms evil was regarded as an essential property of matter; in the modern evolutionary theories this antagonism is regarded as merely a stage in the genetic development of man. We may note the following positions: (1) In the earlier forms of Gnosticism evil was regarded as an essential property of matter, but later came to be regarded as merely accidental. Sin, therefore, was due to man’s possession of a material body. The theory is untenable, for the Scriptures nowhere attach a moral quality to matter. Besides, some of the worst sins are not of the flesh but of the spirit - idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

and envyings (Gal. 6: 20). This error persists to the present in the belief held by many, that man cannot be delivered from sin while he dwells in a mortal body. (2) During the medieval period, this sensuous theory took shape in the form of the Tridentine Decrees of the Roman Catholic Church. Here the lower nature was regarded as being under the restraint of the supernatural gift of grace. With the fall of man this restraint was withdrawn, and hence there was set in motion what came to be known as concupiscence. (3) At the beginning of the modern period Schleiermacher presented a most elaborate exposition of this theory, in which he made the antagonism to consist in the opposition between the God-consciousness in man, and his self-consciousness as related to the world. This conflict was explained by asserting that the higher powers of spiritual apprehension develop more rapidly than the powers of the will, and therefore we see the ideal before we are capable of realizing it. There is, he says, an ever richer and fuller communication coming to man, and the antagonism consists in a refusal to receive it. In Christ, however, there is given to the world a revelation of what human nature did not and could not reach apart from Him, in whom the God-consciousness was always perfectly ascendant and through whom it may become so to us. (4) The modern evolutionary theory is merely another application of the principle of antagonism between spirit and matter. It holds that the higher spiritual elements are developed out of the lower or sensuous part of man: but this sensuous part having been created first, the higher or spiritual part of man can never quite overtake it. As it concerns the origin of sin, the theory holds that moral evil is to be explained by a survival of those propensities which man’s human ancestors, whatever they were, shared with the rest of the brute creation. Since the good is presented to man as a whole, and this can be only gradually realized in actual life; there is a disparity between the consciousness of his attainments and his goal. To this disparity guilt attaches. Since there can be no growth without the consciousness of imperfection, the weakness of this system lies in the fact that a consciousness of imperfection becomes a consciousness of sin. This subject is vitally related to the question of original sin and will be given further consideration under that head

[Dr. N. P. Williams in his Bampton Lectures for 1929 entitled, "The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin," attempts an explanation of the fall constructed on the basis of modern evolutionary philosophy. He finds three complexes in human personality, the "herd complex," the "ego complex" and the "sex complex." In ideal personality, he holds that the herd complex would form an adequate counterweight to the other two, so that the soul would enjoy a condition of perfect equilibrium or poise on which conscious free will could play, reinforcing now one and now the other, of the dominant psychical structures and controlling, modifying, or inhibiting the flow of vital energy into them. The weakness of human nature, or what is essentially original sin, lies in this, that owing to the weakness of the herd instinct which feeds it, the herd complex does not possess anything like the vital energy necessary to place it on equal terms with the other two primary complexes, so as to preserve the equilibrium of the empirical self, or "me," which the transcendental self, or "I," needs in order to function with freedom (cf. pp. 491, 492). This appears to be a statement in psychological terms, and in so far as it contains truth, might be more simply expressed in the theological statement of prevenient grace, given to all men by virtue of the universal atonement in Christ. But the evolutionary phase of the above statement appears in the idea of a "herd instinct" or "herd complex" carried over from an animal ancestry of man. All such theories fail before the fact that sin consists in a self-severance of man’s will from the will of God. This position only makes an adequate place for sin and the guilt which should attach to it.]

4. The dualistic theories are perhaps the most ancient of all the attempts to explain the origin of sin. They hold that evil is a necessary and eternal principle in the universe. The earliest expression of this is found in the religion of Parseeism (100: 1500 B.C.) and commonly known as Persian dualism. Zoroaster who is regarded as the real or imaginary founder of Parseeism, represented Ormuzd as the author of all good, and Ahriman as the author of all evil. The former dwelt in perfect light and the latter in the densest of darkness. These persons, later regarded as principles, were necessary and eternal. Each was independent of the other and ruled absolutely in his own dominion. Upon these fundamental principles, it was held, the whole visible world depended as to its origin, history and ultimate end. But the Persians could not rest ultimately in this dualism, hence there was a struggle upward to a belief in an eternal essence in which both would find their unity, and in the process of the ages their reconciliation. (2) Persian dualism reappeared in the Gnostic systems of the early church, which have been previously mentioned. (3) Manes (or Mani, 215-276 A.D.), a Persian, revived the ancient dualistic error, in what came to be known as Manichieism. However, he softened the antagonism by making it consist in the opposition of principles rather than persons. (4) Still later the Paulician heresy appeared in the seventh century and was revived again in the twelfth, but little is known of their teachings except that they held to a dualism in which evil appeared as the god of this world, and good as the god of the world to come. The error of all these systems lies in the belief that evil is an essential property of matter. (5) In modern philosophy Schopenhauer (1788-1860) and Hartmann (1842-1906) advocated a form of dualism based upon a distinction between the will and presentation, or the volitional and the

[The manner in which the rationalistic systems of philosophy account for sin, is scarcely less Christian than the theories of the ancient pagan religions. Thus Hegel regards sin as representing merely another stage in human development; Schleiermacher, Ritter, Lipsius and others represent it as a consequence of man’s weakness of spirit and will; Ritschl regards sin as ignorance; while the modern evolutionary theory looks upon it as merely a stage of biological or moral development.] logical, which they regarded as two mutually opposing powers in the Absolute. An equally futile theory is that of Schelling (1775-1854), who following Jacob Boehme (1575-1624), assumed that there was in God a dark, fiery principle, side by side with a light principle. By means of struggle and effort, the light principle breaks like lightning through the fire spirit, which although constantly overcome, yet remains as basic in the inner divine life. The self-working of this dark principle is the source of evil in the world. This theory is mentioned only because it has a tendency to reappear in the guise of a finite element in God. The heart of the dualistic theories lies in the fact that life does not exist without opposites; and the only solution of the problem is to be found in Christ - in whom all the contradictions of life are met and fully solved The Libertarian Theories. This class of theories is based upon the fact of freedom and its abuse. The erroneous theories need only brief mention. (1) Pelagianism holds that all sin originates in the abuse of freedom; that man is born without any bias to evil, and therefore character is due wholly to the nature of his choices. The only medium by which the sin of one person may be passed on to another is through the harm done by perverse influences. The philosophy of John Locke maintained a similar position as to the origin and transmission of sin. This theory fails to take into consideration all the facts of sin, especially that of original sin or human depravity. (2) The premoral theory holds that this abuse of freedom takes place in each individual, at the very beginning of personal life and antecedent to the memory. (3) The pre-existence theory of Origen was drawn from his Platonism. He held that each individual soul fell into sin in a pre-existent state. This theory was revived in

modern times by Julius Mueller of Halle, one of the mediating theologians who followed Schleiermacher. To him this was the only solution of a dilemma which he stated as follows: ""If it is impossible to escape sin, what place is there for freedom, the necessary presupposition of the sense of guilt? If freedom is a reality, how is it that there is no escape from sin?" Dr. Dickie points out, that aside from other defects, it falls into the serious error of too closely identifying sin and guilt; and that failure here leads to the denial of the guilty character of all sin. ""This position," he says, ""like every other which makes sin in any way necessary, is fundamentally unchristian" (cf. Dickie, Organism of Chr. Truth, p.146)

It is under this head, also, that we find what is known as the orthodox or ecclesiastical theory of sin, which in a more scriptural manner than the above, likewise finds the source of all evil in the abuse of freedom. To this we must now give attention The Biblical Teaching Concerning the Origin of Sin. The ultimate origin of evil can never be known by philosophy, nor can its purpose be discovered. We are here shut up to the disclosures which God has given us in His holy Word. We have a ray of light in the words of our Lord Jesus concerning the man born blind. His reply to the Jews was, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him (John 9:3). Sin is called "the mystery of iniquity" (2 Thessalonians 2:7; Revelation 17:5), and has excited the interest of speculative minds in every age, only to baffle them. But the Scriptures do give us a clue to the ultimate origin of sin, and this, even from the philosophical viewpoint is the most satisfactory answer which has ever been given to this perplexing question. The Bible connects the origin of sin with the abuse of freedom in free and intelligent creatures. We have already considered the account of man’s temptation and fall, and found that the origin of sin in the human race was due to the voluntary self-separation of man from God. We took into account, also, that man was influenced by some superhuman power, and consequently are led to believe that sin existed in the universe before its origin in man. We may well suppose, also, that sin in the universe originated in the same manner as it did in the human race, the free choice of an intelligent being. This leads us immediately to a consideration of the doctrine of Satan or superhuman evil THE DOCTRINE OF SATAN

Man was tempted by a superhuman being, called in the Scriptures, the devil or Satan. Evil then must have had an existence previous to the Origin of the human race and external to it. The conflict between good and evil is in the Scriptures represented as essentially a conflict between superhuman powers, into which man is drawn by way of temptation. Hence we read that the church is called upon to wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places (Ephesians 6:12). Satan is usually regarded as one of the fallen angels and consequently treated under this head. This it seems to us, does not do justice to the importance of the subject. Satan is not merely one among the many representatives of evil. He is evil in persona. He is not merely evil in this or that relation, but evil in and for itself. In order to present the scriptural teaching on this subject, we shall present it under four heads as follows: (1) Satan in Relation to Creation; (2) Satan in Opposition to Christ; (3) Satan and the Redemptive Work of Christ; and (4) The Kingdom of Satan

[Attempts have been made to show that the doctrine of Satan in the Old Testament cannot be traced prior to the time of the Babylonian Captivity. If this be understood to mean that the Jews did not know of evil angels previous to that time, the position can be easily refuted from the Scriptures. Aside from the one reference in Zechariah 3:1-2, there is perhaps no reference to Satan in the

post-Babylonian Scriptures, while there are numerous passages in the earlier books. (Cf. Job 1:6; 1 Chronicles 21:1; Psalms 109:6; Psalms 106:37.) There are also numerous references to evil angels under the name of "evil spirits" as in Judges 9:23; 1 Samuel 16:14 and others. The doctrine is more fully developed in the New Testament. Including the singular and plural forms of the word "diabolus" it is used forty times in the New Testament, the word Satan twenty-three times, evil spirit eight times, dumb spirit three times, and spirit of divination once

Bishop Martensen in his Christian Dogmatics, pp.186-203, gives us an attractive and interesting presentation of this subject. He has been accused of holding to a merely impersonal view of Satan as the "cosmical principle" limited to a creation and having no existence otherwise. This it seems to us is not a true statement of his position. Some of his statements, however, do not seem to be carefully guarded, and if lifted out of the whole discussion and interpreted by themselves, would seem to indicate that Satan is nothing more than this impersonal principle, which in this case would become the ultimate evil. Bishop Martensen's tendency is toward the cosmological, rather than the soteriological view of theology.]

Satan in Relation to Creation. We have seen in our study of creation, that the Christian position maintains that there is an essential difference between God and the world. Both have reality or substantial existence - the one Absolute and Infinite, the other dependent and finite. In this way Christian thought preserves itself from the error of dualism on the one hand, and pantheism on the other. But because created things have reality in themselves, even though this be finite and dependent, there is the possibility of this created substance being set up in opposition to the Infinite, the creature against the Creator. This Bishop Martensen called the "cosmic principle" of the universe. In the realm of material things, this cosmic principle exists solely as a possibility. Hence the First and Second Commandments of the Mosaic law prohibited idolatry and the making of graven images as objects of worship. In man as a finite being endowed with self-consciousness and self-determination, there not only exists the possibility, but also the power of setting himself up in opposition to his Creator. This power of self-separation we have seen, marks the origin of sin in man. The account of the fall also reveals the presence of a superhuman power as the tempter of mankind. As to the nature of this power, the Scriptures teach us that in the purely spiritual realm there were angels which kept not their beginning, or first estate; and hence there appears to have been a fall in the spiritual realm previous to that of the human race. Nor are we to suppose that the angels simultaneously and voluntarily

[Temptation from without was more than symbolized by the instrument - fallen now like the real tempter himself from his first estate - of that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world. The distinctness of this record is of great importance It establishes a difference between the original sin of earth and the original sin of the universe. We need not, indeed, assume that the angels who fell were only tempted from within: there is every reason to think that as through envy of the devil came death into the world, so through 'the same envy, excited by another Object in heaven death entered among the angels. It cannot be that sin should have its origin within the spirit of a creature of God independently of solicitation from without But in the case of man, the agency of Satan is made prominent from the' beginning of Scripture to the end: not as reducing the guilt of the first transgression but as mitigating its punishment, and suggesting at least a difference put between sinful angels and the human race. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.14.] fell, merely by temptation from within. There must have been among them a

tempter who led them astray. Thus the Christian view of evil, in so far as it is set forth in the Scriptures, terminates in the idea of Satan, who as a superhuman, yet created spirit, originally good, fell from his high estate and became the enemy of God. Evil is personal in its origin. Beyond this reason cannot go and revelation is silent

Satan in Opposition to Christ. St. John makes it clear that Satan is that spirit of antichrist which should come, and even now is in the world. The essential antagonism if this spirit to Christ finds its expression in the fact that he does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (1 John 4:1-3). Furthermore sin, in the New Testament use of the term, is to be interpreted by the attitude which men take toward Christ. Thus the Holy Spirit convinces men of sin, because He goes to the Father; and of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged (John 16:8-11). But if we would understand it rightly, we must trace this opposition back to its source. Referring again to our discussion of Creation and the Logos, we are now in a position to comprehend more clearly the deep significance of this truth. God created the world through the Logos or Word as the intermediary between Himself and the created universe. This Logos and Word was the Eternal Son, the second person of the Trinity. In Him as the express image of the Father were comprehended all the principles of truth, order, beauty, goodness and perfection. Hence as long as the relation between the finite

[Dr. A. H Strong points out some of the contrasts between the Holy Spirit and spirit of evil as follows: (1) The dove and the serpent; (2) the father of lies and Spirit of Truth; (3) men possessed by dumb spirits and men given wonderful utterance in diverse tongues; (4) the murderer from the beginning and the life-giving spirit, who regenerates the soul and quickens our mortal bodies; (5) the adversary and the Helper; (6) the slanderer and the Advocate; (7) Satan’s sifting and the Master’s and the Master’s winnowing; (8) the organizing intelligence and malignity of the Evil One and the Holy Spirit’s combination of all the forces of matter and mind to build up the kingdom of God; (9) the strong man fully armed and stronger than he; (10) the Evil One who works only evil and the holy One who is the author of holiness in the hearts of men. The opposition of evil angels, at first and ever since their fall, may be a reason why they are incapable of redemption. - Strong, Syst. Th., II, p. 454 and the Infinite was mediated through the Logos, it retained its true relationship to God. But as we have indicated in the previous paragraph, finite reality has in it the possibility of being set up in false relation of independency; or in the case of creatures endowed with self-consciousness and self-determination, the power of setting themselves up in this false relation through a voluntary self-separation from God. It is evident, therefore, that between God and the created universe two forms of mediation are possible, the one of truth and righteousness, the other of falsehood and sin

We begin now to see something of the magnitude of Satan and sin. If we place over against the Logos a created being, of such glory and power as would be worthy of God’s created spirit-a true "son of the morning"; and if with the mystics we hold that this being contemplated his own beauty as self-contained, and becoming envious of the Son, sought to sit upon His throne, then they may begin to understand the Scripture which indicated that being lifted up with pride, he fell into condemnation. To this doubtless Jesus referred when He said, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven (Luke 10:18). Its magnitude will be seen in this, that both Christ and Satan appear as mediators between God and the world, the one a true mediatorship of righteousness and holiness; the other a false mediatorship of unrighteousness and sin. Hence St. Paul speaks of Satan as "the

god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4), and again as "the prince of the power of the air"-the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience (Ephesians 2:2). St. John writes with discrimination when he says, "the whole world lieth in wickedness," or in the wicked one; not that the world is inherently evil, but lying in the wicked one, is perverted from the trur purpose of its existence. This evil spirit as Satan (SatanaV) is the "adversary,) the "accuser" and the "deceiver"; as the devil (diaboloV) he is the "slanderer," the calumiator" and the "destroyer of peace"; as Belial (Belial) he is the "low," the "unworthy" and the "abject"; while as Apollyon (Apolluwn) he is the "destroyer." We may contemplate the fact of sin, also, in a new light, as the perversion of God's good gifts to false uses; the holding of the truth in unrighteousness; the false glamor of the things of God presented in a deceitful manner, the works of the flesh and the hollowness of insincerity. Sin is like leaven, in that it must feed upon another substance than itself, and in so doing corrupts and sours the whole

Satan and the Redemptive Work of Christ. For the sake of clarity, we may now be permitted to place this whole subject over against the redemptive work of Christ, and thus set forth with greater clearness the nature of Satan and sin. We have seen that in creation, there is the possibility of the creature exalting itself against the Creator, and by a voluntary self-separation from God setting itself up in a false independency. Thus Satan in opposition to Christ as the true Logos, set himself up as a mediator of the "cosmical principle" of independency or self-sufficiency. Working in creation as the principle of perversion and sin, he thus hypostasizes evil in and for itself. Not having the power of creation himself, he is limited in his scope of activity to the perversion

[St. Peter tells us that the apostate angels were cast down to hell. Here the word "Tartarus" is used, the only place in the New Testament where it occurs. "By Tartarus," says Dr. Dick, "they understood the lowest of the infernal regions, the place of darkness and of punishment, in which those who had been guilty of impiety toward the gods, and of great crimes against men, were confined and tormented. The word as adopted by the apostle conveys the same general idea."

Here the question may be proposed, "Why was not provision made for the recovery of fallen angels, as well as for that of man?" but to this no decisive answer can be returned. Still there are some circumstances connected with their history, as also with the history of our race, which may reflect some light upon this mysterious subject, and which are therefore worthy of our consideration. (1) They were doubtless superior to man in intellectual endowments, and therefore less liable to be deceived. (2) As man was partly material and subject to the influence of the senses, his attention might have been diverted and his judgment biased by allurements addressed to them. But angels were purely spiritual beings and therefore could not have been liable to any such temptation. (3) The progenitor of the human race sustained a federal relation to all his posterity. In him they either stood or fell. But among the angels no such relation existed as they were individually responsible. (4) Man sinned in the earthly paradise through the subtilty of a tempter; but angels sinned in the heavenly paradise without a tempter. For though we do not possess a history of their apostasy yet we know that they were not solicited, as man was, by some being of superior artifice, because they were the sole inhabitants of heaven. - Wakefield, Chr. Th., p. 260. While not tempted by one outside their number, it seems clear from the preceding that they nevertheless fell through one of their own number.] of those things which have the substantiality of God's creation. Hence he becomes diabolos (diaboloV) the deceiver and calumniator of whom Jesus said, He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no

truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it (John 8:44). We may believe that his first sphere of operation was in his own realm of the angels. Thus St. Peter says that God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment (2 Peter 2:4)

God then in His wisdom extended creation beyond the purely spiritual realm and created man as a being in whom were conjoined both spiritual and material substances. Furthermore He created man, not as an aggregate of individuals, but as a race of beings interrelated and dependent, and with the power of propagating their own kind. In creation man was so constituted that subjectively he was a creature dependent upon his Creator, and consequently a servant of God. In the physical realm man was the highest of all the creatures and therefore, in a true sense, the lord of creation. When man in this intermediary position looked up to God he saw himself as a servant; when he looked out upon creation he saw himself as its lord. In the temptation Satan made the lordship to appear more attractive than the servantship. He said, Ye shall be as gods (Genesis 3:5). But what Satan did not tell him was that this lordship was a delegated power, and that he held it by virtue of a faithful stewardship. When man fell, therefore, he ceased to be the servant of God and became the servant of Satan. Hence our Lord said of the unbelieving Jews, Ye are of our father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do (John 8:44). God is the Father of all men, because He always acts as a Father, but men are not always the sons of God because they do not act as sons. Losing his servantship, man lost his true lordship, and now makes all things minister to himself. He views the world from a false slant. He sees everything from a biased standpoint. The things of God committed to his care he holds as his own. Like his father, Satan, he has become a usurper of the throne, untrue to his trust, a servant of sin and a child of Satan But God will forever triumph. He will make even the wrath of man to praise Him. He projects creation still farther, if we may thus guardedly use the term. He creates a new man - not merely a living soul, but a quickening spirit. As in the first man the spiritual rested in the material; so in this new man, the divine rests in the human. This new creation is an incarnation. The Son of God, who was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, took upon Him the form of a servant and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Php 2:6-8). By virtue of this true servantship, Christ brought man in His own Person back into his original relationship with God. He re-established spiritual fellowship and communion. As the Captain of our salvation He met the cross currents of the world and suffered at every step. But He never faltered and consequently overcame even the last enemy which is death. As a servant, He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many. And having met the demands of a perfect servantship, He became the Lord of His people - not this time by creation, for that He never lost, but as their Redeemer, their Saviour and Lord. Having thus triumphed, He received the promise of the Holy Spirit, which now as the Lord of the Church, He gives freely to all who believe. Thus we may say with all the

[To the argument frequently advanced that Jesus and the apostles merely accommodated themselves to the language and beliefs that were current in their day, Dr. Whately says, "Nor can it be said that Jesus and His apostles merely left man in their belief, not thinking it worth while to undeceive them, and trusting that in time they of themselves would discover their mistakes. On the contrary, our Lord and His followers very decidedly and strongly confirm the doctrine by numerous express declarations. For instance, our Lord in His explanation of the Parable of the Tares and Wheat, says expressly that the enemy who sows the tares is the devil. And again, in explaining

that portion of the Parable of the Sower in which it is said that the birds devoured the seed that fell on the trodden wayside, he says, 'Then cometh the evil one, and snatcheth away that which hath been sown in his heart.' If, therefore, the belief in evil spirits is altogether a vulgar error, it certainly is not an error which Jesus and His apostles merely neglected to correct, or which they merely connived at, but which they decidedly inculcated."] redeemed, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever (Revelation 5:13) The Kingdom of Satan. Since the work of Satan is to pervert the things of God, this perversion must extend also to the conception of the kingdom. As there is a kingdom of God and of heaven, so also there is a kingdom of Satan and of evil. Hence we have a reference to principalities, powers and rulers of darkness, which can indicate no other than an organization of evil forces. These are under the leadership of " 'the prince of this world" which Jesus mentions as being ""cast out" (John 12:31), as having nothing in Him (John 14:30) and as being judged (John 16:11). St. Paul speaks of Satan as ""the prince of the power of the air" (Ephesians 2:2) and of "the spiritual hosts of wickedness" (Ephesians 6:12, R.V.). That there are a great number of evil spirits under the leadership of Satan is indicated by a number of scriptures, as "My name is Legion" (Mark 5:9), and the lake of fire prepared for "the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41). This kingdom shall not stand, for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony (Revelation 12:10-11)

["The Scriptures clearly and emphatically teach the separate, distinct and personal existence of a devil, and of an innumerable host of evil spirits commonly called devils. While, in the strict propriety of scripture language, there is but one devil - the prince of the power of the air - one Belial - one adversary - he is joined by a host of evil spirits, partaking of the same nature and engaged in the same work with the father of lies....Those who deny the personal existence of a devil have strangely different methods of interpreting the Scriptures. One says the devil personifies some evil principle; another says it is the evil propensity of the heart; while others say the devil means disease, madness, or insanity. A few plain passages of scripture will show the absurdity of this method of interpreting God's Holy word. The sacred writers were not so careless as to use language vaguely. If there is no personal devil, how are we to understand the case of the man that dwelt among the tombs, as recorded in Mark 5:2-16 and Luke 8:27-38? This man was possessed of many devils. These devils 'besought him.' They came out from the man.' They 'entered into the swine.' These devils had a personal existence separate and apart from the man out of whom they were cast. They entered into the man and went out of him. They existed before they entered into him and they existed after they went out. The actions ascribed to these devils are such as belong only to real personal beings." - Bishop Weaver, Christian Theology, pp.106, 107.] THE NATURE AND PENALTY OF SIN

Having considered the philosophical theories as to the origin of sin, we may now turn our attention to the historical aspects of the subject. Here we shall consider the nature and development of sin as an actual experience in the history of the race. Our best approach will be by means of a brief survey of the terms used in the Scriptures to express the idea of sin. These words are hamartia (amartia), parabasis (parabasiV), adikia (adikia), and asebeia (asebeia), with their many derivatives

1. The word hamartia (amartia) signifies a falling away from, a missing of the right way, or a missing of the mark. The word for sin is sometimes connected with the word iniquity, both of which signify a deflection from the right. In this sense the word for sin indicates a missing of the mark, while the word for iniquity signifies a wrong aim. In the Old Testament there are a number of words used to express the idea of sin, such as ""falling away," ""going astray," ""vanity" and ""guilt." This indicates that the subject was more fully developed among the Hebrews than among the Greeks, due, doubtless, to the emphasis placed upon the holiness of God. None of these designations of sin, however, in either Hebrew or Greek, limit the idea to a mere act. In fact they more naturally suggest the thought of sin as a disposition or a state. Thus hamartia conveys the idea that a man does not find in sin what he seeks therein; hence as Julius Mueller points out, he finds it a state of delusion and deception

2. The second word is parabasis (parabasiV) which signifies sin as an act of transgression. This indicates that the idea of sin is limited by the idea of law, For where no law is, there is no transgression (Romans 4:15). In the broadest sense, this law must be interpreted as the existence of an eternal moral order, with its distinctions of good and evil. This finds its earliest manifestation in the claims made by the conscience. In a more specific sense law is not advice or exhortation, but a positive demand. Consequently the relation to it must be either subjection or transgression. But sin as thus indicated, is possible only to moral and rational beings. Hence brutes and infants may do wrong, but in this sense of the term they cannot sin. Man knows himself unconditionally under law by both reason and conscience. When that claim is disowned, in that instant sin is born

3. But law cannot be regarded as impersonal. It is of necessity immediately connected with the Law-giver. Hence to transgress the law is positive disobedience regarded as a personal affront. Thus St. Paul says, the law worketh wrath (Romans 4:15). Here the word is parabasis as previously indicated, but the point of emphasis now is, that voluntary disobedience subjects the offender to the wrath of the personal Law-giver. Virtue is therefore of the nature of obedience, and sin is disobedience to God, even when the wrong committed is against one’s neighbor. In the Christian system morality is always included in the law of God. The sinner, therefore, who violates the law of God becomes a rebel in the moral realm. For this reason sin is frequently regarded as a breaking of a covenant through unfaithfulness as the word parapiptein (Parapiptein) denotes 4. The next step in the progress of our thought is, that the character of the law and the character of the

[Dr. Bruce says, "to understand Paulinism, we must carefully note the distinction between amaptia and parabasiV . Amartia is objective and common; parabasiV , is subjective and personal. ’Amartia entails some evil effects, but parabasiV ’ is necessary to guilt and condemnation" (cf MACPHERSON, Chr. Dogm., p.247)

Dr. Olive M. Winchester calls attention to the fact that the above words for sin having the abstract ending ia denote "state" or "quality." Thus amartia in the singular denotes sin as a state or quality, and in the plural "sins." There is also another noun from this verb amapthma, a concrete noun instead of an abstract, and therefore denoting a thing or an act

"Sin and lawlessness are convertible terms: Sin is not an arbitrary conception. It is the assertion of the selfish will against a paramount authority. He who sins breaks not only by accident or in an isolated detail, but essentially the ’law’ which he was created to fulfill. This ’law’ which expresses

the divine ideal of man’s constitution and growth has three chief applications. There is the ’law’ of each man’s personal being: there is the ’law’ of his relation to things without him: there is the ’law’ of his relation to God. To violate any part of this threefold law is sin, for all parts are divine" (James 2:10) . - Westcott, Comm. 1 John 3:4

Dr. Westcott also points out that St. James regards sin as selfishness (1: 14ff), and also the neglect of duty, or the violation of the law of growth (James 4:17). St. John holds that "unrighteousness," or the failure to fulfill our obligations to others is also sin (1 John 3:4).]

Law-giver are indissolubly one. Hence the substance of the commandment is comprehended in the one word "love." This we have on the authority of our Lord, who when asked which is the great Commandment of the law replied, 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. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets (Matthew 22:37-40). Here it will be seen that sin, flowing from a lack of love, is both an act and a quality of being. It is for this reason that St. John uses the word adikia in connection with hamartia. He says, If we confess our sins, [amaptiaV], he is faithiul and just to forgive us our sins [amartiaV], and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness [adikia"] (1 John 1:9). Following this he gives us the first of his profound and far-reaching definitions of sin. All unrighteousness [adikia] is sin [amartia] (1 John 5:17). The word adikia signifies the absence of righteousness and consequently is generally translated as unrighteousness, injustice and sometimes as iniquity, although the latter is generally derived from another Greek word. The term means ""crookedness" or a bending or perverting of what is right. Hence like the words hamartia and anomia, it signifies not only perverted actions, but also a state of unrighteousness or disorder, arising from such perversion. Sin, then, is self-separation from God in the sense of decentralization, the place which should be occupied by God being assumed by the self. The love of self which characterizes this state must not be thought to possess the true quality of love. As disobedience to the law of God is not a mark of strength but of weakness, so the love of self is not merely misplaced or exaggerated love, but manifests the very opposite character. Everything either flows from the self or is directed to it. The perfection of love as manifested in Christ, was found in the fact that He did not seek to please Himself (Matthew 22:37-40); and that He did not seek His own (1 Corinthians 13:5). On the other hand, St. Paul declares that the acme of sin in the last days would be found in this, that "they were lovers of themselves" (2 Timothy 3:1-2). Thus adikia signifies a state or condition, wherein the center around which his thoughts, affections and volitions should revolve is displaced, and hence has become one of unrighteousness. For this reason St. John speaks of sins being forgiven, but unrighteousness as being cleansed

5. The next word is anomia (anonia) and is found in St. John’s second definition of sin, although the text appears earlier in the epistle. It is placed second because it involves the use of a stronger term. The definition is found in the following text, Whosoever committeth sin [amartian] transgresseth also the law [anomian]: for sin [amartia] is the transgression of the law [anomia] (1 John 3:4). Here the word anomia does not signify transgression in the sense of an overt act, but as ""a lack of conformity to law," or "lawlessness." It is a stronger term than adikia, in that it does not signify merely a disordered state, but as added to this, the thought of hostility or rebellion. Thus Jesus said, If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father (John 15:24). In this

connection Van Oosterzee says, "Even the tenderest love is not free from a hidden selfishness, and love changes into hate, where the self-denial which it demands is rejected by flesh and blood. It even rises sometimes to the desire that there were neither law nor law-giver and, where a man can withdraw himself from the supremacy of the former at any cost, to powerless rage and spite, as seen in the Cain of Lord Byron.... and where a man dethrones God in order to deify self, he becomes at last destitute of natural

[St. John's definition is important, as showing the difference between the act of transgression and the state of transgression. The words mean that the act is the result of the state, and the state also the result of the act. Sin is only the act of a primitive transgressing will, but that will forms the character behind the future will and shapes its ends. This final statement of St. John may be divided into its two branches, each of which will shed light upon the general terminology of Scripture. Sin is the voluntary separation of the soul from God: this implies the setting up of the law of self activity, and passively the surrender to internal confusion. - Pope, Comp. Chr. Th., II, p.30.] affection" (Romans 1:31) (cf. Von Oosterze, Chr. Dogm., II, p.395)

6. The last word which we shall mention is asebeia (asebeia), or ungodliness. This not only marks the separation of the soul from God, but carries with it the thought of a character unlike God and a state or condition characterized by the absence of God. It is a strong term. St. Paul uses it in his condemnation of sin in connection with adikia. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness [asebeian] and unrighteousness [adikian] of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness [adikia] (Romans 1:18; cf. Ephesians 2:12). The term also carries with it the thought of a verging toward doom. Thus St. Jude says, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly [asebeiV] among them of all their ungodly [asebeiaV] deeds which they have ungodly [hsebhsan] committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly [asebeiV] sinners have spoken against him (Jude 1:14-15)

Definitions of Sin. Theologians have defined sin in different ways, but rarely is the fact overlooked that sin exists both as an act and as a state or condition. This is important in any system of theology where the evangelical principle of salvation by faith is given prominence. We have already cited Dr. Pope's definition that "Sin is the voluntary separation of the soul from God." This we have seen implies, first, a setting up of the law of self-activity, or actual sin; and second, the surrender, to internal confusion, or original sin. James Arminius defines sin as "something thought, spoken, or done against the law of God, or the omission of something which has been commanded by that law to be thought, spoken or done." Mr. Wesley's definition of sin as a voluntary transgression of a known law" is familiar in Arminian theology. According to Dr. Miley, "Sin is disobedience to a law of God, conditional on free moral agency and Opportunity for knowing the law." Dr. Raymond emphasizes the twofold nature of sin. He says, "The primary idea designated by the term sin in the Scriptures is want of conformity to law, a transgression of law, a doing of that which is forbidden or a neglecting to do that which is required. In a secondary sense the term applies to character; not to what one does, but to what he is" (Raymond, Syst. Th., II, pp.54, 55). Van Oosterzee defines sin as a positive negation of God and His will, in so far as it puts something entirely different in the place of that will. In the sinner there is not only a want (defectus) of that which must be found in him; but also an inclination, a tendency, a striving (affectus) which ought not to be in him" (Von Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., II, p.395). Dr. William

Newton Clarke thinks that theology can give no a priori definition of sin, but must derive its definition from experience in the light of the Christian revelation. He presents the subject under five aspects which may be summed up as follows: (1) Sin may be viewed in the light of its own character - then it is badness; (2) it may be viewed in relation to the nature of man - then it is the abnormal; (3) it may be viewed in relation to the standard of duty - then it is a departure from duty; (4) it may be viewed in reference to its motive and inner quality - then it is the placing of self-will or selfishness above the claims of love and duty; and (5) it may be viewed in relation to the moral government of God - then it is opposition to the spirit and working of God's moral government (Clarke, Outline of Chr. Th., pp.231-237). One of the clearest and most comprehensive definitions of sin is from Dr. A. H. Strong. He says, "Sin is lack of conformity to the moral law of God, either in act, disposition, or state" (Strong, Syst. Th., II, p.549). The definition of sin as given in the Westminster Shorter Catechism is one of the most condensed and yet comprehensive definitions found in theology. According to this Confession, "Sin is any want of conformity to, or transgression of, the law of God." The Consequences of Sin. It may be expedient at this time to call attention to the fact that the terms applied to sin and redemption are drawn from three universes of discourse - the home, the law court and the temple service. Stated in other words, there are three aspects of sin and redemption, the natural, the legal and the religious. Much confusion has arisen from a failure to distinguish these uses and to apply to sin or redemption a term which is properly applicable only in another universe of discourse. This will be brought out more clearly later. It is sufficient here to note the natural consequences of sin as an estrangement between the creature and the Creator; the legal consequences as guilt and penalty; and the religious as depravity and defilement. Since man is at once an individual and a social being, the consequences of sin apply to both the person and the race. Sin, whether actual or original, assumes two forms, guilt and corruption. Guilt in turn has a twofold aspect, first, it is personal blameworthiness as regards the commission of sin, commonly known as reatus culpo; and second, it is the liability to penalty, known as reatus poeno. Actual sin includes both of these forms of guilt, while the second attaches only to original sin. Corruption or depravity likewise attaches to both the individual and the race. As it attaches to the sins committed by the individual, corruption is known as acquired depravity; as it attaches to the race it is called inherited depravity or original sin The Nature of Guilt and Penalty. The consequences of sin are to be found in guilt and penalty, which should be carefully distinguished in thought. Guilt is the personal blameworthiness which follows the act of sin, and involves the twofold idea of responsibility for the act, and a liability to punishment because of it. Penalty carries with it the thought of punishment which follows sin, whether as a natural consequence or a positive decree

1. Guilt was originally a legal term, which in the course of history took on also, a moral significance. From debt as the primary meaning of the word, it came to mean liability for debt, then in the wider significance of a violation

[William Adams Brown points out that the consequences of sin must be described according to the point of view from which sin is regarded. Thus, looked at from the moral point of view sin issues in guilt; from the religious point of view in estrangement; from the point of view of man's own character and habits in depravity; from that of the divine government in penalty. - cf. Chr. Th. in Outline, p.277.] of law, and finally as the state or condition of one who had transgressed the law. The law as here understood may mean in some instances objective law, but it cannot be limited to

this. Nor can it be limited solely to a transgression against the attributes of divine justice. It must be regarded as a personal opposition to a personal God, in that degree and to that extent that He has been revealed to the offender. Guilt in this sense takes the form of condemnation based upon God’s disapproval. Thus in conscience guilt is not a sense of transgression against divine justice or absolute law, but against the divine will. Guilt as personal blameworthiness must be distinguished from the consciousness of that guilt. The fact that a person has committed sin carries with it a sense of guilt, but varying circumstances may increase or diminish the consciousness of that guilt. Sin not only deceives but hardens the heart. Frequently a man feels less compunction of conscience the farther he goes into sin. But the guilt nevertheless remains, even though it is not fully realized in consciousness. Guilt must not only be viewed from the standpoint of personal responsibility for the act, but also as personal liability to punishment. In this sense guilt and penalty are correlative terms. However, a distinction must be made between liability to punishment on the part of the offender and the fact of punishment itself

[The conscience in man bears its own clear testimony. This faculty of our nature, or representative of the Judge in our personality, is simply in relation to sin the registrar of its guilt. It is the moral consciousness, rather of instinct than of reflection, though also of both, faithfully assuming the personal responsibility of the sin and anticipating its consequences. Such is the scriptural meaning of the word. It is not the standard of right and wrong set up in the moral nature. St. Paul speaks of that written in the heart of universal man: the Gentiles show the work of the law written in their hearts (Romans 2:15). He goes on to speak of "their conscience also bearing witness," by "accusing or else excusing," undoubtedly looking upward to a Judge and forward t? a judgment. What St. Paul calls suneidhsiV St. John calls kerdia, meaning, however, not the heart, in which St. Paul seats the law, but the consciousness of the inner man. The conscience is the self of the personality, in universal humanity never excusing, but always accusing, and is the conscience of sins (Hebrews 10:2). It is enough to establish this distinction between the standard of right and wrong which may be defective and is not conscience proper, and that moral consciousness which infallibly unites the fault and its consequences in the consciousness of the sinner. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 34.]

Penalty as related to guilt on the one hand, and the principles of God’s moral government on the other, involves two questions, (1) What is the nature of penalty, that is, what part of the consequences of sin may be justly regarded as punishment for sin? (2) What is the function of penalty, that is, what is punishment intended to accomplish in the realm of God’s moral government? As to the nature of penalty, it must be limited to those consequences which are adjudged to be evil, and which in God’s moral government follow as inevitable and necessary consequences. Here again the word for penalty carries with it a legal significance and implies judicial and forensic relations. But we have seen that guilt implies something more than the violation of objective law; so also penalty must be regarded as broader in its significance. It must be made to include the consequences of all the various evils included in sin. Every form of sin has its own penalty. There are sins against law, against light and against love, and each has its own peculiar penalty. There are secret sins and sins against society, sins of ignorance and sins of presumption. Thus there may be degrees of both guilt and penalty as in the case of sins of ignorance or infirmity as over against sins of knowledge (cf. Matthew 10:15; Matthew 12:31; Mark 3:29; Luke 12:47; John 19:11; Romans 2:12). Penalty, therefore, is the punishment which follows

sin, whether it be through the operation of natural, moral and spiritual laws, or by direct decree. God is not limited to His ordinary laws as a means of administration. He is a free Person, and may

[The connection between sin and misery is universally felt, and not seriously disputed by any one....This connection is direct, since sin separates us from Him, in whom alone is our happiness, and on this account can but make us most miserable; reciprocal, because as misery springs from sin, so again does now sin spring continually from misery. Sin is the seed, misery the harvest, but this constantly brings with it new grains of seed; indeed, sin not merely produces, but itself is, the greatest misery. Every other sorrow is partly caused, partly increased, partly at length still more infinitely exceeded in wretchedness by it. Not only the suffering which comes direct from God, but the pain which men inflict on one another, even the calamity which we make for ourselves, must be regarded as its bitter fruit. The consciousness of sin increases on the one hand each load of life, and diminishes on the other the power to bear these with calmness. Just because sin is a much more general, shameful and pernicious evil than any other plague, ought it to be called the greatest cause of complaint. - Von Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., II, p.434.] by direct action employ various means to vindicate Himself and His government. Penalty, however, in all its forms is God's reaction against sin, and is based ultimately on His holiness. As to the function of penalty, there are two general theories - the retributive and the reformative. These may be stated in the form of questions as follows: Does God punish sin solely to vindicate His justice? or, Does He seek the reformation of the sinner and the good of society? Where the dominant thought of theology has been the glory of God, the retributive theory is held as best displaying His justice, or mercy in relation to justice. Where the dominant thought has been the good of man, as in the idea of the kingdom of God, the disciplinary theory is the more prominent. But heredity and solidarity are both facts, and God has so created man that he cannot act apart from his social relations. The two theories, therefore, are not mutually exclusive and should not be set in too great contrast. Dr. William Adams Brown says the retributive theory of punishment may make a place incidentally for discipline, while the disciplinary theory clearly recognizes retribution as a necessary element in moral training (cf. William Adams Brown, Chr. Th. in Outline, p. 289). Penalty, therefore, must be considered in both relation to the individual and to the social structure, and consequently as it attaches to both actual and original sin. The chief penalty of sin is death. But since God loves all men, and seeks their salvation, the penalty of sin and the redemptive work of Christ are intimately bound up together and cannot be understood apart from each other

Death as the Penalty of Sin. The Scriptures teach that the penalty of sin is death (Genesis 2:17), but the nature of this penalty has been interpreted in different ways. Arminian theologians have generally interpreted it to mean what is commonly known as the "fullness of death," that is, death physical, temporal and eternal. Four leading errors have appeared, (1) that death as a penalty for sin applies only to physical or bodily death. This is the position taken by the Pelagians and Socinians; (2) that the penalty is to be limited to spiritual death only, bodily death being regarded as merely a consequence of this; (3) that death is a natural law, and was given a penal significance when sin entered. Death, therefore, becomes a penal affliction and the fear and suffering which man endures become the penalties for his sin; (4) that death is to be regarded as the total annihilation of both soul and body. The first two are more speculative and theological, the last two more diffused and popular

1. Physical death is included in the penalty of sin. Some writers such as Vaughan, Godet, and Meyer seem to make physical death the chief factor in the penalty. Thus Vaughan on Romans says, "Natural death, primarily, and as the punishment specially denounced; spiritual and eternal death, incidentally and secondarily, as the necessary consequence of the severance of the creature from the service and love of the Creator." Dr. Olin A. Curtis emphasizes the same view, regarding bodily death as neither a friendly nor useful event, but as abnormal, hostile and terrible. This position seems to be a reaction against the current scientific teaching that death is simply the expression of a biological law, and a beneficent arrangement to prevent the overpopulation of the earth. The fact that physical death is a

[Guilt has another meaning. It is the sure obligation to punishment; or what is sometimes called the reatus poenæ. We must remember that it is here regarded as absolute, without reference to any atoning provision; that it is the penalty of a living soul and not annihilation: and that it is the penalty of the human spirit informing a human body. The soul that sinneth is guilty of death, or of being sundered from the Holy Spirit of life: the death of the spirit separated from God, involving the separation of soul and body, and in its issue eternal. This is a hard saying, taken alone: but its mitigation will come in due time - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.36

Holy Scripture sums up all the disturbances of human life which are the result and punishment of sin in the designation "Death." "The wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23 and James 1:15; Romans 5:12). There are various kinds of death; and Revelation means by the term not only the death which concerns the inward life - the spiritual semblance of life, the mock being which the sinner leads apart from God, not only the divided state of the inner man, the breaking up and dismemberment of the spiritual powers, which is the result of sin; but also the death which embraces the outward life, the whole array of sicknesses and plagues, which visit the human race, and "all the various ills that flesh is heir to," which are consummated in death, in the separation of the body and the soul. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p.209.] penalty needs fresh emphasis, but that spiritual death is the chief factor needs to be kept constantly in view. Physical death is the consequence of the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit, and is therefore immediately connected with spiritual death. The branch separated from the vine is dead, in that it is no longer connected with its source of life. The moment of man’s separation from God brought in the reign of death. That man’s earthly existence did not end immediately was due to God’s counsel for redemption. The "free gift" of divine grace began before the transgression took place. The virtue of the atonement issued forth from the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. Hence the full strength of the condemnation was suspended and the consequences of the fall mitigated. The Scriptures lead us to believe, also, that not only man’s nature, but also the nature which surrounds him, bears witness to the disorganizing principle of sin. Thus the creation (h ktisiV) itself, according to St. Paul, will be emancipated from the slavery of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God (cf. Romans 8:19-22)

[Though a full and satisfactory explanation of the dark sayings of nature may be impossible in the present limits of our experience, yet a spiritual, a moral view of nature will always be led back to the words of the apostle that the creature is subject to vanity and sighs for redemption. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 214

Physical death is the penalty of human sin: not, however, in itself, but as connected with death spiritual: connected with it in some sense as resulting from the same deprivation of the Holy Ghost, whose indwelling in regenerate man is the pledge of the physical resurrection, even as it is the principle of the spirit's resurrection to life. But it is declared to be expressly the penalty of sin in man; who was on its account subjected to the vanity that was the lot of the lower creatures, denied access to the Tree of Life, and surrendered to the dissolution that had already been the natural termination of the existence of the inferior orders of the inhabitants of the earth Moreover, physical death in the sense of the annihilation of man's whole physical nature, as he is soul and spirit, is never once alluded to throughout the Scriptures. To die never in the Bible means extinction. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.39

Weismann says that the organism must not be looked upon as a heap of combustible material, which is completely reduced to ashes in a certain time, the length of which is determined by its size and the rate at which it burns; but it should be compared to a fire, to which fresh fuel can be added, and which, whether it burns quickly or slowly, can be kept burning as long as necessity demands....Death is not a primary necessity, but it has been acquired secondarily, as an adaptation. - WEISMANN, Heredity, pp. 5, 24.]

2. Spiritual death is due to the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit as the bond of union between the soul and God. By this withdrawal man lost immediately his fellowship with God. Negatively, this was the loss of original righteousness or primitive holiness; positively, it meant a depravation of those powers which in their united action we call man's moral nature. Thus fallen human nature is known as the flesh or sarx, a term which is used to indicate that the whole being of man, body, soul and spirit, have been separated from God and subjected to the creature. Evil consequences follow immediately, among which we may mention the following: (1) Idolatry. The loss of the Holy Spirit leaves the heart of man an abandoned temple. Nothing remains but for the sell to become enthroned as its own god. Hence the world becomes ""a vast pantheon" of lesser gods, all of which are made to minister to the enthroned self. (2) The Self as the Ruling Principle of Life. With the enthronement of the self, there begins the slavery of sin. I am carnal, said the apostle, sold under sin (Romans 7:14); and again, I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members (Romans 7:23). Thus the flesh becomes the opposing principle of the Spirit. When, therefore, St. Paul refers to the carnal mind as sarkinos (sarkinoV), and the spiritual man as pneumaticos (pneumatikoV), he portrays one whose whole nature is under the sway of the flesh, and the other as equally under the influence of the Spirit. (3) The Concupiscence of the Flesh. The self being in a false position, and still retaining its essentially active character,

[The second consequence is, therefore, death spiritual, that moral state which arises from the withdrawment of that intercourse of God with the human soul, in consequence of its becoming polluted, and of that influence upon it which is the only source and spring of the right and vigorous direction and employment of its powers in which its rectitude consists; a deprivation, from which depravation consequently and necessarily follows. This, we have before seen, was included in the original threatening, and if Adam was a public person, a representative, it has passed on to his descendants, who in their natural state are therefore said to be "dead in trespasses and sins." Thus it is that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; and that all evils "proceed from it," as corrupt streams from a corrupt fountain. - Watson, Institutes, II, p.55.] there

arises what is known as concupiscence or inordinate desire. St. Paul in speaking of the carnal mind uses the term phronama (fponhma) or mind. St. James uses a cruder but stronger term, that of epithumia (epiqumia) which is generally translated lust (James 1:14-15). St. John confirms this by referring to the sin of the world as being "the lust (epiqumia) of the flesh, "the lust (epiqumia) of the eyes, and the pridealaxoneia) of life (1 John 2:16). (4) Ungodliness. The self is not only essentially active, but was created for unlimited progress. Under grace this becomes an ever increasing advancement in the divine likeness - a change from glory unto glory (2 Corinthians 3:18). In sin the increase is ""unto more ungodliness" and hence a descent from shame to shame. It must be remembered, however, that sin is but an accident of man's nature and not an essential element of his original being. He retains his personality with all of its powers, but these are exercised apart from God as the true center of his being, and are therefore perverted and sinful. Sin is not some new faculty or power infused into man's being as the special organ of sin. It is rather the bias of all his powers - a darkening of the intellect, an alienation of the affections, and a perverseness of the will

Eternal death is the final judgment of God upon sin. It is the separation of the soul from God made permanent. It is the punishment of sin apart from the mitigating influences of divine grace From the standpoint of the individual sinner, it is the willful separation from God made final, the attitude of the soul's unbelief and sin made permanent. ""But the highest sense of the term "death,' in Scripture," says Mr. Watson, ""is the punishment of the soul in a future state, by both a loss of happiness and separation from God, and also by a positive infliction of divine wrath. Now this is stated not as peculiar to any dispensation of religion, but as common to all - as the penalty of the transgression of the law of God in every degree. "Sin is the transgression of the law'; this is its definition. "The wages of sin is death'; this is its penalty" (Watson, Institutes, II, p. 50)

18. Chapter 19 - ORIGINAL SIN OR INHERITED DEPRAVITY

Chapter 19 - ORIGINAL SIN OR INHERITED DEPRAVITY

We have seen that the penalty of sin is death. We have also seen that the effects of sin cannot be limited to the individual, but must include in their scope, the social and racial consequences as well. It is to these consequences that theology applies the terms Original Sin or Inherited Depravity. Following our usual procedure, we shall first examine the Scriptures themselves in order to establish the fact of human depravity; and from the facts thus gained, we shall attempt to construct a doctrine which will be in harmony with both the Scriptures and human experience. Two questions immediately arise. First, do these consequences attach to Adam as the federal head, or official representative of the race or are they to be regarded simply as the natural consequences of the race's connection with Adam? Second, in what sense are these consequences to be viewed as

[Mr. Wesley's treatise on Original Sin has been characterized as one of the most faithful and stern reflections of the scriptural doctrine that our language contains. His sermon on "Sin in Believers" is equally true to the facts of Christian experience. The latter was the result of his conflict with Moravianism. When he emerged from his maze of doubts and perplexities, he made a declaration of the following principles as summarized by Harrison. "Although the soul begins a new life at the hour of conversion, there remains not only the capacity for, but a tendency to, sin. The old Adam of active sin, of resistance to God and antagonism to holiness, is gone - buried with Christ by the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. But the Adamic fall is more than the ordering of a life, and the new birth is more than a change from one set of motives to another. After we have passed from death unto life, we are conscious that there remains a diseased moral nature whose allies are flesh and blood; and though these are conquered, they are not annihilated by the change which makes us children of God....The sagacious mind of Mr. Wesley analyzed his own experience, and finding himself not actually free from the warfare between good and evil, he searched the scriptures, and was led thereby into the deep things of God. The aspirations of his soul for the higher life were accentuated by the doubts into which he had fallen; and when he once more threw himself upon the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, the Spirit of power and love and of a good conscience, undefiled manifested itself to him, and once more he was clothed with the spirit of rejoicing, having the peace that the world cannot give and cannot take away." - HARRISON, Wesleyan Standards, I, pp. 256, 257.] sin, and in what sense as inherited depravity? Since the term Original Sin seems to furnish a more direct connection with the subject discussed in the previous chapter, we shall examine the Scriptures which treat, (1) of Original Sin; and (2) of Inherited Depravity

Original Sin. The Scriptures teach that the presence of death in the world, with all its attendant evils, is due to man's sin. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses,

even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come....For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) 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 (Romans 5:12-14; Romans 5:17-18). Here it is clearly taught that before of Adam, there was neither sin nor death after his fall there were both, and these are regarded as the direct consequences of sin. It seems clear also from this statement, that natural evil is the consequence of moral evil for death is by sin. The apostle further declares, that death as a consequence of sin passed upon all men, that is, through racial propagation. Hence original sin and inherited depravity seem to be separated in thought only, but identified in fact. The propagation of the race from Adam was therefore not only in his physical likeness but also in his moral image. As if anticipating the error that Adam S sin constituted all men transgressors, he added the words, ""for that all have sinned."(By the apostle’s own admission, however, death reigned even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, that is, by overt act of disobedience. Hence if the penalty of death was imputed to all men, because all had sinned, then this sin must have been a state of the heart, that is, a depraved nature. This is confirmed bye such scriptures as Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world (John 1:29); and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin (1 John 1:7)

Inherited Depravity. Not only are all men born under the penalty of death, as a consequence of Adam’s sin, but they are born with a depraved nature also, which m contradistinction to the legal aspect of penalty, is generally termed inbred sin or inherited depravity. This is defined in the language of the creed as ""that corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam, by reason of which every one is very far gone from original righteousness" (Article V). We are now concerned, however, only with the scriptural teaching on this subject The Scriptures assert that man is born in a state of spiritual death; and while full provision is made for remitting the guilt and condemnation for which man is not directly responsible, it still remains that he is liable for the consequences of this sin. We make this statement in order to show the actual condition of man apart from the mitigating influences of divine grace. The first scripture which indicates the inherited depravity of man’s nature is found in Genesis 5:3, where it is stated that Adam . . . begat a son in his own likeness. (Here a distinction is made between the likeness of God, and Adam’s own likeness in which his son was begotten. Another scripture of similar import is found in Genesis 8:21 where it is said that the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth. Since this word was spoken when there were no other human beings on earth except righteous Noah and his family, it must refer to the hereditary tendency of men toward evil. Closely related to these texts are the words of Job, Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one (Job 14:4). Here again it is clearly indicated that the human race is defiled or polluted by sin, and hence every one born of the race is defiled. This is definitely stated by the psalmist as follows: The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one (Psalms 14:2-3). This scripture is later used by St. Paul as indicating a universally depraved state of mankind. Two other passages from the Psalms may be used as proof texts. Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me (Psalms 51:5); and The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies (Psalms 58:3). The word

iniquity as used here, cannot under any circumstances refer to actual sin, but carries with it the thought of a perverted or twisted nature from the very inception of life. The second verse carries the thought still farther as an estrangement or alienation from God. Since this estrangement is from birth, it must be regarded, not as acquired but as inherited depravity. The Prophet Jeremiah declared that The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? (Jeremiah 17:9). Here the strongest of terms is used to express the natural depravity of the human heart The New Testament references to the morally depraved character of the human race are numerous, but we need give here only a few of the stronger proof texts. Our Lord said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man (Mark 7:20-23). Here our Lord clearly affirms that these evil traits come from within, that is, they have their original source in the natural heart of man. Again He says, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit (John 3:5-6). Here the word flesh refers not only to the physical condition of mankind as born into the world, but implies also that his moral condition is such, that it becomes the ground of necessity for a new or spiritual birth) These words of our Lord are sufficient evidence of the morally depraved state of the natural man, and to the Christian there can be no higher authority. St. Paul uses the term flesh perhaps more than any other New Testament writer; and as he uses it, the term refers to the depraved nature of man - especially to the propagation of a corrupted nature. We can give only a few of these references. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh (Romans 8:5); So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God (Romans 8:8) But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit (Romans 8:9); If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die (Romans 8:13) They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts (Galatians 5:24). The outstanding passage, however, in this connection, is that from which the Church has derived the term ""Indwelling Sin." Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing (Romans 7:17-18). All of these terms show that the bias to sin belongs to fallen human nature as such. The term flesh as here used, is representative of the fallen estate of mankind generally - not the destruction of any of its essential elements, but the deprivation of its original spiritual life, and hence the depravation of its tendency THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH The doctrine of man’s depravity rests upon the solid foundation of Scripture and the universal testimony of human experience. It is implied both in the penalty of the Adamic law and in the natural relation which Adam sustained to his posterity. The doctrine has never been seriously denied in the Church, except by the Pelagians and the Socinians. Mr. Wesley attached great importance to this fundamental belief. He says, ""All who deny this (call it original sin or any other title) are but heathens still, in the fundamental point which distinguishes heathenism from Christianity. But here is our Shibboleth; Is man by nature filled with all evil? Is he wholly fallen? Is his soul totally corrupted? Or, to come back to the text, is every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually? Allow this and you are so far a Christian. Deny it and you are but a heathen still" (Wersley, Sermon on Original Sin). It will serve the purpose of better presenting this important doctrine, if we first make a brief survey of the various views which have been held in the Church, setting them forth in broad outline. Following this we shall indicate the finer distinctions which have served to guard the scriptural position The

Early Christian Church. As with many other of the important doctrines of the Church, this fundamental truth was not questioned, and hence the early Church had no clearly defined doctrine of original sin. However, there soon appeared here and there, those variations which proved in their later developments, to be the germs of widely different systems of theology. The universality of sin was recognized from the beginning. Justin (A.D. 165) says, "Every race knows that adultery, and murder, and such like are sinful: and though they all commit such practices, they cannot escape from the knowledge that they act unrighteously whenever they do so." As to the proper explanation of this universality of sin, Justin appears to be uncertain. He speaks at one time of the ""human race, which from Adam, had fallen under the power of death and the guile of the serpent, and each one of which has committed personal transgression"; but at another time, he says of the posterity of Adam, that ""they becoming like

[The early Christian Church exhibits the truth as it has been educed from the Scripture, but with the germ of every subsequent error here and there appearing. Before the Pelagian heresy the Greek and Latin fathers generally held the Vitium Originis, as Tertullian first called it, but laid stress upon the co-operation of the human will enlightened by teaching and grace. The Latins were still more decided as to both. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.74

Tertullian (200) laid down the theory of natural depravity, which seems closely connected with his views about the traduction of souls. He is generally looked upon as the author of the doctrine of "Original Sin," which he formulates as follows: "There is, besides the evil which comes on the soul from the intervention of the evil spirits, an antecedent, and in some sense natural, evil which arises from its corrupt origin." This doctrine was afterward elaborated by Cyprian and Augustine, and gave rise to much angry controversy. - Crippen, Hist., Chr. Doct., p. 90.]

Adam and Eve, work out death for themselves." Clement appears to have held the position which later came to be known as Pelagianism. He repudiates the idea of any hereditary taint. The later Greek theologians who generally follow Origen, took the same position. They maintained that original sin was merely physical corruption, and therefore could not be regarded as truly culpable. Sin, therefore, had no origin in Adam, but only in the human will. Thus Cyril says of original sin, that ""when we come into the world we are sinless, but now we sin from choice." Chrysostom held a similar position. We may say, therefore, that in general, the Eastern Church regarded original sin as attaching only to the physical and sensuous nature and not to the voluntary and rational. Hence original sin was displaced by a belief in original evil The Pelagian Controversy. The controversy between Pelagius and Augustine was in reality, the focusing of two great systems of theology in their opposition to each other - the East and the West. Pelagius placed extreme emphasis upon the self-determination of the individual to good or evil, and denied that Adam’s sin affected anyone but himself. Hence he denied inherited depravity or racial sin of any sort. The descendants of Adam were born in the same condition in which Adam was created, and like him, sinned by direct transgression. The prevalence

[The seven points of Pelagianism as given by Wiggers are as follows: (1) Adam was created mortal, so that he would have died even if he had not sinned; (2) Adam’s sin injured, not the human race, but only himself; (3) newborn infants are in the same condition as Adam before the fall; (4) the whole human race neither dies on account of Adam’s sin, nor rises on account of Christ’s resurrection; (5) infants, even though not baptized, attain eternal life; (6) the law is as good

a means of salvation as the gospel; and (7) even before Christ some men lived who did not commit sin. (These men were Abel, Enoch, Joseph, Job, and among the heathen, Socrates, Aristides and Numa.) The errors of Pelagianism may be refuted both from the Scriptures and from history. It has been held only sporadically by individuals, and has been regarded in the church as heresy

Pelagianism as related to the denial of "original sin" and death as the effect of sin, was formally condemned as heretical by the General Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. But this did not settle the controversy. Augustinianism was never fully received in the East, for its divines rejected predestination and held to the doctrine of original sin, side by side with human liberty. In the West, Augustinianism gained favor. Some of the monks of Adrumentum went to the extreme lengths of declaring that God predestinated even the sins of the wicked.] of sin, he held, was due to wrong example. Augustine on the other hand, emphasized racial sin or depravity to the exclusion of any true individual freedom. He adopted an extreme realism, maintaining that Adam and the race were the one that sinned - all being in Adam when he sinned, and, therefore, all actually sinning in him. This racial sin beginning in Adam was of the nature of concupiscentia or the ascendancy of the flesh over the spirit. This introduced the necessity of sinning; and the nature transmitted to his descendants made them not only depraved, but guilty in themselves as well as Adam. Semi-Pelagianism sought to mediate between the two extremes, by maintaining that original sin was merely vitiosity, or a weakening of the power to will and do. It held that there was sufficient power remaining in the depraved will to initiate or set in motion the beginnings of salvation but not enough to bring it to completion. This must be done by divine grace The Medioval Transition. The discussions of the schoolmen were largely transitional, although several applications of the doctrine were developed. The Augustinian idea that the posterity of Adam must be considered guilty as well as depraved, found its logical development in the doctrine of the damnation of infants. Since baptism was regarded as the ground of remission for the guilt of original sin, Gregory applied the principle to the full. He maintained that to the pona damni or loss, was added the pona sensus or conscious suffering, and hence the damnation of all unbaptized infants. Another question which greatly divided the opinions of the schoolmen was that of the immaculate conception of Mary. Some maintained that unless Mary had been free from original sin, Christ would not have been born sinless. They held, therefore, that Mary was prenatally sanctified - the one exception to the universality of sin, original as well as actual. Others held that no one could be made holy without the intervention of the atonement. The subject was one of debate for almost a century. The doctrine of the immaculate conception, however, was made an article of faith in the Roman Catholic Church by Pope Pius IX in 1854. The question as to the origin and transmission of original sin was likewise a matter of debate during this period. Peter Lombard maintained the position of Creationism. He held that God created each individual soul pure, but this immaterial spirit infused into the begotten organism of the body, contracted defilement and became guilty. Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, held to Traducianism as the best explanation of inherited depravity, that is, that Adam’s person corrupted the nature; and in his posterity, the nature corrupts the person The Tridentine Development. The theologians of the Roman Catholic Church were as definite as the Reformers in their position concerning the penalty of sin. They maintained that the sin of Adam had entailed upon his posterity, not only the consequences of sin, but sin itself. They affirmed also, that free will had been weakened by the fall, but repudiated the idea that the freedom of the will had been extinguished or lost. They were, therefore, semi-Pelagian in their

beliefs. The denial of original sin and of the freedom of the will were both alike anathematized by the Council of Trent in 1560 A.D. The peculiarity of the Tridentine doctrine, however, consists in the belief that original righteousness was a superadded gift. This we have previously pointed out in our discussion concerning the image of God in man. The loss of original righteousness, therefore, by the sin of Adam, threw the race back to its original condition

[The dogma defined in the Council of Trent combines the Augustinian Realistic identification of Adam and the race with the semi-Pelagian negative idea of the effect of the fall. Adam created in the image of God, with the endowment of free will, and perfect harmony in the purely natural elements, had the gift of original righteousness added: "conditus in puris naturalibus," he was then "in justitia et sanctitate constitutus." Original righteousness was a supernatural added gift, and the loss of it threw the race back into its created condition of contrariety between flesh and spirit, without the superadded restraint. In baptism the guilt of the original offense which incurred the loss is taken away, and yet the concupiscence that sprang from transgression and leads to transgression remains untaken away, not having, however, itself the essential quality of evil Against this the Reformed Confessions all protested, asserting that concupiscence has in it the nature of sin. For the rest, the Roman theory admits that the natural image has been clouded through the fall; man’s whole nature being wounded, and propagated as such. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 77.] of a contrariety between flesh and spirit. From the deprivation of the original gift, concupiscence sprang up, in which the flesh dominated the spirit. The Tridentine doctrine maintains that the guilt which attaches to original sin is taken away by baptism, but the concupiscence remains. This, however, they do not regard as sin. "The concupiscence, which the apostle sometimes denominates sin, the Holy Synod declares the Catholic Church never understood to be called sin because it is really and truly sin in the regenerate, but because it is from sin and inclines to sin." It is admitted, however, that the natural image has been clouded through the fall, and that man’s whole nature being wounded, is propagated as such The Lutheran Standards. The Lutheran theologians generally recognized two elements in original sin - corruption of the nature of man, and guilt as attaching to this corruption. The Augsburg Confession states that "All men begotten after the common course of nature are born in sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in Him, and with fleshly appetite; and this disease or original fault is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit" (Art. 11). Nothing is said here as to the nature of this imputation, whether mediate or immediate, but the theory necessarily identifies inherited depravity and original sin. Lutheranism has always strongly maintained the moral inability of fallen man. The Formula of Concord (1577) served to check two opposite tendencies the synergists who held that there was a certain co-operation of the human will in the matter of salvation; and the theory of Flacius, that original sin is the very substance of fallen man. Against Lutheran Synergism, the creed affirmed that in

[Melanchthon defined original sin as a corruption of nature flowing from Adam, but held rather to the mediate than to immediate imputation of this sin to the race. He says, "On account of which corruption men are born guilty and children of wrath, that is condemned by God, unless remission is obtained. If anyone wishes to add that men are born guilty by reason of Adam’s fall, I do not object." Calixtus among the Lutheran theologians denied that guilt attached to original sin. Both Gerhard and Quensted favored mediate imputation.] natural things man may do good, but in spiritual things his will is entirely bound; against the theory of Flacius, it maintained that original sin

was an accident of human nature, and not of the essence of the human soul. In the language of the schools, original sin is accidens rather than substantia The Reformed Confessions. Calvin and the Reformed Churches generally, made no distinction between imputed guilt and inherited depravity. Original sin included both elements - guilt and corruption. The guilt of original sin was explained in various ways; sometimes by the representative mode, or legal headship of Adam; sometimes by the realistic mode, or the virtual existence of the race in Adam; and sometimes by the genetic mode, or the natural headship of the race in Adam. With few exceptions, the reformers accepted the two former positions, that is, they believed that sin was imputed to the race by virtue of the relation which it sustained to Adam as its legal representative; and they held that the race being in Adam when he sinned, it sinned also, and, therefore, became guilty with him in the first sin. After the time of Cocceius (1603-1669), the federal notion took on greater prominence but did not entirely supplant the realistic position. The imputation was, therefore, sometimes regarded as legal and sometimes as moral. Frequently both elements were retained, giving rise to the Placæan Controversy over mediate or immediate imputation. Calvin and the reformers generally held to an immediate or antecedent imputation, which made the sin of Adam as the federal head of the race, the exclusive and prior ground of condemnation. Placæus on the other hand, advanced the theory of a mediate or consequent imputation, which held that condemnation followed and was dependent upon individual corruption as its ground. His doctrine involved the idea of creationism. The soul he maintained, is created immediately by God and as such is pure, but becomes corrupt as soon as it is united with the body. Inbred sin, therefore, according to this theory, is the consequence but not the penalty of Adam’s transgression

Zwingli (1484-1531) differed very materially from the other reformers in his conception of inbred sin, especially in excluding from it the element of guilt. Sin proper he defined as a transgression of the law. Concerning original sin he says, "’Whether we wish it or not, we are compelled to admit that original sin, as it is in the descendants of Adam, is not properly sin, as has already been explained, for it is not a transgression of the law. It is therefore properly a disease and a condition. He holds, indeed, that men are by nature the children of wrath, but he interprets this to mean that men are not actually adjudged guilty, but that naturally we are without the birthright to immortality, just as the children of one who is made a slave inherit a condition of slavery." This conception of inbred sin is essentially the same as that which later was accepted by Arminius The Arminian Position. The position of James Arminius (1560-1609) on the question of original sin, differed greatly from that of his followers, especially Limborch (1633-1702) and Curcellæus (1586-1659), who in the controversy with Dort leaned too far toward Pelagianism. For this reason we shall reserve the term ""earlier Arminianism" as applying to the teachings of Arminius himself, and also to those teachings as reaffirmed by John Wesley (1703-1791). The position of the Remonstrants is best known as "’Later Arminianism." In its purest and best forms, Arminianism preserves the truth found in the Reformed teaching without accepting its errors. With the Reformers it holds to the unity of the race in Adam, that ""in Adam all have sinned," and that all men ""are by nature the children of wrath." But over against this, it holds that in Christ, the second Man who is the Lord from heaven, ""the most gracious God has provided for all a remedy for that general evil which was derived to us from Adam, free and gratuitous in His beloved Son Jesus Christ, as it were a new and another Adam. So that the baneful error of those is plainly apparent who are accustomed to found upon that original sin the decree of absolute reprobation invented by themselves." The Apology of the Remonstrants further declares that "there is no ground for the assertion that the sin

of Adam was imputed to his posterity in the sense that God actually judged the posterity of Adam to be guilty of and chargeable with the same sin and crime that Adam had committed." "I do not deny that it is sin," said Arminius, ""but it is not actual sin....We must distinguish between actual sin and that which is the cause of other sins, and which on that very account may be denominated sin The Wesleyan Doctrine. John Wesley greatly improved the later Arminian position, purging it from its Pelagian elements and putting it upon a more scriptural basis. Wesleyanism, therefore, more nearly approaches the positions of James Arminius himself. It must be recognized, however, that there are certain differences in the teachings of Arminius and those of Wesley. One of these is quite marked. Arminius regarded the ability bestowed upon our depraved nature which enabled it to co-operate with God, as flowing from the justice of God, without which man could not be held accountable for his sins. Wesley on the other hand, regarded this ability as solely a matter of grace, an ability conferred through the free gift of prevenient grace, given to all men as a first benefit of the universal atonement made by Christ for all men. The differences between the Wesleyans and the Remonstrants are thus summed up by Dr. Charles Hodge: "Wesleyanism (1) admits entire moral depravity; (2) denies that any men in this state have any power to co-operate with the grace of God; (3) asserts that the guilt of all through Adam was removed by justification of all through Christ; and (4) ability to co-operate is of the Holy Spirit, through the universal influence of the redemption of Christ" (Hodge, Syst. Th., II, pp.329, 330). Dr. Pope in his theology more nearly follows Wesley and Watson; while Whedon and Raymond

[The order of the decrees in the Arminian system is as follows: (1) to permit the fall of man; (2) to send the Son to be a full satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; (3) on that ground to remit all original sin, and to give such grace as would enable all to attain eternal life; (4) those who improve that grace and persevere to the end are ordained to be saved.] better represent the type of Arminianism as held by the Remonstrants. Since it is our purpose to more fully present the Arminian position, we need not at this time, give the subject any extended treatment THE ORIGIN AND TRANSMISSION OF ORIGINAL SIN

Granting that original sin or inherited depravity had its origin in the sin of Adam, we must now consider the manner in which this is transmitted to the individual members of the race, and the character which attaches to it. The theories are generally known as "modes of transmission," or in Calvinistic theology, "theories of imputation." There are three principal theories. First, there is the Realistic Mode, which regards Adam as the natural head of the race, and his posterity as identified with him in the original transgression. Second, there is the Representative Mode, which regards Adam as the legal head of the race, and, therefore, being the legal representative of the race, his sin was imputed to them as their sin. Here the emphasis is upon original sin, rather than upon inherited depravity. Third, there is the Genetic Mode, which is based upon natural headship of Adam, but regards the consequences of his sin, chiefly in the light of inherited depravity instead of original sin The Realistic Mode of Transmission. This theory was first advanced by Augustine (354-430), although it appears in germinal form in the writings of Tertullian (d. 220), Hilary (350) and Ambrose (374). For this reason it is commonly known as the Augustinian theory of imputation, or the "theory of Adam’s Natural Headship." With the exception of Zwingli (1484-1531), this was the generally accepted theory of the Reformers. As a mode of transmission, realism holds to the solidarity of the race; and as a theory of imputation, it maintains the constituted personal identity of Adam and his posterity. Three forms or degrees of realism are recognized in philosophical and

theological thought. (1) Extreme Realism, which holds to a single generic nature in which individuals have no separate existence, but which are regarded as mere modes or manifestations of the one substance. This is pantheism and can have no proper place in the Christian System. (2) Moderate or Higher Realism, which also holds to a single generic nature, but which maintains that this one substance through a process of individualization may become separated into distinct individuals, each of which possesses a portion of the original nature or substance. (3) Lower Realism, which holds to the existence of the entire race in Adam, but only in a germinal manner. It is thus closely related to the genetic mode. The theory, however, identifies Adam's posterity with himself in the one original sin

1. The Higher Realism is constructed upon the scholastic distinction between genera and species, between nature and the individual. It is the Augustinian theory of "generic existence, generic transgression, and generic condemnation." Dr. Shedd and Dr. Strong are the best modern representatives of this position, although the former is more pronounced in his realism than the latter. Dr. Shedd has given us by far the clearest statement of the realistic mode of transmission. "Human nature," he says, ""is a specific or general substance created in and with the first individuals of the human species, which is not yet individualized, but which by ordinary generation is subdivided into parts, and these parts are formed into distinct and separate individuals

[Dr. Shedd holds that "A species or a specific nature, is that primitive, invisible substance, or plastic principle, which God created from nonentity, as the rudimental matter of which all the individuals of the species are to be composed." "Though an invisible principle," it is "a real entity, nor a mere idea. When God creates a primordial substance which is to be individualized by propagation, that which is created is not a mental abstraction or general term having no objective correspondent. A specific nature has a real existence, not a noumenal." "Realism, then is true within the sphere of the specific, organic, and propagated being: and nominalism is true within that of non-specific, inorganic, and unpropagated being....man as a general conception, denotes not only the collective aggregate of all the individual men that ever exist, but also that primitive human nature of which they are fractional parts, and out of which they have been derived. The individual in this instance, is not the only actual and objective reality. The species is real also. The one human nature in Adam was an entity, as truly as the multitude of individuals produced out of it. The primitive unity 'man' was as objective and real as the final aggregate 'men.' " - SHEDD, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 68-71.] of the race. The one specific substance, by propagation, is metamorphosed into millions of individual substances, or persons. An individual man is a fractional part of a human nature separated from the common mass, and constituted a particular person having all the essential properties of human nature." He quotes Augustine as follows: "God the author of nature, but not of sin (vitium), created man upright, but he having through his own will become depraved and condemned, propagated depraved and condemned offspring. For we were all in that one man, since we were all that one man who lapsed into sin through that woman who was made from him, previous to transgression. The particular form in which we were to live as individuals had not yet been created and assigned to us man by man, but that seminal nature was in existence from which we were to be propagated....All men at that time sinned in Adam, since in his nature all men were as yet that one man." Upon such statements as these, Dr. Shedd builds his own theory. Thus, the total life of mankind was in Adam, since the race as yet had its only being in him. Its essence was not yet individualized, and his will was as yet the will of the species.

It was in Adam’s free act, that the race revolted from God and became corrupt in its nature. Considered as an essence human nature is intelligent, rational and voluntary; and accordingly, its agency in Adam partakes of the corresponding qualities. Hence generic or

[The question respecting the priority of the universal (the species) and the individual (res) arises here. Whether the universal is prior to the individuals, depends upon what individuals are meant. If the first two individuals of a species are in mind, then the universal, 1:e., the species, is not prior, but simultaneous (universale in re). The instant God created the first pair of human individuals, he created the human nature or species in and with them. But if the individuals subsequent to the first pair are in mind, then the universal, 1:e., the species is prior to the individuals (universale ante rem). God created the human nature in Adam and Eve before their posterity were produced out of It Accordingly, the doctrine of "universale ante rem" is the true realism, in case "res" denotes the individuals of the posterity. The species as a single nature is created and exists prior to its distribution by propagation. The universal as a species exists before the individuals (res) formed out of it. And the doctrine of "universale in re" is the true realism, in case "res" denotes only the first pair of individuals. The specific nature as created and existing in these two primitive individuals (res) is not prior to them, but simultaneous with them. - Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 74.] original is truly and properly sin because it represents moral agency. ON the realistic ground, therefore, Adam’s sin is imputed directly to his posterity, not as something foreign to them, but because all men were in Adam as one moral whole, and all sinned in him. And having sinned in him, human nature at its source was corrupted and all became partakers of the one corrupt nature. Not merely that we inherit the same kind of nature, but that identical corrupted nature is individualized in us, so that by virtue of our own sin we have all corrupted ourselves. There is then, on the Augustinian ground of realism, a threefold imputation - the original act of sin; the corrupt nature as a consequence of that act; and eternal death as the penalty for both the act and the depraved nature The objections usually raised to this theory may be summarized briefly as follows: (1) The assumption of a generic nature is without ground in either philosophy or the Scriptures. Realism never has been fully accepted as a philosophical theory, and has generally found its logical issue in the higher forms of pantheistic monism. (2) If the whole generic nature were personalized in Adam, endowed with and capable of free moral agency, it must have existed in the unity of spiritual essence and personality. If the unity of personality be allowed, it is

[Dr. Charles Hodge, the chief representative of the Federal Theory, raises strong objections to this theory. These may be summarized as follows: (1) Realism is a mere hypothesis; (2) It has no support from the Scriptures; (3) It has no support from the consciousness of men, but contradicts the teachings of consciousness as interpreted by the vast majority of our race. Every man is revealed to himself as an individual substance. (4) Realism contradicts the doctrine of the Scriptures in so far as it is irreconcilable with the Scripture doctrine of the separate existence of the soul. (5) It subverts the doctrine of the Trinity in so far that it makes the Father, Son and Spirit one God only in the sense in which all men are one man. The answers which the Trinitarian realists give to this objection are unsatisfactory, because they assume the divisibility, and consequently the materiality of Spirit. (6) It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the realistic theory with the sinlessness of Christ. If the one numerical essence of humanity nature have been free from sin if he took upon Him the same numerical essence which sinned in Adam. (7) The above objections are theological or scriptural; others of a philosophical character have availed to

banish the doctrine of realism from all modern schools of philosophy, except so far as it has been merged in the higher forms of pantheistic monism.-Hodge, Systematic Theology, II, pp. 221,222.] hardly conceivable that is should be regarded as divisible and distributable. (3) Sin can be predicted of persons only. If in Adam "we sinned all," then there must have existed in him, not the unitary essence of a single personality, but an aggregate of individuals, which no one allows. The general objection to the realistic mode as we see it, is that is appears to be a strained accounted for on other grounds

2. The Lower Realism differs from the higher in that it does not hold to the numerical unity of the generic nature, but is based upon the principle of the germinal existence of the race in Adam. In harmony with the higher realism, however, it maintains the common participation of the race in Adam's sin. The most frequent illustration of this relation is that which exists between the root and the branches of a tree, or between the head and the members of the body. John Owen (1616-1685) who with Richard Baxter and Thomas Ridgely, represented the intermediate group which attempted to reconcile the Realists and Federalists, gives us the following explanation: "We say that Adam, being the root and head of all human kind, and we all the branches from that root, all parts of that body, whereof he was the head, his will may said to be ours. We were then all that one man-we were all in him, and had no other will but his; so that though that be extrisic unto us, considered as particular persons, yet it is intrinsical, as we are all parts of one common nature. As in him we sinned, so in

[In his comment upon the above passage from Owen, Dr. Miley says that "close inspection discovers in it serious logical deficiencies, the pointing out of which will further show the groundlessness of the theory. The argument starts with the assumption of a rudimentary existence of all men in Adam, and respecting the soul as well as the body. Whether the soul so existed in Adam is still an open question with theologians. Augustine himself was always in serious doubt of it. Calvin rejected it, and the Reformed theologians mostly agreed with him. It has no place in the church creed. When so doubtful a principle takes the vital place of a logical premise the whole argument must be weak. On the ground of such an assumed existence in Adam the argument proceeds: 'his will may be said to be ours.' May be said! Many things may be said without proper warrant for the saying. With a doubtful premise and a merely hypothetical inference as the best support that can be given to the theory, its weakness is manifest."-Miley, Systematic Theology, I, pp. 490, 491 him we had a will of sinning." Here again, we may say that the theory is inadequate. It is intended to identify the posterity of Adam with himself in such a oneness that his sin would be chargeable to them, but this responsibility cannot be explained on the theory of germinal existence in Adam The Representative Mode of Imputation. This is usually known as the Federal Theory, or the "Theory of Condemnation by Covenant." The doctrine as held by the Reformed Churches is a combination of the covenant system of Cocceius (1603-1669), with the theories of immediate imputation held by Heidegger and Turretin (1623-1687). In American theology, this theory was developed by the Princeton theologians in opposition to the so-called "New School" of nonimputation in New England. The real impulse to federalism, whether earlier or later, grew out of the difficulty on the Augustinian theory, of accounting for the nonimputation to his posterity, of Adam's subsequent sins. The Federal Theory is therefore one of imputation, as is the Realistic Theory, but it accounts for this imputation in a distinctly different manner. Augustinianism as we have shown, accounted for guilt and depravity on the ground of an actual participation in Adam's

first sin; the Federal Theory accounts for it on the purely legal ground of a covenant, in which Adam became the divinely appointed representative of the race. Hence his obedience was reckoned or imputed to his posterity as their obedience, and his transgression as their transgression

1. We have first to consider, under the Representative Mode, the Theory of Immediate Imputation, commonly known as the Federal Theory. Dr. Charles Hodge is regarded as the ablest exponent of this theory in modern times, and gives us its clearest and most concise statement. He says, "The union between Adam and his posterity which is the ground of the imputation of his sin to them, is both natural and federal. He was their natural head. Such is the relation between parent and child, not only in the case of Adam and his descendants, but in all other cases, that the character and conduct of the one, of necessity to a greater or less degree affect the other. No fact in history is plainer than that children bear the iniquities of their fathers. They suffer for their sins. But there was something peculiar in the case of Adam. Over and beyond this natural relation which exists between a man and his posterity, there was a special divine constitution by which he was appointed the head and representative of his whole race." "The scriptural solution of this fearful problem is," he says, "that God constituted our first parent the federal head and representative of his race, and placed him on probation not only for himself, but also for all his posterity. Had he retained his integrity, he and all his descendants would have been confirmed in a state of holiness and happiness forever. As he fell from the estate in which he was created, they fell with him in his first transgression so that the penalty of that sin came upon all them as well as upon him. Men, therefore, stood their probation in Adam. As he sinned, his posterity came into the world in a state of sin and condemnation. They are by nature the children of wrath. The evils which they suffer are not arbitrary impositions, nor simply the natural consequences of his apostasy, but judicial inflictions. The loss of original righteousness, and death spiritual and temporal under which they commence their existence, are the penalty of Adam’s first sin" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, II, pp.196, 197) In order to greater clarity, we may with profit indicate some of the similarities and contrasts of the Realistic and Federal theories. First, the two theories are similar in this - both maintain that inherited depravity is condemnable. They explain this, however, in different ways. The Realistic theory maintains that Adam’s posterity sinned in him, and are, therefore, guilty on account of their own sin. The Federal theory holds that

[Professor Moses Stuart very aptly characterized this theory as one of "fictitious guilt, but veritable damnation." Dr. Baird said, "Here is a sin, which is no crime, but a mere condition of being regarded and treated as sinners; and a guilt, which is devoid of sinfulness, and which does not imply moral demerit or turpitude." Hollaz held that God treats men in accordance with what He foresaw they would do, if they were in Adam’s place (cf. Strong, Syst. Th., II, p.615.)]

Adam’s posterity did not participate in his sin, but were nevertheless liable to his penalty, in that he was legally their representative. This penalty was the infliction of depravity upon the descendants of Adam, and death as a consequence of that corruption. Thus original sin is essentially a punitive matter. Second, they show marked contrast in this - that the former maintains that guilt in the sense of culpability attaches to depravity, while the latter distinguishes sharply between guilt and demerit. "When it is said that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity, it is not meant that they committed his sin, or were the agents of his act, nor is it meant that they were morally criminal for this transgression; but simply that in virtue of the union between him and his descendants his sin is

the judicial ground of the condemnation of the race" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, II, p.195). Thus a distinction is made between guilt which is simply amenability to punishment without personal culpability; and guilt to which personal demerit and moral turpitude are attached. The latter alone affects moral character There are many objections urged against this theory (1) The Federal headship by virtue of a specific covenant is pure assumption without any support from the

[In his reference to the theory of immediate imputation, Dr. Sheldon says, "what is this but the apotheosis of legal artifice? The same God whose penetrating glance burns away every artifice with which a man may enwrap himself, and reaches at once to the naked reality, is represented as swathing His judgment with a gigantic artifice, in that He holds countless millions guilty of a trespass which he knows was committed before their personal existence, and which they could no more prevent than they could hinder the fiat of creation. If this is justice, then justice is a word of unknown meaning. Sane men condemn the savagery of the tribe which treats all of a nation as enemies because one or more of its representatives has offended. Shall sane men, then, think of the holy God as condemning a race in advance of its existence because of the sin of one?" - Sheldon, Syst. of Chr. Doct., p.320 This theory denies all direct sharing of the race in either the act or the demerit of Adam's sin. This is its distinction from the realistic theory, which, in its higher form, asserts both. As the race had no part in the agency of Adam, his sinning could have no immediate consequence of demerit and guilt upon them as upon himself. Hence, until the judicial act of immediate imputation, all must have been innocent in fact, and must have so appeared even in the view of the divine justice as it proceeded to cover them from the guilt of an alien sin, a sin in no sense their own, and then on the ground of such gratuitous guilt to inflict upon them the penalty of moral depravity and death. Thus the race though innocent in fact, is made the subject of guilt and punishment. - Miley Syst. Th., II, p.503

Scriptures. That Adam is the natural head of the race, and that legal responsibilities attach to this headship is not denied, but the theory is too mechanical and too artificial to be true. (2) It is contrary to the general teaching of the Scriptures. The descendants of Adam are not sinners because God accounts them as such; God regards them as sinners because they are such. St. Paul is explicit - death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned (Romans 5:12). (3) The theory confuses justice with sovereign power. If God by a sovereign act imputes guilt to the innocent, then He becomes an arbitrary ruler who treats the innocent as though they were guilty, and subordinates justice to legal fiction. (4) If the race had no part in either the agency or demerit of Adam's sin, it is evident that until the judicial pronouncement, they were in fact, innocent before the divine justice. Hence by a judicial act there is imputed to them a sin which is not their own, and on the ground of this gratuitous guilt, there is inflicted upon them the penalty of moral depravity and eternal death. This violates all sense of justice, and calls in question, the fundamental idea of God as a Perfect Being

2. We have next to consider, under the Representative Mode, the Theory of Mediate Imputation, commonly known as the "'Theory of Condemnation for Depravity." It was first advanced by Placeus (1606-1655) of the

[The arbitrariness of the covenant system is shown in the fact that it is held in a variety of forms. Coccelus, the originator of the system, and Burmann, one of his immediate followers and an able exponent of the system, held that the covenant of grace was between God and the elect, the office

of Christ being merely that of a Mediator. Witsius held that the covenant of grace was primarily an eternal covenant between the Father and the Son, and secondarily only, a covenant between God and the elect. Turretine and Hodge, who were advocates of the covenant-imputation scheme, held that in the covenant of works there were God and the first Adam; in the covenant of grace, God and the last Adam

Dr. E. C. Robinson thinks that it is perfectly certain that Jonathan Edwards did not hold the doctrine of immediate imputation, and that there is no decisive evidence that he held to the mediate imputation of Placeus. He believed in "a real union between the root and the branches of the world of mankind established by the Author of the whole system of the universe"; "the full consent of the hearts of Adam's posterity to the first apostasy." And therefore the sin of the apostasy is not theirs, merely because God imputes it to them; but it is truly and properly theirs, and on that ground God imputes it to them.- AUGUSTINE, Original Sin. Cf. Robinson, Christian Theology, p.155.]

School of Saumur in France. At first he denied that Adam's sin was in any sense imputed to the race, but this position having been condemned by the Reformed Church in 1644 A.D., he afterward proposed the theory which now bears his name. According to this view, the posterity of Adam are counted guilty, not because of their representative, but because they are born physically and morally depraved. While the corrupted nature comes by natural descent, it is nevertheless considered a sufficient cause for condemnation. On the Federal theory, imputation is the cause of depravity; on the Placean theory, depravity is the cause of imputation. The chief objection to this theory is, that it gives no explanation of man's responsibility for his inborn depravity; and since this corrupt nature cannot be charged to man's account, it must therefore be viewed in the light of an arbitrary divine infliction. This brings it under the same objections as those which are urged against the theory of immediate imputation The Genetic Mode of Transmission. Stated in other words, this is simply the natural law of heredity. It is the law of organic life that everything reproduces its own kind, and that not only as to anatomical structure and physical characteristics, but also as to mental life and disposition. The Augustinian anthropology with its realistic mode of accounting for original sin, is based upon this law of genetic transmission. The Federal theory of imputation regarded Adam as the representative of the race, solely on the ground of his natural headship. So, also, Arminianism has made much of this genetic law in its explanation of native depravity. Dr. Miley says, "On the obedience and the maintenance of his own holiness of nature, his offspring would have received their life and begun their probation in the same primitive holiness. There would still have been the possible lapse of individuals, with the corruption of their own nature and the consequent depravity of their offspring; but apart from this contingency, or so far as the Adamic connection is concerned, all would have been born in the primitive holiness. Under what law would such have been the consequence? Unquestionably, the law of genetic transmission. . . . as the law of genetic transmission rules in all the forms of propagated life and determines the likeness of the offspring to the parentage, and as it was sufficient for the transmission of the primitive holiness to all the race, it must be a sufficient account of the common native depravity" (MILEY, Systematic Theology, II, p. 506). The manner in which Arminianism, earlier and later, is related to this mode of transmission, must be reserved for a later paragraph DOCTRINAL ASPECTS OF ORIGINAL SIN

Original Sin or Inherited Depravity are terms applied to the subjective moral state or condition of man by birth, and therefore express the moral condition of man in his natural estate. This depravity must not, however, be regarded as a physical entity or any other form of essential existence added to man's nature. It is rather, as its name implies, a deprivation of loss. Some theologians have attempted to locate depravity in the human will, but all such attempts are simply forms of the error of attempting to endow the will with personal powers. Depravity belongs to the whole person of man, and not merely to some form of personal manifestation, whether through the will, the intellect or the affections. It is a state or condition in which the person exists, and thus may be said to be a nature - a term which in its metaphysical form is not easily grasped, but which is very real in actual existence. By a ""nature" we may mean either of two things, (1) the constituent elements of man's being which distinguish him from every other order of existence. In this sense human nature remains as it was originally created. (2) The moral development of his being as a growth from within, apart from external influences. It is in this sense only, that we speak of man's nature as corrupt. (This corruption is inherent and not merely accidental. Sin, however, in the former sense of the word nature, is not inherent but simply accidental. It was not a constituent element of man's being as he was originally created. For this reason, sin is not in harmony with man's true nature, as is witnessed by conscience and the profounder law of reason, which is an element of man's natural image. This corrupt nature, therefore, is something alien to the primitive holiness of man's nature by creation, and in thought at least is separable from the person whose condition it represents. Depravity is "deeper down and farther back" than the intellect, the feelings or the will, and therefore metaphysically below consciousness. It is the condition or state in which the person exists, and affects man in both his sensuous and moral nature. By the sensuous nature, we must understand something more than the merely physical; we refer to those sensibilities on the borderline, where the physical condition affects the mental life, or the mental life in turn influences bodily conditions. From this disordered condition, there arise evil tendencies, inordinate sensibilities or affections, and vicious impulses. Likewise the moral nature is so affected that the light of conscience shines dimly, and moral duty is not properly enforced

While most orthodox creeds regard man's moral condition as the loss of original righteousness, the theories of explanation differ widely. Pelagianism and Calvinism represent the extremes of thought, the former

[The sensuous nature, as we here use the term, is much broader than the physical nature, and the seat of many other sensibilities than the appetencies regarded as more specially physical. These manifold feelings have their proper functions in the economy of human life. In a healthful tone and normal state of the sensuous nature, these feelings are subordinate to the sense of prudence and the moral reason, and may thus fulfill their functions consistently with the spiritual life. There 'nay be a disordered state of the sensuous nature, with the result of inordinate sensibilities. Thus arise evil tendencies and vicious impulses and appetencies, inordinate forms of feeling - all that may be included in "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" (1 John 2:16). There are in human life many instances of such perverted and inordinate sensibilities as clearly evince a disordered state of the sensuous nature. Such a disordered state is a part of the depravity of human nature. The moral nature is the seat of the conscious and the moral reason. There may be a disordered state of the moral nature, just as of the sensuous; a state in which the moral reason is darkened or perverted, and the conscience voiceless or practically powerless. In such a state

moral duty is neither clearly seen nor properly enforced. God is far away, or so dimly seen that the vision of Him has little or no ruling power; for, while in the reality of His existence He still might be apprehended in the intuitive or logical reason, it is only in the apprehension of the moral consciousness that He becomes a living presence. - Miley, Systematic Theology, I, pp.443, 444.] denying any evil consequences as derived from the fall, the latter making it an effect of a participation in Adam's sin. Arminianism arose as a via media or mediating position, but sometimes leaned too far one way or the other. Mr. Wesley made every possible effort to live peaceably with the Calvinists, consistent with the scriptural positions which he held. Mr. Fletcher was always consistent, and his "Checks to Antinomianism" was a work so thorough and comprehensive, that it is still the best refutation of the Calvinistic positions. They are deserving of profound study by all who would be informed concerning the truest and best in Arminianism. We greatly prefer the Wesleyan type of Arminian doctrine, for two reasons: (1) it not only teaches, but makes one feel that sin is exceedingly sinful; and (2) it magnifies the atoning work of Jesus Christ. The doctrine of original sin is such, that it cannot be properly understood apart from the free gift of righteousness. Furthermore, if inherited depravity is not of the essence of sin, how can we understand such texts as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world; or the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin? To weaken our position on sin, is to weaken it on holiness also. Consequently in the following pages, we have endeavored to set forth the positions of earlier Arminianism as held by Mr. Wesley himself, Mr. Watson, Mr. Fletcher, Wakefield, Sumners, Fields, Banks and Pope

Definitions of Original Sin. "We believe that original sin, or depravity, is the corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam, by reason of which every one is very far gone from original righteousness, or the pure state of our first parents at the time of their creation, is averse to God, is without spiritual life, and is inclined to evil, and that continually; and that it continues to exist with the new life of the regenerate, until eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit" (Article V). This article is historically related to Article VII of the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism, and Article IX of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church. Mr. Wesley omitted from the English Article, the word "fault" as applied to original sin, and also the words "'so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and therefore, in every person born into this world it deserves God's wrath and damnation." Furthermore, he omitted the words ""And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated," which we have retained in a similar statement. These omissions are significant, but cannot be made to support the idea of non-imputation of penalty as Dr. Miley suggests. As to the Calvinistic definitions, the following from the Westminster Confession will be sufficient. "By this sin (our first parents) fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly deified in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin." The Nature of Original Sin. While with few exceptions, a belief in original sin has been uniform in the church, there has been a wide variety of opinion as to its nature. (1) By the Greek fathers, the Semi-Pelagians

[As commonly understood, the expression original sin" denotes "the inherent corruption in which all men since the fall are born." The corresponding term in science as distinguished from theology, is "heredity"; as such only, can science know it, and so far as this knowledge goes it is correct. We must go beyond science, into Scripture, and affirm that this hereditary corruption is not a mere "uncondemnable vitiosity." if this hereditary corruption comes at all under the view of God, considered as a moral Being, it must be regarded by him as something either agreeable or obnoxious. if it be regarded as the former, then it is not moral corruption, which is contrary to our hypothesis; but if it be regarded as the latter, then it is condemnable. With a mere physical vitiosity, or corruption, the moral government of God, and hence the plan of redemption, has nothing directly to do. Hence we conclude that original sin is not merely hereditary corruption, but it is with this quality of condemnableness attached thereto. - Foster, Theology, p. 406.] and some Arminians, emphasis was placed upon inherited depravity instead of original sin. Depravity was thus regarded as physical rather than moral - that is, vitium or weakness instead of peccatum or sin. Adam's physical condition having deteriorated as a consequence of his sin, this weakened or vitiated nature was communicated to his descendants. Thus the "New School" held that original sin was a vitiosity but not intrinsically sin. It was called such, only because it led to sin. Hence neither vitiosity nor death were regarded as penal inflictions, but only as natural consequences which God ordained to mark His displeasure at Adam's transgression. (2) Closely related to this, is the theory of original sin as concupiscence. By this is meant the native corruption which is the result of the ascendency of man's sensuous or animal nature, over the higher attributes of reason and conscience. It involves a proneness to sin, but is not regarded as intrinsically sinful. This is peculiarly the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, but is also held by some branches of Protestantism. (3) Some divines, through an undue emphasis upon the federal headship of Adam, have supposed that original sin was a positive evil infused into man's nature by a judicial act of God, and consequently transmitted to all Adam's posterity. (4) The generally accepted theory of theologians, both Calvinistic and Arminian, is that of privation - a depravity which is the result of deprivation. Two questions arise which demand our consideration, first, in what sense is depravity a deprivation; and second, in what sense may hereditary depravity be said to be hereditary guilt?

1. Original sin is to be considered as privatio, or a privation of the image of God. This is more in harmony with the tenor of the Scriptures than the notion of an infusion of evil qualities into the soul as a result of the divine degree. Arminius calls it "a privation of the image of God," but explains this privation as (1) a forfeiture of the gift of the Holy Spirit; and (2) in consequence of this, the loss of original righteousness. Depravity is therefore "a depravation arising from deprivation." Connected with this deprivation is a positive evil also, which arises as a consequence of the loss of the image of God. Mr. Watson illustrates this by the analogy of physical death which has passed upon all men. He says, "For as the death of the body, the mere privation of the principle of life produces inflexibility of the muscles, the extinction of heat, and sense, and motion, and surrenders the body to the operation of an agency which life, as long as it continued, resisted, namely, that of chemical decomposition; so from the loss of spiritual life, followed estrangement from God, moral inability, the dominion of irregular passions, and the rule of appetite; aversion, in consequence, to restraint; and enmity to God. . . . This accounts for the whole of man's corruption. The Spirit's influence in him, did not prevent the possibility of his sinning, though it afforded sufficient security to him, as long as he looked up to that source of strength. He did sin, and the Spirit retired; and, the tide of sin once turned in, the mound of resistance being removed, it overflowed his whole nature. In this

state of alienation from God men are born, with all these tendencies to evil, because the only controlling

[The position of Arminius is as follows: "But since the tenor of the covenant into which God entered with our first parents was this, that if they continued in the favor and grace of God, by the observance of that precept and others, the gifts which had been conferred upon them should be transmitted to their posterity, by the like divine grace which they had received; but if they should render themselves unworthy of those favors, through disobedience, that their posterity should likewise be deprived of them, and should be liable to the contrary evils; hence it followed, that all men, who were to be naturally propagated from them, have become obnoxious to death temporal and eternal, and have been destitute of that gift of the Holy Spirit, or of original righteousness. This punishment is usually called a privation of the image of God, and original sin. But we allow this point to be made the subject of discussion - beside the want or absence of original righteousness, may not some other contrary quality be constituted, as another part of original sin? we think it is more probable, that this absence alone of original righteousness is original sin in itself, since it, alone is sufficient for the commission and production of every actual sin whatsoever."

Mr. Watson thinks that the privation is not fully expressed by the phrase "the loss of original righteousness," unless that it be meant to include in it the only source of righteousness in even the first man, the life which is imparted and supplied by the Holy Spirit. Hence he says, "Arminius has more forcibly and explicitly expressed that privation of which we speak, by the forfeiture 'of the gift of the Holy Spirit' by which Adam, for himself and his descendants, and the loss of original righteousness as the consequence. This I take to be at once a simple and scriptural view of the case." - Watson, Theological Institutes, II, p. 80.] and sanctifying power, the presence of the Spirit, is wanting, and is now given to man, not as when first brought into being, as a creature; but is secured to him by the mercy and grace of a new and different dispensation, under which the Spirit is administered in different degrees, times, and modes, according to the wisdom of God, never on the ground of our being creatures, but as redeemed from the curse of the law by Him who became a curse for us" (Watson, Theological Institutes, II, pp. 79-83)

2. The next question concerns hereditary depravity and hereditary guilt. We have just seen that depravity is the loss of original righteousness in consequence of the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit. The curse threatened to disobedience was death. The sin of Adam incurred the penalty, and the penalty was inflicted. God withdrew from the soul of Adam. His descendants, therefore, were born under the curse of the law which has deprived human nature of the Spirit of God, and which can be restored only in Christ. Hereditary depravity then, is only the law of natural heredity, but that law operating under the penal consequence of Adam's sin. Consequently the church teaches, "that the whole race, descending by ordinary generation from the fallen first progenitors, inherit from them a morally tainted and vitiated nature; a nature in which there is no inclination to do anything truly good, but which, as soon as its dispositions or tendencies begin to unfold

[In the discussion of the primitive holiness we fully recognized the presence of the Holy Spirit as the source of its highest form. We did not accept the papal view, that original righteousness was wholly a gracious endowment, superadded after the creation of man, but held the Adamic nature just as created to be upright in its4f. In entire consistency with this view we held the presence of the Spirit as the source of the fuller strength and tone of that holiness. Provision was thus

complete for the more thorough subordination of all sensuous impulses and appetencies, and the complete dominance of the moral and spiritual life. As the result of sin there was a deprivation of the Holy Spirit, and in consequence of this loss a depravation of man's nature. In addition to the more direct effect of this sin upon the sensuous and moral nature, there was a loss of all the moral strength and tone immediately arising from the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit. The detriment was twofold, and in consequence the depravation was the deeper. In this view we still find depravity as a disordered state of the sensuous and moral nature. - Miley, Syst. Th., I, pp. 444, 445.] themselves, shows itself evil in the production of evil thoughts, words and actions." For this reason Mr. Watson says that hereditary depravity arises from hereditary guilt; and Mr. Wesley interprets the scripture for that all have sinned (Romans 5:12), to mean that "they were so constituted sinners by Adam's sinning as to become liable to punishment threatened to his transgression" (Wesley, Works, V, p.535). But the term "guilt" as here used in Arminian theology, needs to be carefully guarded. It may mean, as we have shown, either culpability (reatus culpo), or mere liability to punishment (reatus pono). In this case, the culpability belonged solely to Adam, and resided in the first sinner as the natural head and representative of the race. The consequences of his sin were passed on to his descendants as the reatus pono, or liability to punishment. The two ideas of responsibility for the act and liability for the consequences are not inseparable. Since Adam by his sin was separated from God, this state of separation or death has passed on to his descendants, who in their natural state are therefore said to be "dead in trespasses and sins," and "by nature the children of wrath." To this the testimony of the scriptures is explicit - for the judgment was by one to condemnation, and by one

[The infliction of spiritual death, which we have already shown to be included in the original sentence, consisted, of course, in the loss of spiritual life, which was that principle from which all right direction and control of the various powers and faculties of man flowed. But this spiritual life in the first man was not a natural effect, that is, an effect which would follow from his mere creation, independent of the vouchsafed influence of the Holy Spirit. This may be inferred from the "new creation," which is the renewal of man after the image of Him who first created him. This is the work of the Holy Spirit; but even after this change, this being "born again," man is not able to preserve himself in the renewed condition into which he is brought, but by the continuance of the same quickening and aiding influence. No future growth in knowledge and experience; no power of habit, long persevered in, render him independent of the help of the Holy Spirit; he has rather, in proportion to his growth, a deeper consciousness of his need of the indwelling of God, and of what the apostle calls his "mighty working." The strongest aspiration of this new life is after communion and constant intercourse with God; and as that is the source of new strength, so this renewed strength expresses itself in a "cleaving unto the Lord," with a still more vigorous "purpose of heart." In a word, the sanctity of a Christian is dependent wholly upon the presence of the Sanctifier. We can work out our own salvation only as "God worketh in us to will and to do." - Watson, Th. Inst., II, p. 80] man's offence death reigned by one, but both in relation to the free gift which is of many offences unto justification (Romans 5:16-18). In commenting upon the text By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, Dr. Ralston says, "Now, if all mankind are not involved in the penalty, we must flatly deny the Word of God, which plainly and repeatedly represents death, in every sense of the word, as a penal infliction - a judicial sentence pronounced upon the guilty as a just punishment for sin" (Ralston, Elements of Divinity, p. 179) Both Mr. Watson and Mr. Howe argue the penal nature of depravity from the retraction of the Spirit, based upon Galatians 3:13-14;

Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the

[Watson, Raymond, Field and Banks lean more toward immediate imputation; Pope more toward the mediate idea. "And since Adam was a public person, a representative, this state of death, of separation from God, has passed on to his descendants, who, in their natural state, are therefore said to be 'dead in trespasses and sins,' aliens from God, and therefore filled with evil." - Field, Handbook Chr. Th., p. 151. "The transmission of guilt, in the restricted sense already explained, is perfectly justifiable, if the representative or federal principle is justifiable in the moral as in other spheres. And then the transmission of guilt becomes the basis for the transmission of a corrupt nature." - Banks, Manual of Chr. Doct., p. 139. "The imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is confined to its legal results. If a man has committed treason, and has thereby lost his estate, his crime is so imputed to his children that they with him, are made to suffer the penalty of his offense. We do not mean, however, that the personal act of the father is charged upon the children, but that his guilt or liability to punishment is so transferred to them that they suffer the legal consequences of his crime." - Raymond, Chr. Th., p. 293

It is to be observed that the Scripture never disjoins the condemnation from the depravity; the one is always implied in the other, while both are generally connected with the great salvation. It is impossible to conceive the two former apart from each other; though the precision of scriptural language suggests that those who are born with a sinful bias are therefore condemned rather than that being condemned they are necessarily depraved. There is one passage that strikingly illustrates this. The apostle speaks of the Ephesian converts as having been under the sway of the flesh, in the full sense as given above, and thus showing that they were by nature the children of wrath. The depravity and condemnation of the natural estate are here once brought together: it is the solitary instance in which man's nature is said to be under wrath; but the wrath is upon those who lived after that nature rather than upon the nature itself; and both are brought into close connection with Christ, the light of whose coming already shineth, though the darkness is not yet wholly past. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 54.]

Spirit through faith. "If the remission of the curse carry with it the conferring of the grace of the Spirit then the curse, while it did continue, could but include and carry in it the privation of the Spirit. As soon as the law was broken, man was cursed, so as that thereby this Spirit should be withheld, should be kept off, otherwise than as upon the Redeemer's account, and according to His methods it should be restored" (cf. Watson, Institutes, II, p. 81)

Total Depravity. The Scriptures as we have shown, represent human nature as being totally depraved. Since this term has been so grossly misinterpreted in popular speech, its theological use needs to be carefully guarded. As such, the term is not used intensively, that is, human nature is not regarded as being so thoroughly depraved that there can be no further degrees in wickedness; but extensively, as a contagion spread throughout man's entire being. No informed advocate of this doctrine has ever affirmed that all men are personally wicked in the same degree; or that wicked men may not "wax worse and worse." The term "total" is applicable to depravity in three different senses. (1) Depravity is total in that it affects the entire being of man. It vitiates every power

[It is a remarkable fact, and one which should not be overlooked, that nearly all Calvinistic divines who have attempted to state the Arminian doctrine upon this subject, have taken their views from the semi-Pelagian notions of Dr. Whitby, instead of deriving them from Arminius himself, or those who agree with him. Thus Dr. Dick asserts of the Arminians: "They do not admit that the effect of the fall was a total loss of what we call original righteousness." He represents them as holding that though man "fell from a state of innocence and integrity, and his appetite was now more inclined to evil than before," yet "he did not fall into a state of moral impotence, or lose entirely his power to do good." That these sentiments may be entertained by some who are called Arminiams we will not deny; but to ascribe them to Arminius, or to any of his genuine followers, is a palpable misrepresentation. The first sin, according to that great divine, brought upon the offenders the divine displeasure, the loss of that primitive righteousness and holiness in which they were created, and liability to a twofold death. "Wherefore," he says, "whatever punishment was brought down upon our first parents, has likewise pervaded and yet pursues all their posterity; so that all men are by nature the children of wrath (Ephesians 2:3), obnoxious to condemnation, and to temporal as well as eternal death. They are also devoid of original righteousness and holiness. With these evils they would remain oppressed forever, unless they were liberated by Jesus Christ." It must therefore be evident to every impartial mind, that Arminians as well as Calvinists hold to the doctrine of man's total depravity. - WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 299.] and faculty of spirit, soul and body. The affections are alienated, the intellect darkened, and the will perverted. Mr. Fletcher says that depravity is seen in the corruption of the powers that constitute a good head - the understanding, the imagination, the memory and the reason; and in the depravity of the powers which form a good heart - the will, the conscience and the affections. In the language of the prophet, the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint (Isaiah 1:5). (2) Depravity is total in that man is destitute of all positive good. St. Paul says, For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing (Romans 7:18). This is clearly stated also, in Article VII of the creed. "We believe that man's creation in godlikeness included ability to choose between right and wrong, and that thus he was made morally responsible; that through the fall of Adam he became depraved so that he cannot now turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and works to faith and calling upon God; but the grace of God through Jesus Christ is freely bestowed upon all men, enabling all who will to turn from sin to righteousness, believe on Jesus Christ for pardon and cleansing from sin, and follow good works pleasing and acceptable in His sight." As in the case of demerit which attaches to inbred sin apart from the free gift in Christ, but is remitted through the universal diffusion of grace; so depravity apart from this communication of gracious ability, renders man totally unable in spiritual things. Pelagianism holds to a plenary ability of man in his natural state; the New School holds to natural ability; the Calvinistic churches to total inability apart from the election and effectual calling; while Arminians hold to a gracious ability extended to all men, so that in the words of Mr. Wesley, "the state of nature is in some sense a state of grace." (3) Depravity is total in a positive sense, in that the powers of man's being, apart from divine grace, are employed with evil continually (Genesis 6:5; Matthew 15:19). In the words of the creed, "Man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." Mr. Watson points out that some divines have attempted to soften this article, by availing themselves of the phrase "very far gone," as though it did not express a total defection from original righteousness. The articles were, however, subscribed by the two houses of convocation, in 1571 A.D., in Latin and English also, and therefore both copies are equally

authentic. The Latin copy expresses this by the phrase "quam longissime distet," which is as strong an expression as that language can furnish. It therefore fixes the sense of the compilers on this point, and takes away any argument which rests on the alleged equivocalness of the English version (cf. Watson, Th. Inst., II, p. 47.) ORIGINAL SIN IN RELATION TO CHRIST The question of original sin cannot be understood apart from its counter truth, the free gift of righteousness. By the ""free gift" is meant an unconditional diffusion of grace to all men, as a first benefit of the universal atonement made by Jesus Christ. This may be said to be the distinctive doctrine of earlier Arminianism, and was confirmed by the Wesleyan theologians from Fletcher to Pope. They allowed, with Calvin, that full penalty of death applied to both Adam and his posterity as a consequence of the fall; and that, therefore, apart from the grace of Christ, both guilt and demerit attached to

[This, therefore, is the general ground of justification. By the sin of the first Adam, who was not only the father, but likewise the representative of us all, we all fell short of the favor of God; we all became children of wrath; or, as the apostle expresses it, "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." Even so, by the sacrifice for sin made by the second Adam, as the representative of us all, God is so far reconciled to all the world, that He hath given them a new covenant; the plain condition whereof being once fulfilled, "there is no more condemnation" for us, but "we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." - Wesley, Sermon: Justification by Faith The teaching of the later scripture is summed up and confirmed by St. Paul, to the effect that Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, was given to the race of mankind, as the Fountain of an Original Righteousness that avails to efface and more than efface the effects of Original Sin in the case of all those who should be His spiritual seed. Hence this primitive gift was an objective provision for all the descendants of the first sinner, the benefits of which were to be applied to those whose faith should embrace the Saviour. But it is important to remember that it took the form of an original Free Gift to the entire race, before transgression began, and that it has in many respects affected the character of Original Sin: suspending the full strength of its condemnation, and in some degree counteracting its depravity. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.55.] inherited depravity. Mr. Wesley makes this assertion, but does not offer any explanation as to the manner in which original sin is transmitted. But they differed in this - Calvinism taught that the whole race having fallen in Adam, God might without any impeachment of His justice, predestinate some to salvation in Christ, and leave others to their deserved punishment. Over against this, the Arminians taught that there was a "free gift" of righteousness, unconditionally bestowed upon all men through Christ. Thus Dr. Summers says, "Representative theologians from the beginning until now, from

[Fletcher’s "Checks to Antinomianism" may well be called classic in Methodist theology. In his "Third Check" he sets forth the four degrees that make up a glorified saint’s eternal justification. These are (1) Infant justification; (2) Justification, or the pardon of actual sins, consequent upon believing; (3) The justification by works of St. James; and (4) Justification at the day of judgment

"All these degrees of justification," he says, "are equally merited by Christ. We do nothing in order to the first, because it finds us in a state of total death. Toward the second, we believe by the power freely given us in the first, and by the additional help of Christ’s word and the Spirit’s agency. we work by faith in order to the third. And we continue believing in Christ and working together with God, as we have opportunity, in order to the fourth

"The preaching distinctly these four degrees of a glorified saint’s justification is attended with peculiar advantages. The first justification engages the sinner 5 attention, encourages his hope, and draws his heart by love. The second wounds the self-righteous Pharisee, who works without believing, while it binds up the heart of the returning publican, who has no plea but ’God be merciful to me a sinner!’ The third detects the hypocrisy and blasts the vain hopes of all Antinomians, who, instead of ’showing their faith by their works, deny in works the Lord that bought them, and put him to an open shame.’ And while the fourth makes even a ’Felix tremble,’ it causes believers to ’pass the time of their sojourning here in humble fear’ and cheerful watchfulness

"Though all these degrees of justification meet in glorified saints, we offer violence to Scriptures if we think .... that they are inseparable. For all the wicked who ’quench the convincing Spirit,’ and are finally given up to a reprobate mind, fall from the first, as well as Pharaoh. All who ’receive the seed among thorns,’ all who ’do not forgive their fellow-servants,’ all who ’begin in the Spirit and end in the flesh, and all ’who draw back,’ and become sons and daughters of ’perdition,’ by falling from the third, lose the second and Hymenaeus, Philetus, and Demas. And none partake of the fourth but those who ’bear fruit unto perfection,’ according to one or another of the divine dispensations: ’some producing thirty-fold,’ like heathens, ’some sixty-fold,’ like Jews, and ’some a hundred-fold,’ like Christians

"From the whole it appears, that although we can do absolutely nothing toward our first justification, yet to say that neither faith nor works are required in order to the other three, is one of the boldest, most unscriptural, and most dangerous assertions in the world; which sets aside the best half of the Scriptures, and lets gross Antinomianism come in full tide upon the Church." - Fletcher, Works, I, pp.161, 162.]

Fletcher to Pope, have overthrown this fundamental teaching of Calvinism with the express statement of the Scriptures, setting over against the death-dealing first Adam the life-giving Second. If a decree of condemnation has been issued against original sin, irresponsibily derived from the first Adam, likewise a decree of justification has been issued from the same court, whose benefits are unconditionally bestowed through the Second Adam. 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 (Romans 5:18-19). The first member of each of these verses is fully balanced and reversed by the second member. Had not the intervention of the Second Adam been foreseen, universally making and constituting righteous all who were made and constituted sinners, Adam would never have been permitted to propagate his species, and the race would have been cut off in its sinning head" (Summers, Syst. Th., II, p.39). Thus the true Arminian position admits the full penalty of sin, and consequently neither minifies the exceeding sinfulness of sin, nor holds lightly the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ. It does so, however, not by denying the full force of the penalty, as do the semi-Pelagians, but by magnifying the sufficiency of the atonement,

[But the gift of righteousness to the race before the succession of its history began was of the nature of a provision to counteract the effects of sin, when original sin should become actual. It did not at once abolish the effects of the fall in the first pair, whose original sin was also in their case

actual transgression; it did not place them in a new probation, nor did it preclude the possibility of a future race of sinners. The great Atonement had now become necessary: as necessary to these parents of the race as it was after they had spread into countless multitudes. The Redeemer was already the Gift of God to man; but He was still "the coming One," as St. Paul once calls Him in relation to this very fact: making the first sinner the first type of the Saviour from sin. The Atonement does not put away sin in the sovereignty of arbitrary grace, but as the virtue of grace pardoning and healing all who believe. It began at once to build the house of a new humanity - a spiritual seed of the Second Adam - the first Adam being himself the first living stone of the new temple. And with reference to the life bestowed on this new race St. Paul strains language to show how much it superabounds, how much it surpasses the effect of the Fall. - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 56.] and the consequent communication of prevenient grace to all men through the headship of the last Adam The Natural and Federal Headship of Adam. Arminianism accepts both the natural and federal headship of Adam, but rejects the extreme length to which these positions have sometimes been carried. It holds with realism, to the solidarity of the race, but rejects the idea of personal participation in Adam's sin. It holds also that Adam was legally or federally the representative of the race, but it always holds this in connection with the natural headship of Christ. Natural headship may have its consequences in hereditary depravity, but in no sense can these consequences be sinful, unless they are regarded as operating under penalty. Legal consequences flow only from legal relations. This the Scriptures specifically declare. The locus classicus is Romans 5:12-19, which has already been discussed in some of its phases. Omitting the italicized words in the summary, we have the following: as by one offence, unto all men, to condemnation; even so, by one righteousness, unto all men, unto justification of life. Here the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are regarded as coextensive, the condemnation of the first being reversed by the righteousness of the second. St. Paul declares specifically that Adam was the figure of him that was to come (Romans 5:14). Adam being the type of ""the Coming One," his sin cannot be disjoined from the righteous obedience of Adam the Deliverer. "The redemption of man by Christ," says Wakefield, "was certainly not an afterthought, brought in upon man's apostasy. It was a provision, and when man

[As to the case of Adam and his adult descendants, it will be seen that all became liable to bodily death. Here was justice. But by means of the atonement, which effectually declares the justice of God, this sentence is reversed by a glorious resurrection. Again, when God, the fountain of spiritual life, withdrew himself from Adam, he died a spiritual death and became morally corrupt; and, as "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," all his posterity are in the same condition. Here is justice. But spiritual life visits man from another quarter and through other means. The second Adam "is a quickening Spirit." Through the atonement which He has made the Holy Spirit is given to man, that he may again infuse into his corrupt nature the heavenly life and regenerate and sanctify it. Here is mercy. And as to a future state, eternal life is promised to all who perseveringly believe in Christ, which reverses the sentence of eternal death. Here again, is the manifestation of mercy. - WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 294.] fell he found justice in hand with mercy. If we look at the subject in this light, every difficulty will be removed" (Wakefield, Chr. Th., p.294). The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world, and the atonement began when' sin began. The gospel was preached at the time the first sin was condemned; and the provision far exceeded the offense - for where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. Thus "original sin and original grace met in the mystery of mercy at the very gate of Paradise." The Nature of the Free Gift. What,

then, was the nature of this free gift, and what are the benefits from it which accrue to the race? We may broadly summarize these as follows: (1) The first benefit of the free gift was to preserve mankind from sinking below the p05sibility of redemption. It was the preservation of the race from utter destruction. Not only was the natural

[But for the interposition of the plan of redemption, no other result could have followed the first transgression, at least, so it seems evident in the light of rational thought, than the immediate death of the first pair. Temporal death, or the death of the body, would have terminated their existence, and the second death must have instantly ensued. That the death of the body would render propagation impossible is too evident to require distinct statement. Human nature being what it is, the idea that souls without bodies can be propagated is too preposterous for a moment's indulgence. The only conception admissible in the case, is that, but for redemption, the race would have become extinct in the persons of our parents. For being and its blessings all mankind are indebted to the garden agonies, to the crucifixion and death of our Lord Jesus Christ. Consciousness of thought, emotion, and volition, all the pleasures of knowledge, love and hope, all we are or may hope to be, all we have, and all we enjoy, are the purchase of our Savior's death. We are bought with a price, even the precious blood of the Son of God. Does any one conceive here an incongruity in calling existence a blessing, a gracious gift, the result of a benevolent interposition, in the case of those whose existence issues in eternal death? - RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, II, pp. 308, 309

It is well known that the Methodist doctrine of sin is greatly modified by her doctrine of the atonement and the universality of its grace. we have ever held the doctrine of a common native depravity; that this depravity is in itself a moral ruin; and that there is no power in us by nature unto a good life. But through a universal atonement there is a universal grace - the light and help of the Holy Spirit in every soul. If we are born with a corrupt nature in descent from Adam, we receive our existence under an economy of redemption, with a measure of the grace of Christ. With such grace, which shall receive increase on its proper use, we may turn unto the Lord and be saved. with these doctrines of native depravity and universal grace there is for every soul the profoundest lesson of personal responsibility for sin, and of the need of Christ in order to salvation and a good life. - Miley, Syst. Th., I, pp.532, 533.] image of man preserved, but the eternal sense of right and wrong, of good and evil were not effaced, and thus the moral image was in some sense shielded from violation. The fall was the utter ruin of nothing in our humanity; only the depravation of every faculty. The human mind retains the principles of truth; the heart the capacity for holy affections; the will its freedom, not yet the freedom of necessary evil. All this we owe to the Second Adam" (Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.52). (2) The second effect of the free gift was the reversal of the condemnation and the bestowal of a title to eternal life. Judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so also, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. Thus the condemnation which rested upon the race through Adam's sin is removed by the one oblation of Christ. By this we understand that no child of Adam is condemned eternally, either for the original offense, or its consequences. Thus we may say, that none are predestinated unconditionally to eternal damnation, and that culpability does not attach to original sin. We must believe that condemnation in the sense of the doom of the race, never passed beyond Adam and the unindividualized nature of man. It was arrested in Christ as regards every individual, and thereby changed into a conditional sentence. Man is not now condemned for the depravity of his own

nature, although that depravity is of the essence of sin; its culpability we maintain, was removed by the free gift in Christ. Man is condemned solely for his own transgressions. The free gift removed the original condemnation and abounds unto many offenses. Man becomes amenable for the depravity of his heart, only when rejecting the remedy for it, he consciously ratifies it as his own, with all its penal consequences. (3) The free gift was the restoration of

[The doctrine of natural depravity affirms the total inability of man to turn himself to faith and calling upon God. This being postulated, the affirmation that all have a fair probation involves the doctrine of a gracious influence unconditionally secured as the common inheritance of the race: this gracious influence is so secured; the same blood that purchased for mankind a conscious existence procured for them all grace needful for the responsibilities of that existence. - Raymond, Syst. Th., II, p. 316.] the Holy Spirit to the race; not in the sense of the spirit of life in regeneration; or the spirit of holiness in entire sanctification, but as the spirit of awakening and conviction. We have seen that depravity is twofold - the absence of original righteousness, and a bias or tendency toward sin as a consequence of this deprivation. Both of these have their origin in the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit as the original bond of union between the soul and God. Hence the Spirit was as surely given back to the race as the atonement was given to it, that is, as a provisional discipline for the fuller grace of redemption The Mitigation of Inherited Depravity. The free gift has important bearings upon the question of original sin, and serves to reconcile some of the apparent contradictions in Arminian theology. Thus, both the earlier and later Arminians maintain that Adam’s posterity are not to be held accountable for his sin, but they do it in very different ways. Earlier Arminianism holds that Adam’s descendants came under the full penalty of his sin, that is, death, temporal, spiritual and eternal. But they hold that this penalty was remitted by the free gift imparted to all men as a first benefit of the atonement, made by the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The later Arminians with their Pelagianizing tendencies, reach the same result but in a less scriptural manner, by denying that the consequences of Adam’s sin are penal in nature. The same apparent contradiction is seen in the different views as to the nature of inherited depravity. Both earlier and later Armimanism hold that guilt in the sense of culpability or demerit, does not attach

[The Scriptures affirm that there remains in man, after conversion, what is called "the flesh," the "old man," "carnality," "wrath" - inherited predisposition - some call this predisposition, "tendency to evil," but it is evidently more; the apostle calls it "the body of sin."-Dr. P. F. Bresee, Sermon: Death and Life

Mr. Watson in speaking of the rejection of the remedy for sin, has this to say: "Should this be rejected, he stands liable to the whole penalty, to the punishment of loss as to the natural consequence of his corrupted nature which renders him unfit for heaven: to the punishment of even pain for the original offense, we may also without injustice, say, as to an adult, whose actual transgressions, when the means of deliverance have been afforded him by Christ, is consenting to all rebellion against God, and to that of Adam himself; and to the penalty of his own actual transgressions, aggravated by his having made light of the gospel." - WATSON, Institutes, II, p. 57.] to it. Herein, the Arminian is distinguished from the Calvinist. But earlier Arminianism holds that inherited depravity is of the nature of sin, and that guilt originally attached to it, but was remitted by the free gift. Later Arminianism regards inherited depravity as merely natural heredity without demerit or culpability. Again, earlier Armimanism regards man as unable of himself to faith

and calling upon God, but it regards this lack of natural ability as restored in the form of a gracious ability ORIGINAL SIN IN ITS GENERAL RELATIONS

We have seen that the connection between original sin and the Christian doctrine of salvation is fundamental and universal. The sin of Adam, its consequences for the race, the atonement in Christ and the grace of the Spirit are inextricably bound up together. Whatever the position which is taken toward one, whether theological or practical, affects all. Several general questions arise which must be given consideration: (1) What is the moral condition of man at birth; (2) In what sense is he in bondage to sin; (3) Is it possible to know the carnal mind apart from its manifestations; and (4) What is the difference between original sin and human infirmity? The Corrupt Nature of Man. Man’s nature as he is born into the world is corrupt, is very far gone from original righteousness, is averse to God, is without spiritual life, is inclined to evil, and that continually. However, for this depraved nature he is not responsible, and hence no guilt or demerit attaches to it. This is not because depravity is uncondemnable, but because through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the free gift reversed the penalty as a consequence of the universal atonement. We hold, therefore, as truly as later Arminianism, that man as he comes into the world is not guilty of inbred sin. He becomes responsible for it, only when having rejected the remedy provided by atoning blood, he ratifies it as his own. We may say the same concerning free agency. All who will may turn from sin to righteousness, believe on Jesus Christ for pardon and cleansing from sin, and follow good works pleasing and acceptable in His sight. This free agency, however, is not mere natural ability, it is gracious ability. "Through the fall of Adam, man became depraved, so that he cannot now turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and works to faith and calling upon God; but the grace of God through Jesus Christ is freely bestowed upon all men." Mr. Wesley calls attention to the fact that redemption was coeval with the fall. "Allowing that all the souls of men are dead by nature, that excuses none, seeing there is no man that is in a state of mere nature; there is no man, unless he has quenched the Spirit, that is wholly devoid of the grace of God" (Wesley, Sermon: On Working Out Our Own Salvation) The Bondage of Inbred Sin. The nature of inbred sin is that of a bondage of the higher nature to the lower. This lower nature in its entire being - body, soul and spirit - is called by St. Paul, the flesh or sarx (sarx). In this sense, the "flesh" is the nature of man separated from God and become subject to the creature. That is, the Self or autos ego (autoV egw) is without God, but only in the sense of being without Him as God: and being without God, it is in the world as a false sphere of life and enjoyment. This position which regards the flesh as depraved humanity enslaved to sense, is closely allied to the idea of concupiscence. In fact, St. Paul speaks of its working all manner of concupiscence (Romans 7:8). He further declares that the one spiritual agent has the power to will, but is not able to carry this will into effect. Consequently there is impotence to good. "Therefore the one personality has a double character: the inward man of the mind, to which to will is present, and the flesh or the body of sin, in which how to perform that which is good I find not. But the one person, to whom these opposite elements belong - an inner man, a reason, a will to good; a carnal bias, an outer man, a slavery to evil - is behind all these, behind even the inner man. And in him, in the inmost secret of his nature, is the original vice which gives birth to these

Contradictions....It teaches most distinctly the freedom of the will, and at the same time the inability of man to do what is good. The harmony of these seeming opposites is most manifest; the faculty of willing is untouched in any case, and the influence of conscience prompts it to will the right; but

this is bound up with a miserable impotence to good, and results in both a natural and moral inability to do what the law of God requires" (Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 66, 67)

Filthiness of the Flesh and Spirit. St. Paul makes it clear, that in addition to the works of the flesh which are manifest (Galatians 5:19), there is also a secret filthiness of the flesh and spirit, which exists as the fountainhead or source of these outward carnal manifestations. He therefore urges the disciples to cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Corinthians 7:1). Inbred sin as a principle can be known only through its personal and actual manifestation. Failure to remember this sometimes leads to confusion in the experience of those who seek deliverance from it. They see the "depths of pride, self-will and hell" in their own hearts through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, but they see it in the light of its past manifestations. This only do they see, that the works of the

[The Spirit’s universal influence qualifies original sin as He is in every responsible soul a Remembrancer of a forfeited estate, the Prompter to feel after God and regain that communion which all history proves to be an inextinguishable yearning of mankind. He suffers not the spirit of man to forget its great loss. It is through this preliminary universal influence that guilt is naturally in man ashamed of its deformity....But conscience suggests the thought, at least in man, of recovery; and the same Spirit who moves toward God in conscience, through fear and hope, universally touches the secret springs of the will. Original sin is utter powerlessness to good; it is in itself a hard and absolute captivity. But it is not left to itself. When the apostle says that the Gentiles have the law written in their hearts, and in conscience measure their conduct by that standard, and may do by nature the things contained in the law, he teaches us plainly that in the inmost recesses of nature there is the secret mystery of grace which, if not resisted and quenched, prompts the soul to feel after God, and gives it those secret, inexplicable beginnings of the movement toward good which fuller grace lays hold on. In fact, the very capacity of salvation proves that the inborn sinfulness of man has been in some degree restrained; that its tendency to absolute evil has been checked; and that natural ability and moral ability - to use the language of controversy - are one through the mysterious operation of a grace behind all human evil. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p.60.] flesh having been put off in conversion, there still remains the necessity of crucifying the flesh itself, that is, the carnal nature with its sinful tendencies and out-reachings. They that are Christ’s, in the full New Covenant sense, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts (Galatians 5:24)

Depravity and Infirmity. One more consideration demands our attention. We have seen that the ""flesh" as St. Paul uses the term, includes both the spiritual and physical nature as under the reign of sin. The corruption extends to the body as well as the soul. The depravity of his spiritual nature may be removed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, but the infirmities of flesh will be removed only in the resurrection and glorification of the body. Man in a general way has no difficulty in distinguishing between the soul and the body, but the fine line of demarcation, the exact arresting point between the spiritual and the physical, cannot be determined. Could we but know where this line of distinction lies, we could with ease distinguish between carnal manifestations which have their seat wholly in the soul, and physical infirmities which attach to his physical constitution still under the reign of sin. We are told that the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. Since mental strain often weakens the physical constitution, and physical weakness in turn clouds the mind and spirit of man, there is ever

needful, a spirit of charity toward all men

Fallen human nature is flesh or sarx: the whole being of man, body and soul, soul and spirit, separated from God, and subjected to the creature....The disturbance in the very essence of human nature may be regarded as affecting the entire personality of man as a spirit acting in a body. He is born with a nature which is - apart both from the external Evil One and from the external renewing power of the New Creation - under the bondage of sin. That bondage may be regarded with reference to the lower nature that enslaves the higher, and the higher nature that is enslaved. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 65

19. Chapter 20 – CHRISTOLOGY

Chapter 20 - CHRISTOLOGY In approaching the subject of Christology, we may be permitted to emphasize the fact, that in this department we reach the very heart of Christianity. Here will be found those distinctive doctrines which mark Christianity as unique and universal; and which set it over against the ethnic religions in all of their forms. In our discussion of Religion, we pointed out the twofold ground of distinction between Christianity and the pagan religions as lying, first, in the difference of ethical quality; and second, in the character of the Founder. St. Paul recognized whatever of truth the ethnic religions contained, but condemned them because of their low moral tone. They were untrue to the creature, and untrue to the Creator. By way of anticipation also, we pointed out the superiority of Christianity as being founded by Jesus Christ, the Son of the only true and living God; and as being a religion of redemptive power and inward life. We are now to consider the distinctive doctrines of Christ in a more extended and critical manner

Christology (Cpistou logoV),is that department of theology which deals with the Person of Christ as the Redeemer of mankind. The subject is sometimes enlarged to include both the Person and Work of Christ; but in general the term Soteriology is applied to the latter, and the term Christology limited to the former. The Adevent of Christ is the central fact of all history, and with it is bound up the whole work of creation and redemption. Through Him, God sustains a twofold relation to mankind - one constituted by the creative Word in forming man after His own image; the other, as a consequence of sin having entered the world through the temptation and fall of Adam. A proper conception of the Advent, therefore, involves the two terms, God and man, and their reciprocal relations) As the Advent cannot be referred to God alone, or to man alone, so it may not be referred to merely legal and external relations existing between them. We must view it as an incarnation, in which God and man are conjoined in one Person - the eternal Son. In purpose it antedates, not only the fall of man and of angels, but the very beginning of the creative process. The cosmos included in its consummation the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. In the very heart of God, is to be found that sacrificial love which gave the Son to be the propitiation for our sins. "Amongst all the works God intended before time, and in time effected," said Archbishop Leighton, ""this is the masterpiece that is here said to be foreordained, the manifesting of God in the flesh for man’s redemption." As the doctrine of the Trinity is implicit in the Old Testament, so in the same manner, there is an Old Testament Christology. Thus, Abraham saw my day, and was glad (John 8:56). Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see (Matthew 13:17). The prophets.... searched diligently... what the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow (1 Peter 1:10-12). Only in the New Testament were these mysteries fully revealed. The Old Testament, therefore, must be viewed in the light of a preparatory economy, which comes to its perfect fulfillment in Christ. In the words of Dr. Schaff, "Genuine Judaism lived for Christianity and died with the birth of Christianity." We may note two lines of development - one objective and divine, the other subjective and human

First, there is the objective fact of Divine Revelation. In the protevangelium, (Genesis 3:15) the promise that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head is as broad as the human race. Perhaps it was for this reason that the title "Son of man" was so frequently used by our Lord. Following this there was throughout the course of history added revelations, each in some sense an advent or a coming to God to His people. There was the Abrahamic covenant, in which God selected a people with whom He established personal communion, and through whom the promised Seed should come. Following this was the law given by Moses, which quickened the sense of sin and guilt. It served also as a tutor to bring men to a felt need for One who should be a propitiation for sin. Thus the community originated by the Abrahamic covenant, and taught by this higher revelation, was gradually transformed into a ""peculiar people" (Deuteronomy 14:2; Deuteronomy 26:18-19; 1 Peter 2:9) with a nobler conception of the holiness of God, a deeper sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and a new prophetic hope. They were, as St. Paul declares, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith (Galatians 3:23-24). But Israel failed to grasp the spiritual significance of the law and contented themselves with external forms and ceremonial washings. Only the ""remnant" understood its spiritual import, but out of this remnant the prophets arose. Prophetism in Israel was a distinct and far-reaching force. The prophets cultivated the Messianic hope and pointed the way to a new spiritual order. This prophetic line found its culmination and completion in John the Baptist, of whom our Lord said, There hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist. . . . for all the prophets and the law prophesied until John (Matthew 11:11; Matthew 11:13). Immediately preceding the birth of Jesus prophetism had been reduced to a small, apocalyptic circle - Zacharias and Elisabeth, Joseph and Mary, Simeon the aged and Anna the prophetess - all of whom waited for the consolation of Israel

Second, there is the subjective factor of human submission. Divine revelation is in some sense conditioned by the passive element of human receptivity. As the prophetic order culminated in John, so human submissiveness and trust found its highest Old Testament expression in Mary - the ""highly favored" one of Israel, and blessed among women (Luke 1:28). The character of Mary as it appears in the Gospel accounts is thus summarized by Dr. Gerhart: "Childlike simplicity is united with divine faith, holy self-surrender with womanly innocence, virgin purity with an obedient will. We detect a consciousness of spotless chastity, but no maiden prudery; a perception of the wonderful in the Annunciation, but no ecstatic excitement; a sense of extraordinary dignity of her vocation, but no proud elation; a deep joy, but no self-forgetfulness; an unwonted silence, but no fear; a becoming thoughtfulness, but no unbelief or doubt. The providence of God had in the process and through the conflicts of Messianic history formed a woman who by her moral and spiritual elevation was capable of becoming the mother of the ideal Man" (Gerhart, Inst. Chr. Relig., II, p.201). It was in Mary, therefore, that the protevangelium given in Eden came to its fulfillment through the grace of the covenant. This Mary recognized in the Magnificat, when she declared that he hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed forever (Luke 1:54-55). It is applied directly to Christ by St. Paul, Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ (Galatians 3:16). The nature of this covenant is given its spiritual interpretation by Zacharias in the Benedictus, The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of

our life (Luke 1:73-74). The announcement of the Advent to Joseph in the words, She shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins (Matthew 1:21), is by St. Matthew interpreted as a fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us (Matthew 1:23, Isaiah 7:14) The study of Christology is best approached through its presentation in the Holy Scriptures, where the great events in the life of Christ are viewed in the light of the theological significance which attaches to them. Following this, the development of Christology in the Church will be considered, as furnishing the broad outlines under which the subject must be treated, and the dangers with which it is confronted. We shall then in this chapter consider (I) The Scriptural Approach to Christology; and (II) The Development of Christology in the Church THE SCRIPTURAL APPROACH TO CHRISTOLOGY The events in the life of Christ, which will be considered in their theological significance, are as follows: (1) The Miraculous Conception and Birth; (2) The Circumcision; (3) The Normal Development of Jesus; (4) The Baptism; (5) The Temptation; (6) The Obedience of Christ, (7) His Passion and Death. The Descensus, the Resurrection, the Ascension and the Session, will be best considered in connection with His state of exaltation The Miraculous Conception and Birth. The account of the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus is given in the Gospel of Matthew as an exhibition of the fulfillment of prophecy, and in the Gospel of Luke as a fundamental historical fact in the work of redemption. This fact has been strongly assailed at times, but the preexistence of Christ demands it. Nor is it a matter of indifference as some have asserted, for its denial would reduce Christ to the level of a human being, and involve His person in the sin of the race. Those who deny the Virgin Birth involve themselves in greater problems than those who admit its miraculous nature. The appearance of Christ in the midst of history as the one and only sinless Being, cannot be explained except on the Scriptural basis that the Son of God became man (John 1:14). It is for this reason that the Church affirms that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. From the human viewpoint, Mary conceives according

[Bishop Pearson states that "As the Holy Ghost did not frame the human nature of Christ out of His own substance; so must we not believe that He formed any part of His flesh of any other substance than of the Virgin. For certainly He was of the fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the son of David and Abraham" - Pearson, On the Creed, p. 253.] to the natural law of motherhood but by miraculous agency, and thereby imparts to her child the same organic constitution which she possessed. Furthermore, the child was conceived with all the essential properties of original humanity, the accidental quality of sin in the fallen Adamic race being excluded. Sin is not an essential element of human nature, but an alien principle which falsifies the beginning of individual life (Psalms 51:5), and brings men into bondage through the law of sin and death which is in their members (Romans 7:23) But to establish the real and sinless humanity of Jesus, affirms but one aspect of the mystery of His person. His conception was also the assumption of human nature by the divine Son. As Hooker expressed it, "'The flesh and the conjunction of the flesh was but one act" (Hooker, Eccl. Pol., Bk. 5, chaps. 52, 53). It is for this reason that the Scripture speaks of the new being as "that holy thing" which was to be born; implying thereby that a change was to be wrought in the very constitution of humanity. Jesus was not, therefore, merely the origin of a new individual in the race, but a pre-existent One coming into the race from above; He was not merely another individualization of human nature, but the conjoining of the divine and human natures in a new order of being - a theanthropic person. The

instant human nature is conjoined with God in the person of Jesus it becomes a redeemed nature, and furnishes the principle of regeneration for fallen mankind. In Jesus there is the birth of a new order of humanity, a new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness (Ephesians 4:24). Hence in the person of Jesus Christ is to be found the ground of His mediatorial work, the principle of ""eternal life" which through the Spirit is given to all who believe in Him The Circumcision. The rite of circumcision marked the official induction of a Jewish child into the blessing of the Abrahamic covenant. Jesus was therefore, in conformity to the Levitical law, circumcised on the eighth day (Luke 2:21). By His birth of the Virgin Mary, Jesus partook of the common human nature and was therefore the seed of David according to the flesh (Romans 1:3) But He partook also of the life of the race as it had been elevated and disciplined through the Abrahamic covenant. Consequently He was not only the "seed of David," but also the "seed of Abraham." For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. And as the promise to Abraham included the gift of the Spirit (cf. Hebrews 7:6 and Galatians 3:14); St. Paul affirms further, that He was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead (Romans 1:4). The significance of these scriptures lies just here, that final perfection is not attainable through the kingdom of nature, but through the kingdom of grace. While the humanity of Jesus was spotless, and in some true sense already redeemed in the person of Christ, it was not true in the application of redemption to mankind apart from the incarnation. It could not, therefore, be the final perfecting of the Son for His redemptive office. It should be recalled that the promise to Abraham was that in Isaac shall thy seed be called (Genesis 21:12). And although Isaac was the child of promise, prefiguring the birth of Christ, yet that promise was not made to Isaac after the flesh, but only when in a figure he had been received again from the dead. Hence St. Paul asserts that he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also....For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith (Romans 4:11; Romans 4:13) But a sound Christology must hold that for Jesus circumcision was something more than an empty religious rite, devoid of meaning and spiritual power. For Him it was a covenant of grace, in which God’s relation to man and man’s relation to God was lifted to a unique and exalted level. It was for Him the communion of two natures in one Person - the divine and the human. Hence in this exalted communion with the Father through the Spirit, it was possible for the child Jesus to pass from the spotlessness and purity of His childhood, through perfect youth to an uncorrupted and undefiled manhood. In Him unconscious innocence was transformed into conscious obedience; and the holiness of His nature never knew either the contamination or experience of sin. We may say, then, that the personal fellowship of God with man promised in Abraham, received its perfect fulfillment in Christ without error or deficiency; and hence we read that Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man (Luke 2:52) The Normal Development of Jesus. We must regard that portion of life of Jesus from the circumcision to the baptism, a period of about thirty years as one of preparation for His great mediatorial work. Aside from the account of the visit to Jerusalem when Jesus became a child of the law, the Scriptures are silent; but we must not thereby assume that it was a period of inactivity. It must have been one of physical, ethical and spiritual development, for when our Lord took on Him our manhood, He took it under the law of natural development common to human nature. He

might have taken it with all the glory of the Transfiguration, but He chose instead to take into communion with Himself the germ of all that is called man; that in Him human nature might unfold apart from sin, and consequently through the resurrection and ascension be brought to its glorious perfection. Early in the history of the Church Irenæus wrote that Christ ""did not despise or evade any condition of humanity, nor set aside in Himself that law which He had appointed for the human race, but sanctified every age, by that period corresponding to it which belonged to Himself. For He came to save all through means of Himself, infants, and children, and boys, and youth, and old men....At last He came on to death itself, that He might be "the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence,' The Prince of life, existing before all and going before all."

There are two passages in the Gospel of Luke which refer to the growth and development of Jesus, one to His childhood (Luke 1:80), and one to His youth as a ""son of the law" (Luke 2:52). Dr. Gerhart points out that in the first passage the child is represented as being passive and receptive rather than active. The child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom [or becoming full of wisdom]: and the grace of God was upon him (Luke 2:40). In the second it is stated that he "increased" or "advanced" in wisdom implying that this was a personal advance, due to the free action of His own powers. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man (Luke 2:52). It should be further noted that in the first text the progress is from the physical to the spiritual; while in the second the order is reversed (cf. Gerhardt, Inst. of Chr. Relig., II, p. 233ff). We must conclude that the uniqueness of Jesus as it concerns His growth and development, lies in this, that it was the unfolding of a pure and normal human nature apart from sin. In ordinary childhood there is the disintegrating force of inherited depravity, the bias due to sin and hence its development can never be wholly normal. But Jesus had none of the vitiating consequences of inbred sin. The outward pressures He must have felt, but in His being there were no alien forces, no biased dispositions. Under the tuition of the Holy Spirit, and in spiritual communion with the Father, His development was pre-eminently perfect The Baptism. The baptism of Jesus was His official induction into the office of the Messiah or Christ. As in the case of the circumcision, this rite was not merely a form devoid of significance, but marks the official beginning of His mediatorial ministry. Here again the objective and subjective lines of development come together in the one Mediator, the latter in the consecration of his perfect and mature manhood to the vocation of the Christ, the former in God’s acceptance of the offering and the official anointing bestowed upon Him. In the circumcision, Christ had unconsciously submitted to the imputation of sin, now in conscious obedience to the will of God He becomes the Representative of sinful mankind. Thus as He stood with the multitude awaiting baptism, the prophecy of Isaiah was fulfilled, He was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors (Isaiah 53:12). Having fulfilled all righteousness as required by the law (Matthew 3:15), Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased (Matthew 3:16-17). Here is the divine attestation to the Messiahship of Jesus, an attestation that sin had nothing in Him except as imputed to Him. Here also is the official anointing of the Spirit by which He was consecrated to the holy office of Mediator. One thing only remained, the prophet who was to prepare the way of the Highest must officially announce to the world His assumption of the office. This He did in words vitally related to the voluntary consecration of Jesus as the representative of sinners. when, therefore, he cried,

Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world (John 1:29), he officially announced the death of Jesus as a vicarious atonement for all sin The Temptation. The temptation of Jesus was a necessity of the mediatorial economy, and like the baptism, was of universal import. Two factors are involved. First, Jesus must personally triumph over sin by voluntary opposition to it, before He could become the Author of life to others. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering (Hebrews 2:10). Second, He must not only conquer for Himse1f, but He must secure dignity and strength for His kingdom For this reason He became partaker of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage (Hebrews 2:14-15). When, therefore, the Spirit "driveth" Him into the wilderness, this extreme urgency must imply that the temptation was an essential element in His mediatorial work The temptation was both external and internal. It was external in that it originated outside and apart from Himself. It was not merely a confusion of cross purposes in His own mind. He was confronted by a personality representing the kingdom of evil. The evangelists seem to indicate that since the first Adam was tempted on the threefold level of physical, intellectual and spiritual evil, the last Adam must be likewise tested. As the failure of the first found its issue in the spirit of the world, which St. John interprets as the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life (1 John 2:16); so the triumph of the last issued in life and light and love which were to form the basic principles of the new kingdom. Internally, the temptation was a conscious pressure in the direction of evil. We must believe that Christ felt the full force of the suggestions of Satan, but the Gospels tell us that He repelled them immediately, relying for His strength upon the firm foundation of the truth as "it is written" in the Scriptures The temptation is closely connected also with another question - that of the peccability or impeccability of Jesus. Was it possible for Jesus to sin; and if not, how could He have been tempted? The question is purely academic. It rests upon a misapprehension of the theanthropic Person who conjoins in Himself the two natures - human and divine. It is an attempt to consider the natures separately and apart from the one Person. Unless there be first a tacit assent to the Nestorian position that two persons are conjoined in affiliation, instead of two natures in one inseparable union, the problem cannot arise. The two natures being conjoined in one Person, peccability as attaching to the human nature, and impeccability as a property of the divine nature, are complements of each other-much in the manner as finiteness and infinity, or time and eternity. The former is a metaphysical principle limited solely to the self-determination belonging to personality; while the latter is an ethical fact grounded in the divine nature. "He could not do wrong because He would not," says Dr. Gerhart. "It is, however, more scriptural and more philosophical to express the thought thus: wrong He could neither do nor will, because He constantly willed, and effectually willed to do the right. The ethical impossibility to commit sin is mightier and more ennobling than the physical impossibility. The physical finds its complement in the ethical" (Gerhart, Inst. Chr. Relig., II, p.258). We may confidently affirm, then, that the peccability of Jesus was limited solely to the metaphysical autonomy of His own will, without which He would have been merely an automaton and incapable of voluntary sinlessness; while the impeccability lay in His positive ethical character. He was, as to His humanity, created in righteousness and true holiness. He said of Himself, I am the way, the truth, and the life (John 14:6). The eternal principles of truth, righteousness and holiness, being relative in man may be superseded; but being absolute in God, they can never be transmuted into unrighteousness and

sin. Jesus Christ was not only the embodiment of truth, He was the truth; He was not only accepted as righteous, He was righteous; He was not only relatively holy, He was that holy thing which was born to be the Redeemer of mankind The Passion and Death of Christ. The perfected humiliation of Christ is to be found in the circumstances of His death on the cross. This marks the fulfillment of His perfect obedience. It is evident that no sharp line of demarcation can be drawn between Christ's active and passive righteousness, for even his death was the consequence of His own free determination. Of His own life He said, No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father (John 10:18). While the sufferings of Christ may be distinguished from the precise manner of His death, the death itself cannot be separated from the crucifixion. He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Php 2:8). "Hence the cross was to our High Priest simply the awful form which His altar assumed. His own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24). Isaac as "the most affecting type of the Eternal Son incarnate bore the wood on his shoulders to his Calvary, and that wood became the altar on which in a figure he was slain, and from which in a figure he was raised again....But, while the cross on which human malignity slew the Holy One is really the altar on which He offered Himself, and we forget the tree in the altar into which it was transformed, the cross still remains as the sacred expression of the curse which fell upon human sin as represented by the Just One. For he made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 162). The passion and death of Jesus furnished the ground for His redemptive work, and will be considered further in our study of the Atonement

It is a significant fact that St. Luke in his introduction to the Acts, speaks of his former work as comprehending all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up. He thus limits the earthly life of Jesus, not by His death but by His ascension. The descensus, the resurrection and the ascension are but events in the life of the Eternal One. The state of humiliation ended with the cry on the cross, It is finished and His death which immediately followed. The events above mentioned - the descensus, the resurrection, the ascension and the session - will be treated in connection with the state of exaltation THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTOLOGY IN THE CHURCH

Since the subject of Christology is closely related to that of the Trinity, we need not refer at this time to those controversies by which the deity of Christ as the second Person of the Trinity was firmly established. Following the Trinitarian controversies however, another series arose, which were concerned especially with the integrity of the two natures and their union in the one Person. After a brief review of the Primitive Period, we shall consider the subject under the threefold division of Nicene, Chalcedonian and Ecumenical Christology The Primitive Period. This period includes the thought of the Ante-Nicene fathers, from the earliest times to the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.); and is concerned primarily with the reality of the two natures in Christ

1. The Ebionites denied the reality of the divine nature Christ. This Jewish sect is said to have derived its name from the Hebrew word meaning "poor," which is presumed to be a reference to the poverty so characteristic of the Church at Jerusalem. They accepted the Messiahship of Jesus but rejected His deity, maintaining that at the time of His baptism an unmeasured fullness of the Spirit was given to him, thereby consecrating Him to the Messianic office

2. The Docetæ take their name from the Greek word dokew which means "to seem" or "to appear." As a sect they were greatly influenced by Gnosticism and Manichæism, and therefore denied the reality of Christ's body. Since Gnosticism held that matter is essentially evil, they argued that Christ's body must have been merely a phantasm or appearance. Ebionism was the result of the influence of Judaism on Christianity, Docetism the result of the influence pagan philosophy The Nicene Christology. The Nicene Christology dates from the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) to about 381 A.D. or the time of the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople. Following this, controversies arose which demanded a further statement which was made at Chalcedon. The Nicene Christology was the outgrowth of the Arian and Semi-Arian controversies which for more than half a century agitated the eastern church. Arianism as it affected the trinitarian conception of God has already been discussed, but it had important bearings on Christology also and these must now be given consideration. Anus was a disciple of Lucian of Antioch. Lucian in turn, was a disciple of Paul of Samosata, but differed radically from the views of his master. He attempted to combine the adoptianism of Paul, his master, with the Logos Christology which Paul opposed. Hence he regarded Christ as an incarnation of a previously existent being - the Logos; but this Logos was an intermediate creature, and of another nature than either God or man. Anus accepted this doctrine and thereby came into conflict with Alexander, his bishop, the result being one of the most subtle and bitter controversies in church history. But the church saw and rejected his teaching which substituted an intermediate creature for the true deity of Christ. The Semi-Arians attempted a mediation between the heter-ousia of the Arians who regarded Christ as of a different nature, and the homo-ousia of the Athanasians who regarded Him as of the same nature of God. They affirmed a homoi-ousia, or like essence of Christ with the Father, but denied His numerical essence and therefore His proper deity. In opposition to these heresies the Council of Nicea was convened by Constantine, which affirmed the deity of the Son, and after a further struggle, reaffirmed it at the Second Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople in 381 A.D. The statement as found in the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed is terse, but has become the standard of the orthodox faith since that time. The text is as follows: (We believe) "in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father: by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." The Chalcedonian Christology. While the Council of Nicea affirmed the Deity of Christ, it left the question of His humanity unsolved. Athanasius had taken for granted that Christ was truly man as well as truly God, and in the controversy had neglected the problem of the two natures. When the question of the Deity of Christ was solved by conciliar action, the problem of His humanity became even more insistent. The Chalcedonian Christology, therefore, is the answer to three heresies, all of which were concerned with the constitution of the theanthropic Person, (1) Apollinarianism; (2) Nestorianism; and (3) Eutychianism

1. Apollinarianism was the first heresy which confronted the church during this period. Apollinaris (d. 390), Bishop of Laodicea, was one of the most learned men in the ancient church. He argued that if Christ possessed a rational human soul, He could not be truly God incarnate, but merely a God-inspired man. Otherwise one of two things would follow as a necessary consequence, either He must retain a separate will, in which case His manhood would not be truly united with the Godhead; or, the human soul would be deprived of its own proper liberty through union with the

divine Word. He took the position that the divine Logos in becoming incarnate took on human nature, but not a human personality. On the basis of the Platonic trichotomy which he later held, he ascribed to Christ a human body (swma), and an animal soul (yuch alogoV), but not a human spirit or rational soul, (yuch logikh or pneuma). Instead, he held that the divine Logos took the place of the human spirit, thus uniting with soul and body to form a divine-human being, or the one theanthropic nature. He maintained that the active personal element in Jesus was divine, and the passive was composed of the human body and soul. While this position provided for both the fusion of the divine and human natures, and for the deification of human nature as required by the realistic theory of redemption, it was felt by the Church that Apollinaris had sacrificed the true humanity of Jesus in order to maintain His deity. As in the case of Arianism, Basil and the two Gregories opposed Apollinaris but offered no clear statement of their own. The chief opposition came from the Antiochan school which was represented at that time by Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia - the latter being regarded as one of the great exegetes of the Church. The interest of the Antiochan school being primarily ethical, its representatives looked upon Christ as a moral example, meeting and overcoming temptation, and therefore building up a character of His own - an ethical holiness. This He could not have done, had He not been completely human as well as perfectly divine. They therefore insisted that Christ must have had a genuine human personality, with freedom of the will and an independent moral character. Furthermore, they insisted that the human nature of Christ could not be merely impersonal nature apart from the rational soul, nor even human nature personalized by the divine Logos. The error of Apollinarianism lay in the fact that it presented a defective human nature in Christ, and was condemned at the Second Ecumenical Council, held in Constantinople, 381 A.D

2. Nestorianism was the second great heresy of this period. The Antiochan theologians in their opposition to Apollinarianism, seemed to develop the doctrine of two persons in Christ - one the divine Logos, the other the human Jesus. Each of these they regarded as a perfect and complete personality. The Logos, they claimed, dwelt in man but did not become man. They especially objected to that form of union between the divine and the human which precluded any development in the person of Christ. Theodore went so far as to declare that the divine Logos and the human Jesus lived in perfect harmony with each other, not because of compulsion but by free choice. The controversy reached its climax when Nestorius became patriarch of Constantinople (428 A.D.); and while his teaching was no different from that of Theodore, his name became connected with the heresy because of the leading part which he took in the controversy. Nestorius attacked the Alexandrians for what he called their Apollinarianism. He objected especially to the word Theotokos or "Mother of God" which they applied to the Virgin Mary. The term was in common use among the Alexandrians and was also being used in Constantinople. Nestorius maintained the full deity of Christ and also His perfect humanity; but he regarded these rather as a loose connection or affinity than as an indissoluble union. The chief opponents of Nestorianism were found in the Alexandrian School, especially Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria (412-444 A.D.), who resolutely supported the Theotokos. The controversy was bitter, and aggravated further by court intrigue. The emperor Theodosius endeavored to appease the parties by convening the general council of Ephesus (431 A.D.). This council, however, under the influence of Cyril, hastily condemned the doctrines of the Nestorians without waiting for the arr4val of the Roman and Syrian delegates. When John, archbishop of Antioch, arrived with his delegation, they followed the example of Cyril and called a rival council, at which Cyril was condemned and the doctrines of the

Nestorians approved. That peace might be restored, a so-called "union symbol" was prepared and signed by both Cyril and the Antiochans. In order to satisfy the Antiochans, Apollinarianism was condemned; while Cyril secured the recognition of the Theotokos, the one Person and the two natures. The formula, however, was very elastic, and each party interpreted it in its own peculiar manner. The union symbol is commonly known as the creed of Antioch, and is attributed to Theodoret of Cyrrhus (433 A.D.)

3. Eutychianism was the third and last Christological heresy of this period. It took its name from Eutyches, who at that time (444 A.D.) was the head of a monastery in Constantinople; and is a revival of the older Christology, in which the divine nature was so emphasized by the Alexandrians, as to make it a docetic absorption of His human nature. The ""union symbol" or Creed of Antioch which was intended to reconcile the

[The Creed of Antioch is as follows: "we, therefore, acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Only-begotten, complete God and complete man, of a rational soul and body; begotten of the Father before the ages according to (His) divinity, but in these last days . . . . of Mary the virgin according to (His) humanity. For a union of the two natures has taken place; wherefore, we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. In accordance with this conception of the unconfounded union, we acknowledge the holy Virgin to be the mother of God, because the divine Logos was made flesh and became man, and from her conception united with himself the temple received from her. We recognize the evangelical and apostolic utterances concerning the Lord, making the characters of the divine Logos and the man common as being in one person, but distinguishing them as two natures, and teaching that the godlike traits are according to the divinity of Christ, and the humble traits according to His humanity" (cf. Seeburg, Textbook in the History of Doctrines, p. 266).]

Antiochan and Alexandrian schools was but a weak compromise, and resulted in further confusion. Eutyches taught that "after God the Word became man, that is, after the birth of Jesus, there was but one nature to be worshiped, that of God, who was incarnate and made man." It will be seen that this position is the direct opposite of that held by the Nestorians. Nestorianism preserved its belief in the distinctness of the two natures at the expense of the one person; Eutychianism maintained its belief in the unity of Christ’s person at the sacrifice of the two natures. The absorption of the human by the divine was carried to such extreme length as to be in effect, a deification of human nature, even the human body. Hence the Eutychians held that it was permissible to use such expressions as "God was born," "God suffered," and "God died." Eutyches was deposed and excommunicated at a council held in Constantinople (448 A.D.) but appealed his case to Leo of Rome, as did also, Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. Dioscurus, the successor of Cyril had won the approbation of Theodosius, the emperor. A council was called to confirm the doctrine of Eutyches, and was presided over by Dioscuros, commonly known in church history as "the Robber Council" (449 A.D.). Dioscurus by brutal terrorism intimidated the delegates and forced his view upon the council. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus was deposed, and Flavian who had deposed Eutyches was murdered. Leo’s Tome was not read. The following year the emperor Theodosius died, and the Council of Chalcedon convened in 451 A.D. This was the largest council which had been called up to that time, and by it both Eutychianism and Nestorianism were condemned. Here also the various errors and deficiencies in the statement of the doctrine of Christ’s person were corrected and the creed drawn up by this council has from that time to the

present been acknowledged as the orthodox statement The Chalcedonian Statement. The Council of Chalcedon approved the two letters of Cyril and Leo's Tome, and these furnish the basis of the Chalcedonian statement. Cyril's First Letter (to John of Antioch) affirmed the unity of the Person of Christ as against Nestorianism; and his second letter (to Nestorius) was likewise opposed to it. Leo's Tonic was concerned with the reality, the integrity and the completeness of Christ's manhood as against Eutychianism. The following is the text of the Chalcedonian Creed:

"Following the holy fathers we teach with one voice that the Son (of God) and our Lord Jesus Christ is to be confessed as one and the same (Person), that He is perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, very God and very man, a reasonable soul and (human) body consisting, consubstantial (omoousion) with the Father as touching His Godhead, and consubstantial (omoousion) with us as touching His manhood; made in all things like unto us, sin only excepted, begotten of His Father before the worlds (pro aiwnwn) according to His Godhead; but in these last days for us men and for our salvation born (into the world) of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God (QeotokoV) according to His manhood. This one and the same Jesus Christ, the only begotten son (of God) must be confessed in two natures, unconfusedly (asugcutwV), immutably (atreptwV), indivisibly (adiairetwV), inseparably (axwristwV) (united) and that without distinction of natures being taken away by such union, but rather the peculiar property (idiothV) of each nature being preserved and being united in one Person (proawpov) and Hypostasis (upostasin), not separated or divided into persons, but one and the same Son and Only Begotten, God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets of the old time have spoken concerning Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ hath taught us, and as the Creed our fathers hath delivered to us."

[The statement against Eutyches as found in Leo's Tome is as follows: "For it confutes (1) those who presume to rend asunder the mystery of the Incarnation into a double Sonship, and it deposes from the priesthood (2) those who dare say that the Godhead of the Only Begotten is passible; and it withstands (3) those who imagine a mixture or confusion of the two natures of Christ; and it drives away (4) those who fondly teach that the form of a servant which He took from us was a heavenly or some other substance; and it anathematizes (5) those who feign that the Lord had two natures before the union, and that these were molded into one after the union."] The Post-Chalcedonian Christology. The Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) marked the close of the controversy in the West. The Eastern churches, however, refused to accept the decrees of the Council and called for a supplementary statement concerning the two wills of Christ. In 482 A.D., the emperor Zeno published a decree known as the Henoticon, in which both Nestorianism and Eutychianism were condemned, the Chalcedonian Creed abrogated, and the Creed of Constantinople declared to be the only standard of orthodoxy. Four leading tendencies appear, (1) Monophysitism; (2) Monothelitism; (3) Adoptianism; and (4) Socinianism

1. Monophysitism was a revival of Eutychianism, or the doctrine that Christ had but one composite nature. His humanity was regarded merely as an accident of the divine substance. The liturgical shibboleth was "God has been crucified." While they were regarded as heretical, their beliefs were substantially those of Cyril and the Alexandrians of his time. Leontius of Byzantium attempted to appease those with Cyrillian sympathies by recasting the Chalcedonian formula in accordance with the categories of Aristotle, giving rise to his doctrine of the Enhypostasia. He asserted that one nature may combine with another in such manner, that it retains its peculiar characteristics, and yet have its substance in the second nature. It is not therefore without hypostasis, but

enhypostasis, for "it has given of its attributes interchangeably, which continue in the abiding and uncommingled peculiarity of their own natures." Monophysitism was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (553 A.D.)

2. Monothelitism held that Christ possessed but one will, and is therefore closely related to Monophysitism. The emperor Heraclius who had become alarmed at the progress of Mohammedanism in Arabia, sought to reconcile the Monophysitists and the orthodox by suggesting

[A distinction should be made between the terms enhypostasia, and anhypostasia. Theology uses the former to express the fact that Christ has the two natures but in one person - the one nature having its hypostasis in the other; it uses the latter term to express the idea that the human nature of Christ has no separate personality of its own.] the acceptance of a doctrine proposed a century previous in a book attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. This teaching was to the effect that there were indeed two natures in Christ - the divine and the human, but these were united in a manner which admitted of but one will and one operation. The compromise was accepted for a short time but was unsatisfactory to both parties. The emperor issued an edict known as the Ekthesis, giving sanction to Monothelitism but this only increased the strife. His successor, Constans II in 648 A.D. abrogated the Ekthesis and by another decree, the Typos, prohibited both the affirmation and the denial of Monothelitism. Constantine Pognatus in 680 A.D. called the Sixth Ecumenical council at Constantinople to settle the controversy. The Council condemned Monothelitism and added a paragraph to the Chalcedonian Creed which affirmed not only two natures but two wills, the human will being subject to the divine in the Person of Christ

3. Adoptionism was similar to the earlier Nestorianism, and arose in Spain during the latter part of the eighth century. Two bishops, Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgel, attempted to reconcile the doctrines of the church with the Mohammedan Koran. They suggested that Christ was the Son of God naturally, only in respect to His deity; but that in respect to His humanity, He was merely the servant of God, as are all men, and was made the Son by adoption. According to His divine nature, He was the Only Begotten; according to His human nature, He was the First Begotten. His humanity was adopted into His divinity by a gradual process. Beginning with His miraculous conception, it was more fully manifested at His baptism, and perfected at the time of His resurrection. This was but a revival of Nestorianism. Christ was regarded as an ordinary man

[The paragraph added to the Chalcedonian Creed is as follows: "And we likewise preach two natural wills in Him (Jesus Christ), and two natural operations undivided, incontrovertible, inseparable, unmixed, according to the doctrine of the holy fathers; and the two natural wills (are) not contrary, far from it! (as the heretics assert), but His human will follows the divine will, and is not resisting or reluctant, but rather subject to His divine and omnipotent will. For it was proper that the will of the flesh, should not be moved, but be subjected to the divine will, according to the wise Athanasius."] united to God in an ordinary manner, and was in no particular sense an incarnation. Charlemagne convened two synods in order to determine the orthodox faith. At Frankfort (794 A.D.) Adoptianism was condemned; at Aix-la-Chapelle (790 A.D.) it was again condemned, and in addition, Felix was deposed

4. Socinianism belongs to the earlier part of modern church history and is related to the ancient Arianism. A crude unitarianism had previously appeared among the Italian humanists, whose

views seem to have embodied the various modifications of Arianism and Ebionism. In 1546 a secret confraternity of rationalistic reformers is said to have held meetings in Vicenza. Two Italians of noble birth, Lælius Socinus, the uncle, and Faustus Socinus, the nephew, appear to have been the leaders. The former elaborated a system of unitarianism in which he regarded Jesus as supernaturally conceived and born of a virgin, so that He was truly the Son of God; but as to His nature, He was regarded simply as a man to whom God gave extraordinary revelations, exalted Him to heaven after His death, and committed to Him the government of the Church. He was, therefore, a divinized man. Early Socinianism held that Christ received the Spirit at the baptism, and since He was carried to heaven to receive special instructions, was therefore to be worshiped. Later Socinianism under the pressure of rationalism, developed into Deism and Unitarianism, which in its liberalistic forms regards Jesus Christ as no more than a man of exceptional character and power. Lælius Socinus died in Zurich in 1562, and Faustus Socinus soon after organized a Unitarian Society in Transylvania

Ecumenical Christology. The development of ancient catholic Christology was practically closed at the time of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople in 680 A.D. As we have indicated, Adoptianism and Socinianism appeared later, but these were only variations of the ancient heresies condemned by the Creed of Chalcedon. John of Damascus in the Eastern church, and Thomas Aquinas in the West, were perhaps the ablest exponents of the Chalcedonian Christology. The former offered an explanation of the two natures and the two wills in relation to the one Person, but otherwise made no further contribution. His great work was the systematizing and preserving of the results already gained. In the Western church, the scholastic theologians confined themselves largely to a discussion of incidental matters connected with the creed and cannot be said to have made any real progress. Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris (1164), whose Four Books of Sentences were sanctioned by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) became the standard of orthodoxy. His assertion that "the human nature of Christ was impersonal," was challenged by Walter of St. Victor (100: 1180) who accused him of maintaining "that Christ had become nothing." This gave rise to the "Nihilian Heresy." The mystics,

[John of Damascus endeavored to answer the question, "How can the doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ be reconciled with the unity of His Person?" His solution was as follows: first, he regarded the divine nature as that which constituted the person; and second, he supposed a kind of interpenetration or perichoresis, which brought about an interchange of properties between the two natures (cf. CRIPPEN, Hist. Chr. Th., p. 116) The Augsburg Confession: "Also they teach that the word, that is, the Son of God, took unto Him man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably joined together in the unity of the person; one Christ, true God and true man: who was born of the virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried that He might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." The Second Helvetic Confession: "we acknowledge, therefore, that there are in one and the same Jesus Christ our Lord, two natures, the divine and the human nature; and we say that these two are so conjoined or united, that they are not swallowed up, confounded or mingled together, but rather united or joined together in one person, the properties of each nature being safe and remaining still: so that we worship one Christ our Lord, and not two; I say, one, true God and man; as touching His divine nature, of the same substance with the Father, and as touching His human nature, of the same

substance with us, and 'like unto us in all things, sin only excepted.'" The Westminster Confession: "The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did when the fullness of time was come, take upon Him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, or her substance: so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and Manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. which person is very God, and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and men." This is usually considered the clearest and strongest expression of the Calvinistic churches.]

Tauler (d. 1361) and Ruysbroek (100: 1381) emphasized Christ as the Divine Representative, or the "Restored Prototype of humanity." The Lutheran and Reformed Churches also built upon the Chalcedonian statement. The Lutherans leaned more toward the Eutychian position of the unity of the Person, and the Reformed toward the Nestorian distinction between the two natures, but both denied these ancient heresies. Protestantism, however, uniformly rejected the Theotokos, regarding the expression, "Mother of God" as objectionable and misleading. Otherwise the Chalcedonian statement has become the orthodox creed of Protestantism, whether Lutheran, Reformed or Anglican. Dr. Shedd maintained that "the human mind is unable to go beyond it in the endeavor to unfold the mystery of Christ's complex Person." Dr. Schaff states that "the Chalcedonian Christology is regarded by the Greek and Roman, and the majority of orthodox English and American divines as the ne plus ultra of Christological knowledge attainable in this world: The statements of the Prostestant position are to be found in the various creeds and confessions, especially the Augsburg Confession (1530), the Second Helvetic confession (1566), and the Thirty-nine Articles (1571). Later creeds, including the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism are generally abridgments or revisions of the former creeds In more modern times, there developed what is known as the communicatio idiomatum, or communion of the two natures, a doctrine which apparently found its germ in the perichoresis of John of Damascus. In connection with the two estates of Christ, there arose the Kenotic and Kryptic theories which may best be considered in connection with the subject of Christ's humiliation. Modern Christology has been greatly influenced

[The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England: "The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to he divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men."] by the rationalistic and critical philosophies of our times, as has every other department of theology; and while the attacks were severe, they have failed to shake the firm foundations of the Christian faith. We must admit that the creeds are inadequate, for the finite can never express the Infinite; but we may still exclaim with St. Paul, "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory (1 Timothy 3:16)

[The Twenty-five Articles of Methodism: "The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." It will be noticed that the only difference between this and the statement found in the Thirty-nine Articles, is the omission of the phrase, "of her substance."

Articles of Faith, Church of the Nazarene: "We believe in Jesus Christ, the second person of the Triune Godhead: that He was eternally one with the Father; that He became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and was born of the virgin Mary, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and manhood, are thus united in one person very God and very man, the God-man. we believe that Jesus Christ died for our sins, and that He truly arose from the dead and took again His body, together with all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven and is there engaged in intercession for us."]

20. Chapter 21 - THE PERSON OF CHRIST

Chapter 21 - THE PERSON OF CHRIST Our historical approach to the subject of Christology shows that the doctrine of the Person of Christ has not always been properly limited and defined. We have seen that a sharp distinction must be made between the two ""natures" and the one ""Person," and that there must be neither a division of the person nor a confusion of the natures. We have seen, also, that the Church through its councils sought to carefully guard the orthodox teaching from heretical opinions - the Chalcedonian Christology, and the Athanasian or Third Ecumenical Creed being the authoritative conciliar statements. The right faith according to the Athanasian symbol is That our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father; begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the substance of His mother, born into the world; perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood; Who although He be God and Man: yet He is not two but one Christ; One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking the Manhood into God; One altogether, not by confusion of substance: but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ. The doctrine, therefore, involves the following truths which must be given proper consideration, (I) The Deity of Christ; (II) The Manhood of Christ; (III) The Unity of Christ's Person; and (IV) The Diversity of the Two Natures THE DEITY OF CHRIST The deity of the Son, as eternal in the essence of the Godhead, was considered at length in our discussion of the Trinity; now we have to do with a consideration of the deity of the Son in the Person of Christ. Two avenues of approach to this subject are found in the history of doctrine - the textual and the historical. The textual method approaches the subject through the numerous proof texts, classified in various ways but usually including those scriptures which refer to His Divine Titles, Divine Attributes, Divine Acts and Divine Worship. With its many advantages, this method has one distinct disadvantage - the reliance upon proof texts is always open to the objection that they may be interpreted in a wrong manner by those whose minds are biased or prejudiced against the proper deity of Christ. It is the historical method, however, by which men have been convinced of the supernatural character of Christ and have been led to the persuasion that He is very God. This is the method of the Gospels, and any attentive reader may share the wonderment of the disciples, their insight and their conclusions as to the deity of their Lord. Dr. Johnson points out that any idea formed of Christ in this manner, "will neither be wavering nor vague, but as our conception of His personality grows clear and firm, insight into His nature deepens, and His divinity is revealed before our eyes" (Johnson, Outline of Systematic Theology, pp. 159, 160). Rothe likewise points out the necessity of apprehending the divine nature of Christ from the study of the picture of His human life. ""To speak of recognizing and acknowledging the divine element in Christ," he says, "without having observed it shine forth from what is human in Him, or having caught its reflection in the mirror of His humanity, is merely to bandy idle words." We shall not attempt, therefore, any elaborate system of proof texts in this connection, but will refer the reader to the collation of scriptures concerning the deity of Christ, which has already been furnished in connection with our discussion of the Trinity. It is sufficient here to consider only those points which involve the

incarnation and its relation to the redemptive work of Christ The Pre-existence of Christ. The Church in all ages has affirmed the doctrine of the true deity of Christ, and hence His eternal existence - the Messiah of the Old Testament, and the Christos of the New Testament. Was Jesus of Nazareth the Christ? Did the Christ of the Gospels have an eternal personal existence before His birth of the Virgin Mary? If so, what was the nature of this existence? Did He exist as man or as God? If the latter, did He exist as the sole God - a simple and absolute personal unity; or did He exist as one of the essential and infinite Persons of the Triune Godhead? The Holy Scriptures and the conciliar actions of the Church, both affirm that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus speaking of Himself said, Before Abraham was, I am (John 8:58); and No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven (John 3:13). Isaiah called Him the everlasting Father (Isaiah 9:6), and St. Paul declares that he is before all things, and by him all things consist (Colossians 1:17) The mere fact of existence, however, does not necessarily carry with it the evidence of deity. It does not furnish a proof against Arianism which maintains that Christ was of like essence with the Father, but no identical in essence and therefore not truly God. Nor does the fact of pre-existence furnish proof against the modern so-called "idealistic theories." One of these theories maintains that Christ's pre-existence was only ideal - an impersonal principle or potency, which became personalized in Jesus. Another of these theories maintains that Christ was not an eternal being, but a premundane, created being, a perfect spiritual image of God and the prototype of humanity. Thus Pfleiderer, who held that Christ existed in another form previous to His earthly state, regarded this pre-existence not as an abstract, impersonal principle, but as a concrete personality, an image of God and thus a created Son of God. But this

[Whenever the attempt is made to bring Christology to a logical conclusion, and formulate it, the difficulty of avoiding Ebionism or Docetism, Nestorianism or Monophysitism, which stand on either side like Scylla and Charybdis, will present itself, and the history of doctrines will require, to defend itself against the attacks of various forms of heresy, the manner best suited to repel the antagonizing error. The reason for this fact does not, however, lie in the doctrine itself, with its infinite significance, but in the human limitations which affect the dogmatics of each particular age. - Crooks and Hurst, Encycl. and Meth., p. 431.] pre-existent Christ he did not regard as true deity in any sense, but as man - a pre-existent "spiritual" man. It is evident that these theories are closely related to ancient Arianism, and must therefore be classified among the forms of modern Unitarianism. The fact of preexistence does, however, refute Socinianism and all the purely humanitarian conceptions of Christ The Holy Scriptures teach, and the Church has believed that the pre-existent One was none other than the eternal Son of God, the second Person of the Trinity. Christology is, therefore, vitally related to Trinitarianism. "The anti-Trinitarian movements of recent times," says Dorner, "have made it perfectly clear that there consequently remains only the choice either to think of God in a Unitarian manner, and in that case to see even Jesus as a mere man; or if He is supposed to be the God-man, to hold eternal distinction in God, and therefore undertake to prove that the unity of God is quite consistent with such distinctions" (Dorner, Syst. Chr. Doct., I, p. 415). This the Church does by maintaining that in the Trinity there are three Persons subsisting in one divine essence or nature; and that it was not that which was common to the three persons who assumed our human nature, but that which marks the distinctions in the Trinity. It was not the Godhead which became incarnate, but one of the persons of the Godhead. It was not the Father or the Spirit who became incarnate, but the Son - the Second Person of the

Trinity. The preexistent One, therefore, is not a mere abstraction or idealization; He is not a pre-existent creature, whether human or divine; He is "the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made." The Church finds its ground for this position in the Holy Scriptures. The classic passage is found in the prologue to John’s Gospel (John 1:1-5), In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. Here the Word or Logos is identified with Jesus, and to the description of this Logos the whole Gospel is devoted. This Logos was eternal - He existed in the beginning. But in the eternal world He was not alone, He was proV ton qeon, existing with God, whom as the incarnate Word He came to reveal. Furthermore, this Logos was not only eternal, existing in the beginning with God, but He was God. The locus classicus of St. Paul is to be found in his Epistle to the Philippians, where he distinctly declares that Christ, prior to His existence on earth as Jesus of Nazareth, existed to all eternity "in the form of God," and ""equal with God" (Php 2:5). Likewise, also, the Epistle to the Hebrews places Christ as the Son above the angels (Hebrews 1:5); and furthermore identifies the priestly office as coeternal with the Son himself. Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec (Hebrews 5:6). As the priesthood was considered to have no end, neither did it have a beginning. The two were coeternal - the Sonship and the priesthood

Christ was the Jehovah of the Old Testament. The deity of Christ finds abundant support in the Old Testament Scriptures, as previously pointed out in our discussion of the Trinity. In order, however, to show the continuity of the redemptive mission of the Son, it seems necessary to point out the fulfillment of two prophetic utterances concerning the Messiah. The first is the prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the New Covenant. It will be recalled, that the Mosaic law was given by the dispensation of angels, referring more especially to the ""angel of Jehovah," who was at once servant and Lord, angel and Jehovah; and that this law was given in His own name (Exodus 23:20-21). Later Moses declared that The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken (Deuteronomy 18:15). Still later Jeremiah prophesied saying, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt (Jeremiah 31:31-32). The first of these prophecies was specifically declared by Stephen in his last address, to have been fulfilled in Christ; and he refers also to the law given by the dispensation of angels, a subject which receives its full development by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in his discussion of the New Covenant (Cf. Acts 7:53 with Hebrews 8:6-13; Hebrews 10:16-18). Closely related to this, but referring more specifically to the temple than to the covenant, is the prophecy of Malachi. Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts (Malachi 3:1). As the Lord of a temple is the Deity to whose worship it is consecrated, the act of our Lord in entering the temple makes it evident that He was the Jehovah of the Old Testament to whom it was consecrated The Unique Claims of Jesus for Himself. The highest testimony to the deity of Christ must, of necessity, be His own claims. If it be argued that a man’s claims for himself

are worthless, it must be answered that this depends upon the prior question as to who the man is. This was the objection of the Pharisees who said to Jesus, Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true. Jesus answered and said unto them, Though I bear record of myself, Vet my record is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go....It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me (John 8:13-18). It is possible here to enumerate only a few of the claims of Jesus - one of the most profound subjects that can engage the mind of man. Jesus claimed for Himself, (1) the possession of divine attributes, such as eternity (John 8:58; John 17:5), omnipotence (Matthew 28:20; Matthew 18:20, John 3:13), omniscience (Matt. ii 27, John 2:23-25; John 21:17), and omnipresence (Matthew 18:20, John 3:13). (2) He claimed, and manifested the power to work miracles, or to empower others to perform wonderful works (Matthew 10:8, ii 5, 14:19-21, 15:30, 31, Mark 6:41-44, Luke 8:41-56; Luke 9:1,

2). (3) He claimed divine prerogatives, such as being Lord of the Sabbath (Mark 2:28); the power to forgive sins and to speak as God or for God (Matthew 9:2-6, Mark 2:5-12, Luke 5:20-26). (4) He claimed to know the Father in a direct and perfect manner, as no other being can; (Matthew 11:27, Luke 10:22) and to be the Son of God in a unique manner (Matthew 10:32-33; Matthew 16:17; Matthew 16:27). (5) He spoke words of infinite wisdom, for He spake as never man spake. (6) He accepted the homage of worship (Matthew 14:33). And (7) He claimed to be the final judge of all men (Matthew 7:21-23; Matthew 13:41-43; Matthew 19:28; Matthew 25:31-33, Mark 14:62, Luke 9:26; 26:69, 70) THE MANHOOD OF CHRIST

Christ became incarnate in a manner that made Him man. The Scriptures tell us that the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (John 1:14); and that as children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same (Hebrews 2:14). We must, then, regard His human nature as true and entire, admitting no defect in any of its essential elements, nor acquiring any additions by virtue of its conjunction with Deity. Furthermore, our Lord’s human nature was assumed under conditions which properly belong to man, and underwent a process of development in common with other men, sin only excepted. Hence in Him development was natural and normal, being free from the bias of inherited depravity or the blighting influence of

[Here the prophet describes the coming Messiah, not only as the messenger of the covenant, but also as the Lord and Owner of the Jewish temple; and consequently, as a divine prince or governor - he shall "come to his temple." The Lord of any temple is the divinity to whose worship it is consecrated. The temple at Jerusalem of which the prophet here speaks, was consecrated to the true and living God; and we have therefore the express testimony of Malachi that the Christ, the Deliverer, whose coming he announced, was no other than the Jehovah of the Old Testament. - Raymond, Chr. Theology, p. 194.] sin. For this reason He is called the ""Son of man" the perfect realization of the eternal idea of mankind The Human Nature of Christ. The Incarnation did not mean merely the assumption of a human body; for human nature does not consist in the possession of a body only, but in the possession of body and soul. Two facts stand out clearly. First, our Lord had a human body. This was at first denied by the Docetæ on the ground that matter is essentially evil, but this heresy soon disappeared. The Scripture proofs of His human nature are many and varied. There is the account of His birth, His circumcision, His visit to the temple, His baptism and temptation (Matthew 2:1-23; Matthew 3:1-17; Matthew 4:1-11, Luke

2:1-52; Luke 3:1-38; Luke 4:1-13). He was hungry (Matthew 4:2), thirsty (John 19:28), and weary (John 4:6). We are told of His bodily pain and of His bloody sweat in the garden (Luke 22:44); of His sinking under the weight of the cross (Luke 23:26); of the piercing of His hands and feet, His agony on the cross, His death and burial (Matthew 27:33-66, Mark 15:22-47, Luke 23:33-56, John 19:16-42). Second, our Lord had a human soul. The evidence for this is regarded as almost equally conclusive. It was called in question by Apollinarius, who substituted the divine Logos in place of the human soul; and it has appeared in various forms from time to time, but has never been an accepted doc-

[There are several ancient accounts of the personal appearance of our Lord, but none of them can be accounted thoroughly trustworthy. The first is reported to be composed by Publius Lentulus, a Roman officer; while another, discovered by Tischendorf, is said to have been written by Epiphanius in Greek. We give the first only as translated from the Latin. "A man of tall stature, good appearance, and a venerable countenance, such as to inspire beholders with love and awe. His hair, worn in a circular form and curled, rather dark and shining, flowing over the shoulders, and parted in the middle of the head, after the style of the Nazarenes. His forehead, smooth and perfectly serene, with a face free from wrinkle or spot, and beautiful with a moderate ruddiness, and a faultless nose and mouth. His beard full, of an auburn color like his hair, not long but parted. His eyes quick and clear. His aspect terrible in rebuke, placid and amiable in admonition, cheerful without losing its gravity: a person never seen to laugh, but often to weep" (For both accounts Cf. Potts, Faith Made Easy, pp. 206, 207)

Find us a better answer to the questionings of our spirits than Christ has furnished! Show us a better ideal of manhood than He has given! Bring us a better testimony to the life beyond the grave than He has borne! Ah! for four thousand years the world has tried in vain to return to God, and now that He has come Himself to be the way, we wifi not give him up for any negation. - William M. Taylor, D.D.] trine of the Church. In anticipation of His passion, Jesus said to His disciples, Now is my soul [yuxh] troubled (John 12:27); and again in the garden, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death (Matthew 26:38). Jesus said of Himself, I am meek and lowly in heart (Matthew 11:29) and He rejoiced in spirit (Luke 10:21) when the disciples returned from their successful mission. Christ, therefore, had a human soul as well as a human body. To deny that the attributes, acts and experiences natural to a human soul are not evidences of a complete humanity is to lay the ground for a denial of His deity, as based on the divine acts, attributes and names ascribed to Him The Sinlessness of Christ. There was no original sin in Christ. Inherited depravity is the result of a natural descent from Adam; but Christ’s birth was miraculous and hence He was born without the natural or inherited corruption which belongs to other men. Having God alone as His Father, the birth of Christ was not a birth out of sinful human nature, but a conjoining of human nature with Deity which in the very act sanctified it. Sin is a matter of the person, and since Christ was the preexistent Logos, the Second Person of the adorable Trinity, He was as such, not only free from sin but from the possibility of sin. Christ was, from His birth, perfect in His relation to His heavenly Father, and absolutely free from the sinful bias which characterizes every natural son of Adam. Christ was also free from actual sin. He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth (1 Peter 2:22). His earthly life was free from fault or blemish. As a child He was filial and obedient (Luke 2:51); as a youth, respectful and docile (Luke 2:52); and as a man was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens (Hebrews 7:26) But Christ was made

also in the likeness of sinful flesh (Romans 8:3). The best expositors have always agreed that this passage means that Christ's flesh is like that which in us is sinful. ""Neither the Greek nor the argument requires that the flesh of Christ shall be regarded as sinful flesh, though it is His flesh, His incarnation, which brought Him into contact with sin (SANDAY, Com. on Romans). We may argue, with sin (Sanday-Headlam, Com. on Romans). We may argue, with Debose, that since the holiness of Jesus Christ was by Holy Ghost, in Him, and not merely in His nature, He therefore the cause of His own holiness and His sinlessness was His own (Cf. Dubose, Soteriology of theNew Testament). The mystery is that Christ should take our nature in such a manner, that while without He bore the consequences of our sin. Furthermore, Christ had immortality in Himself. In him was life (John

1:4). This right to the immortality of His body He surrendered and of Himself laid down His life, that He might take it again. And while we may say that Christ, being divine Son incarnate and not born after the manner other men, was lifted above all those infirmities which exist in man as a consequence of sin, yet He voluntarily made Himself the partaker of human weaknesses and infirmities, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath Fered being tempted, he is able to succour them that tempted (Hebrews 2:17-18) THE UNITY OF CHRIST'S PERSON

We have considered the scriptural proofs of the deity of Christ, and of His perfect manhood, and must now give attention to the union of these two natures in one person. S union was effected by the incarnation; and the result is a theanthropic person, or God-man, (who unites in Himself all the conditions of both the divine and the human existence. This one personality is the pre-existent Logos, or the divine Son, who assumed to Himself human nature, and in this assumption both personalized and redeemed it. Four things are involved in our study, (1) The Nature of the Incarnation; (2) The Hypostatic ion; (3) The Incarnation and the Trinity; and (4) Incarnation as a Permanent Condescension The Nature of the Incarnation. The Incarnation in sense in which we shall now consider it, was not rely a stage in the mediatorial ministry of Christ, but the necessary basis of all. As it applies to "the Word made flesh," the incarnation must be distinguished from every form of transubstantiation. The apostle does not teach that the second Person of the Trinity ceased to be God when He became man. The expression is equivalent to saying that Christ came in the flesh, thereby assuming a human nature, that He might enter redemptively into the experiences of men. A scriptural view of the Incarnation involves the following facts. First, it was the Word, or second Person of the Trinity alone who became incarnate. One trinitarian Person may become incarnate, and yet that incarnation will not be of the whole Godhead, because the Godhead represents the divine essence in three modes; and the essence in all three modes did not become incarnate. Since the whole essence or divine nature exists in each of the three modes, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we may say that when the Son became incarnate, there dwelt in Him all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, but only in the mode of the second Person, or the divine Son. Second, the Incarnation was the union of a divine Person with human nature and not with a human person. The human nature which He assumed acquired personality by its union with Him. The Redeemer is therefore said to have laid hold on "the seed [sperma] of Abraham" (Hebrews 2:16); and further, was known both as the ""seed of the woman" (Genesis 3:15), and the ""seed of David" (Romans 1:3). These expressions can only mean that the nature our Lord as-

[While the Incarnate Person is the God-man, or manifestation of God in the flesh, the divine personality is only that of the Son, the second Person in the Trinity. As a distinct Person in the Godhead He brings the entire divine nature into humanity, and continues His eternal personality through all the processes of His development and mediatorial work forever - Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 113 The full truth of the Incarnation is not contained in the notion of a union of the divine nature, simply as such, with the human nature. The subject of the Incarnation was not a mere nature, but a person - the personal Son. The divine nature is common to the persons of the Trinity: therefore any limitation of the Incarnation to the divine nature would deny to the Son any distinct or peculiar part therein. This would contradict the most open and uniform sense of Scripture. The Father and the Holy Spirit had no such part in the Incarnation as the Son. Nor could any union of the divine nature, simply as such, with the human nature give the profound truth and reality of the incarnation. It could mean nothing for the unique personality of Christ; nothing for the reality and sufficiency of the atonement. - Miley, Syst. Th., II, p. 17.] sumed was as yet not individualized. Christ's human nature was not impersonal except in this sense - it was not personalized out of the race by natural birth, but by becoming a constituent factor of the one theanthropic Person. Third, the body which the Son assumed was prepared for Him by the Holy Ghost. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me (Hebrews 10:5). The Son in the trinitarian sense, is the "only begotten" of the Father; but He is also that "holy thing" which was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. The Socinians supposed that some of the elements of His body were furnished by the Virgin, and some by the Holy Spirit, hence He was called the Son of God. Bishop Pearson says, that "As He was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was He not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget Him by communication of His essence, therefore He is not the father of Him, though He were conceived by Him. There were no material elements in the person of Christ except those He received from her." "There is nothing on which the Scripture is more explicit than this," says Dr. Summers, "that as His divinity was begotten without a mother, from eternity, so His humanity was begotten without a father. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost: not by any communication of His essence, as in human paternity, but by a miraculous operation which enabled the Virgin to perform the functions of maternity, and be a virgin still" (Summers, Syst. Th., I, p. 203) The Hypostatic Union. The union of the divine and human natures in Christ is a personal one - that is, the union lies in their abiding possession of a common Ego or inner Self, that of the eternal Logos. In theology, this is termed the hypostatical union, and is derived from the use of the word hypostasis, a term which marks the distinction between personal subsistences in the Godhead, and their common substance or essence. The two natures meet and have communion with each other, solely through the self which is common to both. The term is understood, therefore, to guard against two errors - that of a confusion of the two natures in a third essence, neither divine nor human; and that of a loose conjunction or affiliation of natures which may be considered in separation from each other. The possession of the two natures does not involve a double personality, for the ground of the person is the eternal Logos and not the human nature. Christ, therefore, uniformly speaks of Himself in the singular person. Always and everywhere, the Agent is one. There is never any interchange of the "I" and the "thou" as in the Trinity. The varying modes of consciousness pass quickly from the divine to the human, but the Person is always the same. Hence He says, I and my Father are one (John 10:30), and again, I thirst (John 19:28). In the first

instance, the form of the consciousness is divine; in the latter, human. Frequently there are passages where the person is designated by a divine title, and yet human attributes are ascribed to Him, such as feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood (Acts 20:28); He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all (Romans 8:32); had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory (1 Corinthians 2:8); and in whom we have redemption through his blood (Colossians 1:14). Divine attributes are also predicated of the person designated by a human title. No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven (John 3:13); What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before (John 6:62); and Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing (Revelation 5:12) The Incarnation and the Trinity. The question sometimes arises as to the relation existing between the Incarnation and the Trinity. Prior to the Incarnation the Trinity consisted of the Father, the unincarnate Son (logoV asarkoV) and the Holy Spirit; subsequent to the Incarnation, it consisted of the Father, the incarnate Son (logoV ensarkoV) and the Holy Spirit. But the incarnation makes no change in the Trinity, for the Son's assumption of human nature is not the addition of another Person to Him. The second Person of the Trinity was modified by the Incarnation, but the Trinity was not so modified; for neither the Father nor the Spirit became divine-human Persons. In becoming man, the Son remained God, for He still subsisted in the divine nature The Incarnation as a Permanent Condescension. The union of the two natures in the one theanthropic Person is indissoluble and eternal. Marvelous as it may seem, and mysterious beyond compare, our Lord took His human nature with Him into the depths of the Godhead. In His ascension, He carried His glorified humanity to the throne of God. ""He became man once for all: our manhood is a vesture which he will not fold and lay aside. Immanuel is His name forever." His glorified human nature is now united with the eternal Son, so that the God-man is the middle Person of the Trinity. For

[We must consider that the divine nature did not assume a human person, but the divine Person did assume a human nature; and that of the three divine Persons, it was neither the first nor the third that did assume this nature, but it was the middle person who was to be the middle one (mediator) that must undertake the mediation between God and us. For if the fullness of the Godhead should have thus dwelt in any human person, there should have been added to the Godhead a fourth kind of person; and if any one of the three persons besides the second had been born of a woman, there should have been two Sons in the Trinity. Whereas, now, the Son of God and the Son of the blessed virgin, being but one Person, is consequently but one Son; and so no alteration at all made in the relations of the persons to the Trinity. - Usher, Incarnation, I, p. 580

It is the infinite condescension of the Son of God and the glory of man that the union of the two natures in Christ is permanent. He became man once for all: our manhood is a vesture which we will not fold and lay aside. Immanuel is His name forever. This being so, it is scarcely right to speak of our Lord's alliance with our race as a part of His mediatorial humiliation: were it such, His humiliation would never terminate. It is true that the effect of His condescension will never cease. He will be one with mankind to all eternity: as it were expressly to declare this, to keep it in the minds of His people and prevent misconception, that one profound saying was placed on record: "Then shall the Son also himself be subject," or subject himself (1 Corinthians 15:28). His union with us, which is the same thing as His kingdom or His tabernacle with us, shall have no end. We know Him only as Immanuel. - Pope, Chr. Th., II, pp. 141, 142.]

It is the doctrine of the Church, as definitely formulated in the Chalcedonian symbol, that the union of the two natures in Christ is forever an inseparable one. - Miley, Syst. Th., II, p. 23.] this reason the Son stands in the closest possible relation to the redemption of mankind, and by His Spirit is ever present to secure the progress of His kingdom. Hence the Scriptures declare of Christ that He is over all, God blessed forever (Romans 9:5); that in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, bodily (Colossians 2:9); Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today, and forever (Hebrews 13:8); and above all, We have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens (Hebrews 4:14-15) THE DIVERSITY OF THE TWO NATURES The Unity of Christ's Person finds its complementary truth in the Diversity of the Two Natures. That the Godhead and the manhood each retains its respective properties and functions, without either alteration of essence or mutual interference is as necessary to a true conception of the Incarnation as is their hypostatic union in Jesus Christ. While the acts and qualities of either the divine or the human nature of Christ may be attributed to the theanthropic Person, it may not be said that they can be attributed to each other. The properties which belong to a nature are necessarily confined to it. A material substance can have only material properties, and an immaterial substance can have only immaterial or spiritual qualities. So, also, human nature can have only human properties, and the divine nature only divine properties. Natures, on the other hand, however heterogeneous, may belong to the same person. Thus, in the Trinity, three Persons or Hypostases subsist in one nature. In man, one person subsists in two natures - one immaterial or spiritual, the other material or physical. In Christ as a theanthropic Being, the one person subsists in two natures - the divine and the human; or, if we analyze more minutely, in three natures - the divine, the spiritual and the physical The Chalcedonian Creed. The Chalcedonian statement, previously mentioned in connection with the development of Christology in the Church, furnishes us with a true guide to the orthodox belief concerning the two natures. "This one and same Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son (of God) must be confessed in two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably (united) and that without the distinction of natures being taken away by such union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and being united in one Person and Hypostasis." Dr. Shedd in his "History of Christian Doctrine" (Vol. I, p. 399ff) gives us a somewhat simpler translation as follows: ""He is one Christ, existing in two natures without mixture, without change, without division, without separation - the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed by their union in the person." Here the two natures of Christ are not only affirmed, but their relations adjusted to each other in four main points - without mixture (or confusion); without change (or conversion); without division; and without separation. If then we would hold to the orthodox or catholic faith, (1) we must believe that the union of the two natures in Christ does not confuse or mix them in a manner to destroy their distinctive properties. The deity of Christ is as pure deity after the Incarnation as before it; and the human nature of Christ is as pure and simple human nature as that of His mother or of any other human individual - sin excluded. (2) We must reject as unorthodox any theory that would convert one nature into the other, either an absorption of the human nature by the divine as in Eutychianism; or the reduction of the divine nature to the human, as in some of the kenotic theories. (3) We must hold the two natures in such a union that it does not divide the person of Christ into two selves, as in Nestorianism, or such a blending of the two natures into a composite which is neither God nor man as in Apollinarianism. The resultant of the union is not two persons, but one person who unites in Himself the conditions of both the divine and human existence. (4) We must hold to a union of the two natures that is inseparable. The

union of humanity with Deity in Christ is indissoluble and eternal. It is a permanent assumption of human nature by the second Person of the Trinity The Incarnation and the Redemptive Work of Christ. We have seen that the incarnation is the basic fact in the mediatorial economy; we must now indicate briefly its relation to the redemptive work of Christ. The primary purpose of our Lord's assumption of "flesh and blood" was to provide atonement by sacrificial death. It was the purpose of the Father, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man (Hebrews 2:9). By this death He effected three things - the abolishment of death itself, the reconciliation of offenders, and the propitiation necessary for both. This it is further stated, He accomplished by "taking hold on" or "rescuing" the "seed of Abraham," thereby becoming a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people (Hebrews 2:16-17). Thus the primary purpose of the Incarnation was to provide an atonement. But the "seed of Abraham" refers also to a more remote purpose of the Incarnation. The atonement while perfected in Christ, requires to be applied by the Spirit. By taking to Himself the "seed of Abraham" it is implied that He assumed human nature in its capacity for development, or continuity as a race. Christ was, therefore, a racial man, the true Representative of the human race, and consequently is Himself called "the seed of Abraham," to whom the promises were made. (Galatians 3:16). Hence, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us . . . . that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through

[This passage with its entire context (Hebrews 2:10-18) impressively shows that the Incarnation was the way to the cross. Three terms are used, each of great importance. It was to abolish death, by taking his power from its representative and lord, that is, the devil. This, however, required that He should take our flesh in order that He might taste death for every man, and thus deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage: this deliverance being accomplished by His sacrifice of reconciliation, as the words apallaxh and enocoi sufficiently prove. Only as man could He be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God to make expiation for the sins of the people, eiV to ilaskesqai. In order to accomplish these results - the destruction of death, the reconciliation of the offenders subject to death, and the propitiation required in order to both - He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham: He taketh to Himself epolambanetai humanity, or the blessed with faithful Abraham, and the seed of Abraham my friend. But it was that He might taste of death uper mantoV . - Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 144.]

Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Galatians 3:13-14). St. Paul expresses this purpose with an ethical emphasis when he declares that he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love. Christ then is the "seed" or vital center from which shall spring a redeemed and holy people, characterized by St. Peter as a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people (1 Peter 2:9). But this remote purpose is to be succeeded by a final or ultimate purpose. Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him (Ephesians 1:9-10). Here then the Incarnation is related, first, to the finished work of Christ, or the Atonement; second, to the more remote purpose found in the work of the Spirit, or the Administration of Redemption; and third, to the last things, or Eschatology

21. Chapter 22 - THE ESTATES AND OFFICES OF CHRIST

Chapter 22 - THE ESTATES AND OFFICES OF CHRIST A consideration of the estates and offices of Christ forms the natural transition between the doctrine of His Person and that of His finished work - commonly known as the Atonement. The estates of Christ are two - the State of Humiliation and the State of Exaltation. Theologically they represent varying emphases upon the two natures of the God-man. The doctrine of the two estates was formulated in the fourth century and was an outgrowth of the Apollinarian controversy. As to the limits of the humiliation, different positions are held. The Reformed Church holds that it extends from the miraculous conception to the close of the descent into Hades, while the Lutheran Church makes the descensus the first stage in the exaltation. The Arminian theologians have generally accepted the Lutheran position. The offices of Christ are three - that of prophet, priest and king. This threefold classification was worked out carefully by Eusebius at an early date, and was followed by both

[There is no method of studying the theology of redemption at once so interesting and so effectual as that which connects it with the successive stages of our Lord's history. This does not, however, demand the presentation of what is commonly called The Life of Jesus....Yet there is an historical review of the Savior's career which may be made the basis of the entire system of evangelical theology. The life of our Lord was the manifestation of His Person and of His work, as begun below and continued above; and, remembering that the Acts and the Epistles and the Apocalypse supplement the Gospels, even as the Old Testament is their preface, we shall pursue our study of the Mediatorial Ministry in strict connection with the stages and processes of our Lord's history on earth and in heaven, before and at and after the fullness of time. - Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 140 The work of Christ forms in itself one whole, completed as to its principle, when He left the earth (John 17:4). But that which for His consciousness was inseparable, must be divided in our presentation of it, on account of the extent and dignity of the subject. A sharp line of separation between the different parts would lead to one-sidedness; but correctness of distinction is here one of the requirements. Thus the old dogmatic mode of speaking of a twofold state (duplex status), in which the Lord accomplished His redeeming work, is to be approved in principle; and we cannot be surprised that traces of it present themselves even in the earliest fathers. - Van Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., II, p. 540.]

Calvin and Luther. In more modern times it has been the principle of distribution by Schleiermacher, Dorner, Martensen, Hodge, Pope and Strong. We shall, then, in this chapter, consider the following subjects: (I) The State of Humiliation; (II) The State of Exaltation; and (III) The Offices of Christ THE STATE OF HUMILIATION The Scriptures present Christ in strikingly contrasted conditions. The prophets foresaw Him as subjected to the greatest indignities, and as seated on the most exalted of thrones. Unable to reconcile these contrasts, the Jewish exegetes sometimes affirmed the necessity of two Messiahs. Much of the opposition to Jesus during His earthly life, was based on His humble condition, and the reasons given by His opposers are in exact correspondence with the nature of the humiliation which the prophets had foretold concerning Him. If in the light of modern exegetical studies, we inquire as to the nature of the

humiliation, we shall find that it pertains generally, though not exclusively to the limitations of His human nature, and its relation to the penalty of sin. The portion of scripture which has furnished the basis for numerous and widely divergent Christological theories is found in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the

[Perhaps the best rendering of Php 2:6-8 is as follows: "Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, the death of the cross." The Emphatic Diaglot has the following translation: "Who, though being in God's Form, yet did not meditate a Usurpation to be like God, but divested Himself, taking a Bondman's form, having been made in the Likeness of Men; and being in condition as a Man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross." Rotheram in his "Emphasized New Testament" gives the text in the form of a transliteration, "Who in the form of God subsisting, not a thing to be seized accounted the being equal with God, but himself emptied taking a servant's form coming to be in men's likeness; and in fashion being found as a man humbled himself, becoming obedient as far as death, yea, death upon a cross."] likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Php 2:5-8). A sound exegesis reveals, in this text, two stages in the humiliation, first, from the divine to the human; second, from the glory of created manhood, to the ignominy of the cross. Each stage is marked by parallel steps in the decline. Subsisting in the form of God, there was (1) a self-renunciation, He thought it not robbery to be equal with God, or as frequently translated, not a thing to be grasped and held on to; (2) a self-emptying or kenosis, He made himself of no reputation, that is, He emptied Himself; and (3) He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Subsisting in the form of man, there are likewise three well-defined steps in the humiliation set in parallel to the preceding, (1) a self-renunciation, He humbled himself; (2) a subordination, and became obedient unto death, and (3) a perfection of His humiliation as the Representative of sinners, even the death of the cross

[There is a sense in which the Person of the Incarnate, as such, was incapable of abasement. His assumption of a pure human nature, by which the center of His being, that is, His personality, was not changed, was an act of infinite condescension, but not of humiliation strictly so called. The self-determining or self-limiting act of the Godhead in creating all things cannot be regarded as a derogation; nor was it such in the specific union of Deity with manhood. But, as we shall hereafter see that the descent into Hades was the moment which united the deepest abasement and the loftiest dignity of the Christ, so the moment of the Incarnation in the womb of the virgin united the most glorious condescension of the second Person with His most profound abjection. His work began as a suffering Redeemer, with the submission to conception and birth. Hence the Person and the work cannot be separated. And the humiliation which the Redeemer underwent must be regarded as the humiliation of the God-man. He assumed it, even as He assumed the nature that rendered it possible. - Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 164 The whole activity of the Son of God before His Incarnation bears an exalted and beneficent character, but not yet actually a redeeming one. It is for this reason here mentioned simply as the basis and starting point for that which He, after His

appearing as the Redeemer of the world, both in the state of humiliation and in that of exaltation, has done, is doing, and will yet further do. As such, however, it must not be overlooked, since His activity after His incarnation becomes, to a certain extent, more intelligible to us, even on account of His previous activity. Yet, the incarnation of the Word, the true beginning of His work of redemption properly so-called, is, on the other hand, simply the continuation of that which the Logos had already earlier effected in order to bring in light and life. - Van Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., II, p. 342.] The Stages of Christ's Humiliation. From the scripture just cited it is evident that the two states of Christ's being - as pre-existent Logos, and as the Word made flesh, necessitated a twofold renunciation, from the divine to the human, and from the manger to the cross. The Reformed Christology generally applies the term exinanition to the first stage, and limits the humiliation to the second or earthly life of Jesus. If now we place the total process in its historical relations, we shall observe the following consecutive stages in the humiliation of the Redemptive Person: (1) The Exinanition, or self-renunciation on the part of the pre-existent Logos, who existing in the form of God, thought this not a thing to be grasped and maintained. It is not the divinity, however, that is relinquished, but the form under which the divine nature was to be manifested. Hence it must refer to what is termed in the high priestly prayer, "the glory"; by which is meant the free and independent exercise of His divine powers (John 17:5). (2) The Incarnation or submission to the laws of natural birth, thereby taking His human nature from the substance of the virgin. Being conceived by the Holy Ghost, His nature was sinless, yet He took it in such a manner that He bore the consequences of man's sin. (3) The self-limitation of human finiteness, by which He subjected Himself to the laws of natural growth and development, as a preparation for His office as Mediator. (4) The subordination, or the exercise of His divine powers in submission to the mediatorial will of the Father, and under the control of the Holy Spirit. (5) The humiliation, which began officially at His baptism when He became the Representative of sinners; and was followed through

[The voluntary Incarnation of the Son of God must be regarded as the first step in the path of His humiliation. Apart from all the privations and sufferings which, as became later apparent, were for Him, from the beginning to the end, connected with being man among men, even the incarnation itself was for the Lord a self-denial in the natural and moral aspect. And indeed, it was not His fate only, but His own act, that He appeared as man upon earth, an act of grace (2 Corinthians 8:9) explicable only from the inexhaustible riches of His obedience and love (John 6:38; Hebrews 10:5) in consequence of which He, who was God in God, placed Himself, as the Ambassador of the Father, to the Father in the lowly relation of a servant. - Van Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm., II, p. 543.] all the downward steps of temptation and suffering to its perfection - the death on the cross

Following the Reformation, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches took widely different positions concerning the nature of the humiliation. We may summarize these briefly under four heads: (1) The Communicatio Idiomatum; (2) The Earlier Depotentiation Theories; (3) The Later Kenotic Theories; and (4) The Mystical Theories The Communicatio Idiomatum. This was peculiarly a Lutheran development, and signified the communication of the Idiomata, or attributes of the two natures of Christ to the one Person, and through that Person from one nature to the other. It does not involve the merging of one nature into the other, but it does hold that all the attributes, whether of the divine or human natures, are to be regarded as attributes of the one Person. The acts of Christ, therefore, are acts of the one Person and not of either nature independently of that one

Person. This doctrine presupposes the Communio Naturam or Communion of Natures in such a manner that there is a communication of the attributes and powers of the divine to the human nature. This, however, is not reciprocal, for the human nature cannot communicate anything to the divine which is unchangeable and perfect. The divine nature is the higher and active, while the human is the lower and passive. Here, again, no confusion of the natures is allowed, but a permeation of the human by the divine on the basis of a perichoresis; this permeation taking place through the person which is the bond of union between the two natures. Thus

[The Lutheran theologians further developed the Communicatio Idiomatum under three genera: (1) the Genas Idiomaticum, in which the peculiarities of either or both natures are predicated of the one Person. Thus "they crucified the Lord of glory," or "ye killed the Prince of life" (Cf. 1 Corinthians 2:8; Acts 3:15; John 3:13; Romans 9:15). (2) The Genus Majesticum by which the Son of God communicates His divine majesty to the human nature which He assumed. The Lutherans interpreted this to mean that Christ possessed according to His human nature, such relative attributes as omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence (cf. Matthew 11:27; Matthew 28:20). (3) The Genus Apoteiesmaticum signifies that the mediatorial acts of Christ proceeded from the whole Godhead, and not from either the one or the other nature (cf. Luke 19:10; 1 John 1:7).] through the Person, the resources of the divine nature are placed at the disposal of the human. This position was denied by the Reformed Church. To the Lutheran maxim, "Humana natura in Christo est capax divino," or human nature in Christ is capable of the divine, they opposed the formula, "Finitum non est capax infiniti," or the finite cannot become the infinite The Earlier Depotentiation Theories. The development of the Communicatio Idiomatum led finally to a controversy within the Lutheran Church. Early in the seventeenth century two schools arose - the Giessen and the Tubingen, which took widely different positions as to the nature of the humiliation. Starting from the communicatio as a common basis, both schools held that from the moment of His conception Christ possessed the attributes of omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence. But they interpreted the humiliation in different ways. The Giessen theologians held that there was a kenosis or emptying of the divine attributes during the earthly life of Christ, and hence were known as kenotists; while the Tubingen school maintained that the attributes were only concealed, and hence were known as kryptists. The kenotists, however, made a distinction between the possession of the attributes (kthsiV) and the use of the attributes (crhsiV), the kenosis applying only to the latter. Hence the kryptists regarded the glorification as the first display of the divine attributes in the life of Christ, while the kenotists viewed it as a resumption of them. The depotentiation theories took various forms but there was a common element in them all - they believed that there was a literal merging of the Deity of Christ into the Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus

[The general bearing of the question is well seen in the following words of Gerhard: "Not a part to a part, but the entire Logos was united to the entire flesh, and the entire flesh was united to the entire Logos; therefore, on account of the hypostatic union and intercommunion of the two natures, the Logos is so present to the flesh and the flesh so present to the Logos that neither is the Logos extra carnem, nor the flesh extra Logos; but wherever the Logos is, there it has the flesh most present, as having been assumed into the unity of the person." The controversy led to no definite results: indeed, to us who look at the question from the outside, there is but little difference between them. - Pope, Chr. Th., II, p. 193.] The Later Kenotic Theories. During the earlier part of

the nineteenth century an attempt was made to unite the two great branches of German Protestantism - the Lutheran and Reformed churches, on the basis of the kenotic Christology. The substance of this new position was to the effect that Christ in becoming incarnate "emptied" Himself, and thereby brought the eternally pre-existent Logos within the limitations of finite personality. The form and degree of this kenosis or "self-emptying" was a matter of Dispute. Four more or less distinct types of kenotic theory appear in the Christological literature of the period - that of Thomasius, Gess, Ebrard and Martensen

1. Thomasius (1802-1875), a Bavarian Lutheran was the earliest advocate of modern kenoticism. He held that the Lutheran conception of the two natures demanded, either that the infinite be brought down to the finite, or the finite raised to the infinite. Since the acceptance of the latter position had led to insuperable difficulties in Lutheran theology, he held that the majestas should be abandoned for the kenosis. According to Thomasius, the Son of God entered into the existence form of creaturely personality, and made Himself the ego of a human individual. His consciousness, therefore, had the same conditions and content as that which belonged to finite persons. The difference lay in this, that in Him the ego was not born out of human nature, but instead was born into it, that He might work His way through it to a complete divine-human being. We may say then, that the distinctive characteristic of the kenosis as held by Thomasius, was that the Logos emptied Himself of the

[Bruce in his "Humiliation of Christ" arranges the modern kenotic theories in four groups as follows: (1) the absolute dualistic type represented by Thomasius; (2) the absolute metamorphic type represented by Gess; (3) the absolute semi-metamorphic type represented by Ebrard; and (4) the real but relative type represented by Martensen The link between the earlier kenoticism of the Giessen-Tübingen schools, and that of the modern schools, is generally found in the pietistic Christology of Zinzendorf (1702-1760). To him, Jesus was on the one hand the natural Son of God, of divine essence; and on the other, mere natural man. "These can be reconciled," says Dorner, "only if we assume Zinzendorf's idea to have been that the self-conversion into a human germ, which then appropriated to itself material elements from Mary, so that the Son of God woke up to life in Mary a man."] relative attributes of omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence, while still retaining the immanent or essential attributes of Deity

Gess (1819-1891), a Swabian theologian, was brought up under the influence of Bengel, Oetinger and Beck. Starting, therefore, from a background of theosophic biblical realism, he carries the kenotic theory still farther than Thomasius. He affirmed that the Logos not only emptied Himself of the relative attributes, but divested Himself also of the essential attributes. There was, therefore, an actual transformation of the Logos into a human soul. This theory holds still further, that while Christ assumed His flesh from the body of the Virgin, His soul was not so derived, but was the result of a voluntary kenosis

Ebrard (1818-1888) was a Reformed theologian who first advanced his doctrine in connection with the Holy Supper. He agreed with Gess in regarding the incarnate Logos as taking the place of the human soul, but differs from him, in that he does not hold this to be a depotentiation. He held that the attributes of omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence remained, and therefore the humiliation was a disguising of His divinity. The position very closely approaches the older orthodoxy of the Reformed Church

Martensen (1808-1884), a Danish bishop and theologian, advanced the theory of "'a real but relative" kenosis. By this he means that the depotentiation though real, applied only to the earthly life of Christ in the flesh, and not to His divine nature or attributes. "The manifestation of the Son of God in the fullness of the times points back to His pre-existence; by pre-existence understanding, not merely that He had been originally in the Father, but also that He had been originally in the world. As the mediator between the Father and the world, it appertains to the essence of the Son not only to have His life in the Father, but to live also in the world. As 'the heart of the Father,' He is at the same time the "eternal heart of the world.' As the Logos of the Father, He is at the same time the eternal Logos of the world, through whom the divine light shines into creation (John 1:4). He is the ground and source of all reason in creation.... the principle of the law and the promises under the Old Testament, the eternal light which shines in the darkness of heathenism; and all the holy grains of truth which are found in heathenism were sowed by the Son of God in the souls of men" (Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 237). Bishop Martensen makes a distinction between the Logos revelation and the Christ-revelation, and confines the kenosis to the latter. The Logos while continuing as God in His general revelation to the world, enters at the same time into the bosom of humanity as a holy seed, that He may rise within the human race as a Mediator and Redeemer. As the Logos, He works in an all-pervading activity through the kingdom of nature; as Christ, He works in the kingdom of grace; and He indicates His consciousness of personal identity in the two spheres by referring to His pre-existence

If now we add to these, the earlier kenotic and kryptic theories, we shall have at least a practical survey of the various kenotic theories in their relation to the humiliation of Christ. Julius Mueller (d. 1879) is a modern representative of the earlier kenoticism - holding that the Incarnation implied not only a renunciation of the use but of the possession of the divine attributes and powers. Kahnis (1814-1888) and Lange (1802-1884) returned more nearly to the older orthodox position, maintaining that the kenosis must be limited solely to the abandonment of the use of the divine attributes. Dorner criticizes the kenotic theories, and in their place sub-

[The new feature in the revelation of Christ is not that union of the divine and human nature, which is involved in the idea of man as created in the image of God. The new feature is such a union of the two natures, that a man on earth appears as the self-revelation of the divine Logos. Although the word "God-man" is not found in the New Testament, the thought expressed by it lies at the basis of its Christological representations. Christ describes Himself as both the Son of God and son of man. In styling Himself the Son of man, He sets Himself forth as the personal embodiment of human nature in its pure archetypal form (as the second Adam according to the explanation of the Apostle). And in styling Himself the Son of God, He assumes the position of the Only Begotten of the Father. (He is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person" (Hebrews 1:3). - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 240.] stitutes the idea of a progressive union consummated by an enlarging impartation from the Logos to the growing receptivity in the human nature. This theory applies the kenosis to the whole range of the earthly life of Jesus instead of limiting it to a single event. It follows also the pattern of the earlier kenoticism, in that there is no depotentiation of the Logos, which remains unchanged in being and reality; but finds the limitation in the human nature, to which according to a growing capacity, there is a self-communication of the Logos The Mystical Theories. As previously indicated, the teaching of Zinzendorf was in some sense, the germ from which the later kenotic theories developed. It also marked a stage in the

development of the modern mystical theories. In its bearing upon Christology, mysticism was developed by Weigel, Arndt, and Boehme into what amounted to a Protestant philosophy in theosophical form. The Christology of the Confessions did not satisfy the friends of mysticism. They felt the need of a stronger emphasis upon the essential affinity of man with God, and also upon the notion of a mystic vision. The eye by which earthy knowledge becomes real, they held to be man himself. In the matter of supernatural knowledge, the eye is not man but God, who is both the light and the eye in us. This inner light, Weigel identified with Christ. Later there developed the doctrine of a preexistent humanity or pretemporal Incarnation, in which the Word and this ideal humanity were conjoined from eternity. It was not, therefore, the Son of God who directly became flesh, but the Son of God already in the heavenly nature of mankind. There are three representative types of this mysticism in modern times

1. Barclay, the theologian of the Quakers, taught that the flesh of which St. John speaks under the symbol of "the bread of life which came down from heaven" (John 6:51) is a spiritual body, and therefore the pretemporal humanity of Jesus. In order to maintain a belief in the historical Redeemer, Barclay was driven to

[Lange points out the curious fact that the Labadism of the Reformed Church is on the one side connected with the Roman Catholic Jansenism, and on the other with Lutheran Spenerism.] posit two bodies of Christ - one heavenly, the other earthly. The peculiar tenet of Barclay, however, was his inclination to the view that the Word of God revealed Himself to men in all ages by means of the same body. The Old Testament theophanies were, then, manifestations of this body previous to the Incarnation. For this reason all men could become partakers of the life which is in Christ; and this is possible to faith, even apart from the Eucharist

2. Zinzendorf was the founder of Herrnhut and the head of the Moravian Brethren. John Wesley was profoundly influenced by the spiritual experience of the Brethren, but reacted sharply against their peculiar doctrines. Zinzendorf shows in a marked manner the influence of the earlier mysticism as found in Weigel (1533-1588) and Boehme (1575-1624). He maintains that the human soul of Jesus was inbreathed as a glorious, holy, chaste, divine substance, by the Son himself. It took place, however, in such manner that His humanity was made subject to His divinity, His soul being a part of the divine essence. Jesus is, therefore, the natural Son of God. This family idea of Zinzendorf is applied to the Trinity and to the Church

3. Oetinger interpreted the text ""he came unto his own" (John 1:11), as indicating that man was fashioned after the pattern of the humanity of the pretemporal Christ, and, therefore, the Incarnation was a literal coming to His own in a physical sense. Hence he says, "Because Wisdom, before the Incarnation, was the visible image of the invisible God, therefore the Son, in comparison with the Being of all beings, is something relatively incorporeal although He, too, is pure spirit. The heavenly humanity which He had as the Lord from

[The one fundamental principle in these sporadic speculations - they have never been formulated in any Confessions - is that the pure humanity of our Lord was as independent of the race of man as that of Adam was when he came from the hand and breath of his Maker. Denying, with the Scripture, that Jesus owed anything to a human father, they deny, without or in opposition to Scripture, that He derived anything from a human mother. The Virgin was no more than the instrument or channel through which a divine humanity, existing before the foundation of the world

or from eternity, was introduced by the Holy Ghost into human history. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th.. II, p. 194.] heaven was invisibly present even with the Israelites. They drank out of the rock." It is thus the heavenly humanity of Jesus which takes on or assumes to itself an earthly body

Summary and Critical Statement. The theories under discussion will be best understood by considering them in their relation to the development of modern thought. The older Lutheranism with its extreme emphasis upon the deity of Christ, had practically ignored His humanity. It had, as Dr. Schaff says, arrived at the brink of Docetism. The rationalism which arose at the close of the eighteenth century was a reaction against this scholastic and confessional Christology, and brought a renewed emphasis upon the humanity of Christ. However it went to the opposite extreme; it ignored the divine nature, and soon fell back upon a purely human or Ebionitic Christ. With the arrival of the evangelical faith in Germany, the divine element was again emphasized, followed by original modifications and reconstructions of the orthodox Christology. Two tendencies may be noted - the humanistic and the pantheistic; the former having its origin in the theology of Schleiermacher, the latter in the philosophy of Hegel and Schelling. The humanistic tendency includes, in addition to the Christology of Schleiermacher, those also of Channing, Bushnell and other unitarian developments. The pantheistic tendency is best represented by Daub, Marheineke and Goeschel

It is evident from our discussion of the kenotic theories that some of them must be classed with the humanistic theories, and others with the pantheistic. We have seen that the earlier depotentiation theories limited the kenosis merely to the use, or the manifested use of the divine predicates. The later theories, however, applied the kenosis directly to the Logos, holding to such a depotentiation as in some instances reduced the divine Logos to a mere finite human being. Here must be mentioned the theories of Thomasius, Gess and Julius Mueller. These are unitarian, or at least humanitarian theories and cannot be held consistently with orthodox trinitarianism. Their error lies in this - that they carry the humiliation and self-limitation to the extent of a metaphysical impossibility, and consequently contradict the essential unchangeableness of God. The pantheistic tendency led to another type of Christology. Starting from the idea of an essential unity between the divine and the human, it held to a continuous incarnation of God in the human race as a whole. The peculiar position of Christ according to this theory, is that He was the first to awake to a consciousness of this unity, and represents it in its pur

[Schielermacher’s Christology may be said to mark the beginning of the nineteenth development in Unitarian thought. while holding to the divine element in Christ, and emphatically asserting His sinlessness and absolute perfection, Schleiermacher nevertheless emphasizes Christ’s humanity to the disparagement of His deity. He holds Christ to be a perfect man, in whom, and in whom alone, the ideal of humanity has been realized. He admits that Christ was a "moral miracle," and that there was in Him a peculiar and abiding indwelling of the Godhead, which marked Him as different from all other men. "He was willing," says Dr. Philip Schaff, "to surrender almost every miracle of action, to save the miracle of the person of Him whom he loved and adored, from his Moravian childhood to his deathbed, as his Lord and Savior. He adopts the Sabellian view of the Trinity as a threefold manifestation of God in creation (in the world), redemption (in Christ), and sanctification (in the Church). Christ is God as Redeemer and originated an incessant flow of a new spiritual life, with all its pure and holy emotions and aspirations which must be traced to that source. Sabellian as he was, Schielermacher did not hold an eternal pre-existence of the Logos

which would correspond to the historical indwelling of God in Christ." - Schaff Herzog Encylop., Art., Christology

Richard Rothe was greatly influenced by Schleiermacher and Hegel. Next to Schleiermacher, he is generally considered the greatest speculative theologian of the nineteenth century. He held to the divine-human character of Christ, but abandoned the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. God by a creative act called the last Adam into existence in the midst of the old natural humanity. Christ was born of Mary yet not begotten of man, but created by God as to His humanity, and hence free of all sinful bias as well as actual sin. He stood every moment of conscious life in personal Union with God, but the absolute union took place only at the completion of His personal development. This took place at the time of His Perfect self-sacrifice in death. The death of Christ on earth was at the same time His ascension to heaven, and His elevation above the limitations of earthly existence The criticism urged against Bishop Martensen's twofold Logos revelation and Christ revelation, is that he fails to explain more clearly the unity of Christ's Person on this theory than does the orthodox creed with its two natures. As to the progressive idea of Dorner, if it be understood to make Christ more and more a theanthropic Person, we must reject it. Christ must be regarded as a theanthropic Person from His conception and birth; and His normal development, as we have previously pointed out, must be the law of natural development under which he assumes true human nature.] est and strongest form. But the idea of a racial Incarnation soon developed into a denial of the specific dignity of Christ as the only true God-man, and consequently the theory found its logical issue in rationalistic criticism and religious skepticism. The mediating theologians, Martensen and Dorner, attempted by their kenotic theories to harmonize orthodox Christology with this idealistic philosophy, but with doubtful success. As to the mystical theories, their tendency was toward Arianism as is shown in the position of Isaac Watts, and as actually affirmed in the case of Paul Maty

If now we take into account the teaching of St. Paul that there was in the humiliation of Christ a kenosis or self-emptying (Php 2:7); and if we set over against this the idea of a divestment of His pre-existent glory, as indicated by our Lord in His high priestly prayer (John 17:5), we shall find some light on this perplexing problem. The mystery of the humiliation, however, must forever transcend human comprehension. Of this divestment, Dean Alford says, " "He emptied himself of the momfh Qeou, not the essential glory but the manifested possession. . . . the glory which He had with the Father before the world began and which was resumed at His glorification. He ceased while in the state of examination to reflect the glory which He had with the Father." Lightfoot takes practically the same position. "He divested Himself, not of His divine nature, for this was impossible, but of the glories, the prerogatives, of Deity" (Lightfoot, Comm. Phil., p. 110). We may then, with safety interpret this divestment of the glory to mean the giving up of the independent exercise of His own divine attributes during the period of His earthly life. We may also confidently believe: (1) That the pre-existent Logos gave up the glory which He had before the foundation of the world, in order to take upon Himself the form of a servant. (2) That during His earthly life He was subordinate to the mediatorial will of the Father in all things; yet knowing the will of the Father, He voluntarily offered Himself in obedience to this will. (3) That His ministry during this period was under the immediate control of the Holy Spirit, who prepared for Him a body, who instructed Him during the period of development, who anointed Him for His mission, and who enabled Him at last to offer Himself without spot to God THE STATE OF EXALTATION The Exaltation is that state of

Christ in which He laid aside the infirmities of the flesh according to His human nature, and again assumed His majesty. As in the humiliation there were stages of descent, so also in the exaltation there are stages of ascent. These stages are as follows: (1) The Descensus, or descent into Hades; (2) The Resurrection; (3) The Ascension; and (4) The Session The Descent into Hades. The brief interval in redemptive history, between the death of Christ and the resurrection, is known as the Descensus ad inferos, or the Descent into Hades. The term is not found in the Scriptures but in the creeds, and as found there is expressed in the words, "He descended into hell." The doctrine of the descensus however, is based upon such scriptures as Psalms 16:10 quoted by the Apostle Peter in His sermon at Pentecost. Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.... He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption (Acts 2:27; Acts 2:31). Closely con-

[Various views have been held concerning the Descensus. It has been held (1) that Christ in His own person preached to the good in the spirit world. This view is attributed to Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria Tertullian, Origen and Gregory the Great. It was advocated also by Anseim, Alburtus and Thomas Aquinas. Zwingli held that Christ preached the gospel of redemption to the "spirits in prison," that is, to the Old Testament saints, who could not be admitted into heaven proper prior to the actual death of Christ. This is substantially the view of the Roman Catholic Church. (2) Christ preached to both the good and bad. This view was maintained by Athanasius, Ambrose, Erasmus and Calvin. (3) Christ preached to the wicked only, announcing their final condemnation. This was held by many of the Lutheran divines. (4) Christ in the person of the apostles preached to the spirits in prison that is, to those yet in the prison of the body or flesh. This was the view of the celebrated Grotius, and also of Socinius. (5) Christ preached in the person of ancient Noah, to those who were alive on earth in his day. This view has been held by a number of eminent expositors, ancient and modern.] nected with these texts is another by the same apostle, which states that he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water (1 Peter 3:19-20). The Greek word Hades ("AidhV) and its Hebrew complement, Sheol, signifies the hidden or unseen state, that is, the realm of the dead. It has no reference to punishment endured while in this hidden state. It was into this realm of the dead that our Lord entered, while His body was concealed in the sepulcher, or "visible representative of the invisible Hades into which He entered as to His soul."

We must regard the descensus as the first stage in the exaltation. The Reformed Churches generally regard it as the last stage in the humiliation, although it is not made an Article of Faith. Calvin and the Heidelberg Catechism regarded the creedal expression "he descended into hell" as referring to the intensity of Christ’s sufferings on the cross, where he may be said to have tasted the pains of hell for sinners. The Westminster divines held that the expression meant merely that Christ continued

[Cremer says that "qanatoV , is not an isolated occurrence or fact merely, it is also a state, just as life is a state: it is the state of man as liable to judgment. It is the antithesis of that eternal life which God has purposed for man, and which man may yet obtain through Christ....We find that, according to the context, the reference of qanatoV , is either to death as the objective sentence and punishment accounted for man, or to death as the state in which man is as condemned

through sin (Cf. Romans 6:23; 1 John 3:14-16). - Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek

Christ’s humiliation after His death consisted in His being buried and continuing in the state of the dead and under the power of death until the third day, which hath been otherwise expressed in these words, He descended into hell. - Larger Westminster Catechism, Question 50

We simply believe that the whole person of Christ, including both His divine and human natures, after His burial, descended into hell (ad inferos), conquered Satan, overturned the power of hell, and broke down all the strength and power of the devil. But in what manner Christ did this, it is not possible that we should ascertain, whether by argumentation or by sublime imaginings. - Formula of Concord, Art. 9: 2 The Roman Catholic Church holds that Christ descended into an intermediate state known as the "Limbus Petrum"; His purpose being to deliver the righteous dead whom He led on high as captives when He ascended after the resurrection. This assumes that the ordinances of salvation in the Old Testament were not efficacious, and that no Old Testament saint could be admitted into heaven proper on the basis of a Christ not yet historically come.] dead as far as this world is concerned, for the period of three days. The Lutheran Church, on the other hand, held that the descensus belongs to the exaltation of Christ and is a constituent element in His redemptive work. This is the teaching of the Formula of Concord (Art. 9:, 2). The older theologians based their doctrine chiefly upon the words of St. Peter (1 Peter 3:18-19) and like wise regarded it as the first stage in the exaltation. It took place, according to their belief, immediately after the quickening in the tomb and just preceding the visible resurrection. We may safely believe, then, that when our Lord uttered the cry, "It is finished!" the humiliation ended and in the same instant His exaltation began. His death was His triumph over death, consequently death had no more power over Him (Romans 6:8-9). When, therefore, He entered into the realm of the dead it was a Conqueror. Descending into the lower parts of the earth (Ephesians 4:8-9), He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. "Quickened by the Spirit," He went and preached to the spirits in prison (1 Peter 3:18-19), a scripture which "Indicates, and will allow no other interpretation, that in the interval the Redeemer asserted His authority and Lordship in the vast region where the congregation of the dead is the great aggregate of man-

[The word Hades is derived from a meaning not; and aidhV to see and therefore means etymologically the "not seen." It occurs ten times in the New Testament, Matthew 11:23; Matthew 16:18; Luke 10:15; Luke 16:23Acts 2:27-31; Revelation 1:18; Revelation 6:8; Revelation 20:13-14

Calvin maintained that "If Christ had merely died a corporeal death no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite also that’ He should feel the severity of the divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God, and satisfy His justice. Hence it was necessary for Him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death" (Cf. Calvin, Institutes, II, 16: 10). This makes the descensus a part of the humiliation, against which Arminian theologians generally have protested

Godet in his comment on Romans 14:9 has the following "With the view of securing the possession of His own, whether as living or dead Jesus began by resolving in His own person the contrast between life and death. He did so by dying and reviving. For what is one raised again except a dead man living? Thus it is that He reigns simultaneously over the two domains of being through which His own are called to pass and that He can fulfill His promise to them, John 10:28, ’None shall p’ luck them out of my hand.'"

Bengel remarks (Revelation 1:18, He might have said, apeqanon, "I died," but with singular elegance it is egenomhn nekpoV , "I became dead," to denote the difference of times, and of the events in them.] kind, the great assembly to which also we may apply the words In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee" (cf. Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 168, 169). We must believe also, that Christ's body was preserved inviolate, and consequently saw no corruption (Acts 13:37). As through the Incarnation, the Son of God took upon Him flesh and blood and thereby entered into the state of human life, so in the descensus He entered triumphantly the hitherto unknown state of the dead The Resurrection. The second stage in the exaltation of Christ is the resurrection, or that act by which our Lord came forth alive from the tomb. As previously indicated, St. Luke in his introduction to the Acts, makes the span of Christ's earthly life to end, not at His death but at His ascension, the time when he was taken up (Acts 1:2). The ascension marked the transition from His earthly to His heavenly state. The resurrection therefore, was the last and crowning event of our Lord's earthly mission. Two phases of this truth must be given brief consideration; first, the historical fact of the resurrection; and second, the dogmatic significance, or meaning of the resurrection

First, the fact of the resurrection was attested by many infallible proofs (Acts 1:3). The testimony of the apostles and first disciples is of great value, and the historical significance of the resurrection must not therefore, be undervalued. Jesus having been crucified, dead and buried, His body on the third day disappeared from the tomb; and this despite the fact that the tomb was sealed and a Roman guard set before it. To the women who early visited the tomb an angel declared that He had risen and gone before them into Galilee (Matthew 28:1-7). Our Lord's clothes were found in the tomb, in positions

[In His one Person He kept inviolate His human body, which did not undergo the material dissolution of its elements: not because, as is sometimes said, He was delivered from the grave before corruption had time to affect His sacred flesh; but because the work of death was arrested in the very instant of the severance of soul and body. As His spirit dieth no more, so His body saw no corruption. The unviolated flesh of our Lord was still the moment He was quickened a silent declaration of perfect victory: His divinity never left His body, any more than it forsook His spirit in its passage into the world of spirits. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II. p. 168.] which suggested that the body was exhaled in a manner which left them undisturbed, except causing them to collapse. He appeared alive to His disciples in tangible "flesh and bones" by which they recognized His body as that in which He had been crucified. Added to this, they recognized that he had acquired new and mysterious powers, which transcended those manifested during His earthly life in the flesh. During the forty days, the following appearances are recorded: to Mary in the garden (John 20:15-16); to Peter (Luke 24:34); to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24:13 ff); to the ten gathered together, Thomas being absent (John 20:19); to the eleven (John 20:24-29); to the disciples as they were fishing on the Sea of Tiberias (John 21:1 ff); to above five hundred brethren at once (1 Corinthians 15:6); to James (1 Corinthians 15:7); at the ascension (Luke 24:50-51); and last of all. to the Apostle Paul (1 Corinthians 15:8). One of the strongest evidences of the resurrection, therefore, was the complete and instantaneous change which took place in the minds of the disciples. From discouragement and unbelief, they were suddenly transformed into joyous believers. The supreme evidence of the resurrection, however, must ever be the gift of the Holy Spirit to the disciples, making of them flaming evangels of the gospel, and giving them power in

the preaching of the Word (cf. Acts 4:33; Acts 5:32; Acts 10:44 and Hebrews 2:4)

Second, the resurrection must also be considered in its dogmatic relations. Here may be mentioned, (1) the self-verification of Jesus, or the evidential power of the resurrection; (2) the new humanity as the basis and consummation of the atoning sacrifice; (3) The resurrection as the ground of our justification; (4) The glorified humanity in Christ as the basis of a new spiritual fellow-

[The denial of the miracle of the resurrection is not, therefore, the bare denial of a single historical fact, it is the denial of the entire prophetic aspect of the world which Christianity presents; which finds in the resurrection its beginning in fact. A view of the world which makes the present order of things perpetual, and which considers the eternal to be only a continual present, naturally allows no room for the resurrection of Christ, which is an interruption of the order of this world by the higher order of creation still future; and which is a witness to the reality of a future life. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 319.] ship; and (5) The resurrection of Christ as the guaranty of our future resurrection

1. The resurrection of Christ was the self-verification of the claims of Jesus. He was declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead. The resurrection, therefore, was an event of supreme evidential value, and afforded the apostles a new significance of the Person and work of Christ. In turn, it made possible the fuller revelation of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:45, John 20:22-23). We must regard it, therefore, as the divine attestation of Christ's prophetic ministry, by which not only His claims were vindicated, but by which His mission was interpreted to the apostles and evangelists

2. The new humanity of Jesus being sinless, furnished the ground of the atoning sacrifice. In the Incarnation our Lord assumed flesh and blood that He might taste death for every man; in the resurrection He achieved victory over death. It is for this reason that the resurrection is called a birth (Colossians 1:18, Revelation 1:5). It was in reality a birth out of death, and therefore the death of death. By taking our nature and dying in it, then reviving or quickening it, this new and glorified humanity becomes the ground of an eternal priesthood, His death and resurrection being the consecrating basis. It is therefore an event of progress, in which the Redeemer passes from a lower to a higher plane in the new creation. The resurrection was not merely a return from the grave to the natural status of human life. It was a

[All the four Gospel accounts of the resurrection seem to introduce two contrasted representations concerning the nature of the resurrection body of the Lord. The risen One seems to live a natural human life, in a body such as He had before His death. He has flesh and bones, He eats and drinks: again, on the contrary, He seems to have a body of a spiritual transcendental kind, which is independent of the limitations of time and space; He enters through closed doors, He stands suddenly in the midst of the disciples, and as suddenly becomes invisible to them. This contradiction, which occurs in the appearances of the risen Savior during the forty days may be explained upon the supposition, that during this interval His body was in a state of transition and of change, upon the boundary of both worlds, and possessed the impress or character of both this world and the next. Not until the moment of the ascension can we suppose that His body was fully glorified and freed from all earthly limitations and wants, like the spiritual body of which Paul speaks (1 Corinthians 15:44) . - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 321.] transcendent event. For this reason two classes of phenomena appear - natural and supernatural. The natural phenomena

served to identify Him, such as the nail prints, the wound in His side (John 20:26-29), and the fact that He ate with them (Luke 24:39-43). With these were connected such supernatural phenomena as suddenly standing before the disciples, the door being shut, and as mysteriously appearing from time to time. Our Lord plainly distinguished His resurrected state from His previous mode of existence, when in speaking to His disciples He said, while I was yet with you I spake of the things which must needs be fulfilled (Luke 24:44). The resurrection as it pertains to the mode of existence during the forty days, must therefore, be regarded as an intermediate stage in the history of the exaltation, looking forward to the ascension and His final and perfect glorification

3. The resurrection furnished the ground for our justification. Christ was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification (Romans 4:25). It becomes, therefore, a vindication, not only of His prophetic work, but also of His priesthood; and this both as to the character of the offering and the efficiency of the offerer. His birth or emergence out of death, established a new and unchangeable priesthood. For this cause He is the mediator of a better covenant (Hebrews 9:11-15). He died for the transgressions that were under the first testament; He arose to become the executor of the new covenant - by the which will, or covenant, we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (Hebrews 10:9-10). The resurrection, therefore, furnishes a new and vital principle - a power for righteousness, which is the abiding source of justifying and sanctifying grace. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us (Hebrews 10:14-15). Here the resurrection is directly related to the ascension and session, as it pertains both to His Person and to His work

4. The glorified humanity of Christ formed the basis of a new spiritual fellowship. He was the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature....And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell (Colossians 1:15; Colossians 1:18-19). This new humanity in Christ, which made Him the firstborn among many brethren (Romans 8:29), furnishes the bond between Him and those who are adopted as children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will (Ephesians 1:5). This new humanity is ethical and spiritual (Ephesians 4:22-24, Colossians 3:9-10), and as the basis of a new and holy fellowship becomes the Church, or the body of Christ

5. The resurrection of Christ is the guaranty of our future resurrection. Christ was the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead....But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming (1 Corinthians 15:20-23). It is a vital part of the redemptive purpose of God in Christ, that man should not only be delivered from sin spiritually, but that he should be made free from the consequences of sin physically The Ascension. The Ascension is the third stage in our Lord’s exaltation, and marks the close of His life on

[In the resurrection is anticipated the perfecting of the world. That regeneration, including renewal and glorification, which mankind and all creation look forward to as the consummation of the world’s development, in which spirit and body, nature and history, are perfectly reconciled - human nature being glorified into a temple for the Holy Ghost, and material nature being brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God - that regeneration which necessarily involves and demands

the belief, that the contradiction between the physical and the ethical, between the kingdom of nature and that of grace shall not continue as if eternal and indissoluble - is revealed ideally in the resurrection of the Lord. The resurrection of the Lord is not the mere sign of that regeneration, it is itself the actual beginning of it. It is the sacred point where death has been overcome in God's creation; and from this point the spiritual as well as the bodily resurrection . . . . proceeds. Now, for the first time, as a risen Savior can Christ become the real Lord and Head of His Church. Now that the perfecting of the world is in His person ideally accomplished, he becomes the actual Perfecter of the world, and can replenish this present world with the energies of the future. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 318 Cf. also Romans 8:18-23; 1 Corinthians 15:24-28; 1 Corinthians 15:49-57; Ephesians 1:9-10; Colossians 1:16-20.] earth. It is noticeable that St. Luke alone records the event in its historical order (Luke 24:50-51; Acts 1:9-11), although St. Mark mentions it as a fact in the concluding verses of his Gospel (Mark 16:19). Christ's removal from earth to heaven must not be understood to mean merely a transference of His presence from one portion of the physical universe to another, but a local withdrawal into what is known as the Presence of God. The ascension was the passing into a new sphere of mediatonal action, the taking possession of the Presence of God for us and is, therefore, immediately associated with His High Priestly intercession. It signifies our Lord's entrance into the holy place, there to appear in the presence of God for us (Hebrews 9:24). Here He offers His living manhood, perfected through sufferings (Hebrews 5:6; Hebrews 5:10), as the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2). Here also He has consecrated a new and living way for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; His glorified body becoming the way of access through which His people have liberty or boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus (Hebrews 10:19-20). Lastly, the ascension signifies the withdrawal of Christ in the flesh in order to establish conditions under which the Holy Spirit could be received as a gift to the Church. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you (John 16:7)

[The pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost was at once the immediate proof of the verity of the ascension, and demonstration of the authority to which it led. The prediction of the psalmist, "Thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them, was interpreted by both our Lord and by St. Paul of the supreme gift of the Holy Spirit (Psalms 68:18). I will send him unto you (John 16:7) was the promise before the Savior's departure; it was confirmed after His resurrection and it was fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost once for all and for ever....The Gift itself was the demonstration of the Session of Christ at the right hand of God (Acts 2:33; Ephesians 4:8; Ephesians 4:12). But the great prophecy in the Psalms (Psalms 68:18), that the Lord God might dwell among them, had its plenary fulfillment when the Holy Ghost came down as the Shekinah, the symbol of God manifest in the flesh, resting upon the Church and abiding within it as the indwelling presence of the Holy Trinity. Thus the glory within the veil, and the candlestick outside, symbols of the Son and the Spirit, were blended when the veil was removed, into one and the same fullness of God. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 182.] The Session. The fourth and last stage of the exaltation is known as the Session. It is closely connected with the ascension, and signifies, primarily, the place of Christ at the right hand of God as an intercessory presence. St. Mark connects the ascension and the session when he says of Christ that he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God (Mark 16:19). Our Lord referred indirectly to the session when He quoted the prophecy of David, The Lord said unto

my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool (Matthew 22:44); and later directly in the words, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power (Matthew 26:64). Both St. Peter and St. Paul speak of Christ as being at the right hand of God (1 Peter 3:22; Ephesians 1:20-23). As the prophetical office of Christ was merged into His priestly work by His death and resurrection, so His priestly office is merged into His Kingship by the ascension and session. And as the resurrection was the divine attestation of His prophetical office, so the gift of the Holy Spirit is the divine attestation of both the ascension and the session. As prophet, our Lord foretold the coming of the Holy Spirit as the Comforter (John 15:26; John 16:7; John 16:13); as priest, He received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost; and as King he shed forth this, which ye now see and hear (Acts 2:33). Christ's presence on the throne is the beginning of a supreme authority which shall end only when He hath put all enemies under his feet (1 Corinthians 15:25). He is not only the Head of the Church, but the Head over all things to the Church (Ephesians 1:20-23). From the session our Lord will return to the earth a second time, without sin unto salvation (Hebrews 9:28); and the ascension is the pattern of this return (Acts 1:11) THE OFFICES OF CHRIST The mediatorial process which began historically with the incarnation, and was continued through the humiliation and exaltation, reached its full perfection in the session at the right hand of God. The estates and offices therefore, form the transition from a consideration of the complex Person of Christ, to that of His finished work in the Atonement - the former relating the mediatorial work more directly to His Person, the latter more immediately to the Finished Work. As Mediator, the work of Christ is resolved into the threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King. Into these offices He was inducted at His baptism, and by a specific anointing with the Holy Spirit became officially the Mediator between God and man. But before directly considering the prophetical, priestly and regal offices of Christ, it will be necessary to consider some of the more general characteristics of Christ as Mediator. This will serve to prevent any misconception as to the nature of the mediatorial work as a whole

1. Christ as mediator between God and men cannot be God only, or man only, for a mediator supposes two parties between whom he intervenes. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one (Galatians 3:20). For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus (1 Timothy 2:5). The man to which the apostle refers is Christ Jesus, and therefore the theanthropic or God-man. The Logos was not actually and historically the Mediator until He assumed human nature. In the Old Testament Christ was Mediator by anticipation, and men were saved through His mediatorial work in view of His future Advent. In the New Testament the types and shadows through which the Word manifested Himself are done away, being superseded by the fuller revelation of the incarnate Word

2. The Mediatorship of Christ is an assumed office. We must regard Creatorship as a primary function of Deity. The Son never assumed it and He will never lay it down. But the mediatorship as an office is not inherent in Deity, although we may say that it is inherent in His nature as sacrificial love (Ephesians 1:4; 1 Peter 1:19-20; Revelation 13:8). The Son voluntarily assumed the office of Mediator, being sent of the Father; and being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself and became obedient even to the death of the cross (Php 2:5-11). Because the office was voluntary and involved the carrying out of a commission, His condescension and humiliation are deserving of reward. Wherefore, 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 (Php 2:9-11). Furthermore, the office of Mediator because it was assumed will also end - in this sense, that there will be a time when the work of redemption will cease. And while the God-man will forever exist, and the relations of His people to the Father will be eternally mediated through Him, the work of redeeming sinners will be superseded by the judgment of all things. As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (that is, without a sin-offering) unto salvation (Hebrews 9:27-28)

3. Christ is represented as the Mediator of a Covenant. In a strict sense, there can be but two forms of a covenant - the legal and evangelical. The first is based upon justice, the second upon mercy. Man having sinned in the fall, the first became inoperative; consequently the evangelical covenant alone could be established. This is sometimes known as the covenant of redemption, and sometimes as the covenant of grace. The evangelical covenant existed first under the Old Dispensation, and as such was known as the "first covenant" (Hebrews 8:6-13). It exists now in a second form under the New Testament, and is known as the "new" or "better covenant" (Cf. also Hebrews 8:6-8). The first was more external, and was administered through animal sacrifices and visible types and symbols. It was therefore ceremonial and national. The second is an internal covenant of life, and therefore spiritual and universal. In the first covenant the words were spoken to the people in the form of external law; in the new covenant the law is written within, upon the hearts and minds of the people (Hebrews 8:8-13; Hebrews 10:16-18)

4. Christ, as the Mediator of the New Covenant, discharges three offices, that of prophet, priest, and king. Under the Old Testament, Samuel was a prophet and a priest; David a prophet and a king; and Melchisedec, a priest and a king; Christ alone, unites in Himself the threefold office. His prophetical office is mentioned in Deuteronomy 18:15; Deuteronomy 18:18, For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you (Acts 3:22). His priestly office is foretold in Psalms 110:4, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec (Hebrews 5:6; Hebrews 4:14-15). Since Melchisedec was a king-priest, Christ’s priesthood involved also His kingship. This is directly stated in Isaiah 9:6-7, where He is called the Prince of Peace; and again in the Psalms, I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion (Psalms 2:6) The Prophetic Office. Christ as a prophet is the perfect revealer of divine truth. As the Logos, He was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John 1:9). In the Old Testament He spoke through angels, through theophanies, through types, and by means of the prophets, to whom He communicated His Holy Spirit. As the Incarnate Word He faithfully and fully revealed to men the saving will of God. He spoke with inherent authority (Matthew 7:28-29) and was recognized as a teacher come from God (John 3:2). After His ascension He continued His work through the Holy Spirit, who now dwells in the Church as the Spirit of truth. In the world to come His prophetic work will be continued, for we are told that the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof (Revelation 21:23). It will be through His glorified manhood that we shall see and enjoy the vision of God to all eternity The Priestly Office. The priestly office of Christ is concerned with objective mediation, and includes both sacrifice and intercession. He offered up himself (Hebrews 7:27). He was at once the offering and the Offerer, the one corresponding to His death, the other to His resurrection and ascension,

and together issuing in the Atonement. Based upon His sacrificial work in His office of Intercession and Benediction, which are together connected with the Administration of Redemption. It was on the eve of the crucifixion that our Lord formally assumed His sacrificial function - first by the institution of the Lord’s Supper, and following this by His high priestly prayer of consecration (John 17:1-26). After Pentecost the priestly office became more prominent. Consequently the cross becomes the center of the apostolic gospel (1 Corinthians 1:23; 1 Corinthians 5:7); His death is the establishment of a new covenant (1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 11:24-26); and His sacrifice is regarded as a voluntary act of atonement and reconciliation (Ephesians 5:2,1 Peter 2:24, Romans 5:10, Colossians 1:20). After Pentecost the priestly work of Christ is continued through the Holy Spirit as a gift of the risen and exalted Savior; and in the world to come our approach to God must be ever through Him as the abiding source of our life and glory The Kingly Office. The kingly, or regal office of Christ is that activity of our ascended Lord which He exercises at the right hand of God, ruling over all things in heaven and in earth for the extension of His kingdom. It is based upon the sacrificial death, and therefore finds its highest exercise in the bestowment of the blessings secured for mankind by His atoning work. As our Lord formally assumed His priestly work on the eve of the crucifixion, so He formally assumed His kingly office at the time of the ascension. We must not overlook the fact, however, that by anticipation Christ assumed to Himself the office of king during His earthly life, particularly at the time just preceding His death. But at the ascension, He said, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. 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. Amen (Matthew 28:18-20). Having already proclaimed His rule over the dead in the descensus: and having declared it to His brethren on earth, He ascended to the throne, there to exercise His mediatorial power until the time of the judgment, when the mediatorial economy shall end. God’s efforts to save men then have been exhausted, and the fate of all men, whether good or evil, will be fixed forever. This is the meaning of St. Paul, when he says, Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet (1 Corinthians 15:24-25). It is obvious that the kingly office as exercised for the redemption of mankind applies only to that era of extending and perfecting the kingdom; and the regal office in this sense will end when that era is completed. Nor does this mean that the Son shall not continue to reign as the Second Person in the Trinity; nor that His theanthropic Person shall cease. He shall forever reign as the God-man, and shall forever exercise His power for the benefit of the redeemed and the glory of His kingdom The Names and Titles of Our Lord

[In our discussion of "The Divine Names and Predicates" we pointed out the practical value of a study of the names through which God had revealed Himself, and also the misuse which had been made of this subject by the so-called "Higher Criticism" of modern times. There is likewise a practical value in the study of "The Names and Titles of Our Lord." "It is the divine method of teaching us the doctrines of the economy of redemption; he who understands the derivation, uses and bearings of the rich cluster of terms, in their Hebrew and Greek symbols especially....will have no mean knowledge of this branch of theology and of theology in general. For this study will also tend to give precision to the language of the theologian, especially the preacher, who will observe with what exquisite propriety every epithet is used by evangelists and apostles in relation to the

person and work and relations of the Redeemer. There can be no better theological exercise than the study of evangelical doctrine as based upon the titles of Jesus. No study more surely tends to exalt our Lord. we cannot range in thought over the boundless names given by inspiration to our adorable Master without feeling that there is no place worthy of Him below the highest, that He cannot be less than God to our faith and reverence, and devotion and love" (Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 261 ff). Dr. Pope classifies the names and titles under the following six general heads: (1) Names of the supra-human Being who became man; (II) Names that express the union of the divine and human; (III) Names that express the official aspects of Christ; (IV) Names which designate the specific offices of the Redeemer; (V) Names resulting from the changes and combinations of the titles of the Redeemer; and (VI) Names which refer to our Lord's relations with His people The various helps to the study of the Bible generally give lists of the Names, Titles and Offices of Christ. (Those found I'm the Oxford Bibles are excellent.) The following list is not intended to be exhaustive, but merely to furnish the student with a classification and guide to the direct study of the Scriptures

Adam, the last, 1 Corinthians 15:45; 1 Corinthians 15:47; Advocate, 1 John 2:11; Alpha and Omega, Revelation 1:8; Revelation 22:13; Amen, Revelation 3:14; Author and Finisher (or Perfecter) of our faith, Hebrews 12:2; Beginning of the creation of God, Revelation 3:14; Blessed and only Potentate, 1 Timothy 6:15; Branch, Zechariah 3:8; Zechariah 6:12; Bread of God, John 6:33; Bread of Life, John 6:35; Captain of our Salvation, Hebrews 2:10; Child, Holy, Acts 4:27; Child, little, Isaiah 11:6; Christ, Matthew 16:16; Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20; John 6:69; Cornerstone, Ephesians 2:20; 1 Peter 2:6; Counsellor, Isaiah 9:6; David, Jeremiah 30:9; Dayspring, Luke 1:78; Deliverer, Romans 11:26; Desire of all nations, Haggai 2:7; Emmanuel, Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:23; Everlasting Father, Isaiah 9:6; Faithful witness, Revelation 1:5; Revelation 3:14; First and Last, Revelation 1:17; First begotten (Firstborn) of the dead, Revelation 1:5; God, Isaiah 40:9; 1 John 5:20; God blessed forever, Romans 9:5; Good Shepherd, John 10:11; Governor, Matthew 2:6; Great High Priest, Hebrews 4:14; High Priest, Hebrews 5:10; Holy Child Jesus, Acts 4:27; Holy One, Luke 4:34; Holy Thing, Luke 1:35; Horn of Salvation, Luke 1:69; I AM, Exodus 3:14; image of God, 11 Cor. 4:4; Jehovah, Isaiah 26:4; Jesus, Matthew 1:21; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; Just One, Acts 3:14; King of Israel, John 1:49; King of the Jews, Matthew 2:2; King of kings, 1 Timothy 6:15; Lamb of God, John 1:29; John 1:36; Law-giver, Isaiah 33:22; Life, the, John 14:6; Light of the world, John 8:12; Light, the true, John 1:9; Lion of the tribe of Judah, Revelation 5:5; Living stone, 1 Peter 2:4; Lord, Matthew 3:3; Lord God, Almighty, Revelation 15:3; Lord of all, Acts 10:36; Lord of Glory, 1 Corinthians 2:8; Lord of lords, 1 Timothy 6:15; Lord our righteousness, Jeremiah 23:6; Mediator, 1 Timothy 2:5; Messiah, Daniel 9:25; John 1:41; Mighty God, Isaiah 9:6; Mighty One of Jacob, Isaiah 60:16; Nazarene, Matthew 2:23; Passover, 1 Corinthians 5:7; Priest forever, Hebrews 5:6; Prince, Acts 5:31; Prince of Peace, Isaiah 9:6; Prince of the kings of the earth, Revelation 1:5; Prophet, Deuteronomy 18:15; Luke 24:19; Redeemer, Job 19:25; Righteous, the, 1 John 2:1; Root and offspring of David, Revelation 22:16; Root of David, Revelation 5:5; Ruler in Israel, Micah 5:2; Same yesterday, today, and forever, Hebrews 13:8; Savior, Luke 2:11; Acts 5:31; Shepherd and Bishop of souls, 1 Peter 2:25; Shepherd of the sheep, Great, Hebrews 13:20; Shiloh, Genesis 49:10; Son, a, Hebrews 3:6; Son, the, Psalms 2:12; Son, my beloved, Matthew 3:17; Son, only-begotten, John 3:16, Son of David; Son of God, Matthew 8:29; Luke 1:35; Son of man, Matthew 8:20; John 1:51; Son of the Highest, Luke 1:32; Star, Bright and Morning, Revelation 22:16; Star and sceptre, Numbers 24:17; Truth, the, John 14:6; vine, the true, John

15:1; John 15:5; way, the, John 14:6; Witness, Revelation 3:14; Wonderful, Isaiah 9:6; word, John 1:1; Word of God, Revelation 19:13.]

22. Chapter 23 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS BIBLICAL BASIS AND HISTORY

Chapter 23 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS BIBLICAL BASIS AND HISTORY A few general remarks are necessary in order to prepare the mind for a satisfactory study of the Atonement

(1) It is important to include in this study, the various phases of the scriptural presentation, such as expiation, propitiation, redemption, reconciliation, and others of like character. Since the subject may be approached from so many angles, our knowledge of it will be unbalanced and fragmentary, unless we give due consideration to the wide range of material found in the New Testament. (2) It is important to guard against the fallacies which arise through abstract processes of thought. There is not a leading idea of this important subject that has not been drawn out into unprofitable abstractions. Thus the idea of penalty has been so stated as to make it necessary to regard Christ as a sinner. The idea of substitution has been so conceived as to make the atonement merely a commercial transaction. Errors have arisen also by abstracting one attribute of God from the others, and treating it as if it were the whole divine nature. Socinianism exalted the will of God, Calvinism, the justice of God. (3) A sharp distinction should be made between the fact of the atonement, and the various theories which are advanced for its explanation. Some have questioned the value of any attempt to formulate a theory of the atonement; but the wordtheoryas it is here used simply expresses meaning, and no moral fact can be properly related to an intelligent being without it. Otherwise priestcraft would become the dominant factor in religion. Then, too, we are commanded to be able to give a reason for the hope that is within us. Christianity must stimulate, not abjure, intelligence. (4) The literature on this subject is enormous, and apart from basic facts becomes confusing and unprofitable. We shall, therefore, give primary attention to this subject as presented in the Scriptures; and following this, we shall study the various explanations as found in the history of Christian doctrine

Foreshadowing of the Atonement in the Old Testament. The doctrine of the atonement was gradually unfolded to the world. Three principal stages in its development may be mentioned, (1) The Primitive Sacrifices; (2) The Sacrifices of the Law; and (3) The Predictions of the Prophets

1. The Primitive Period is everywhere characterized by sacrifices. In the patriarchal story, the altar is always prominent. It is regarded as an essential element in any approach to God. While the Scriptures give us no account of the origin of sacrifice, they do give us a record of sacrificial worship, from the earliest dawn of history to the time when the sacrifices were done away by the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ. We may note here, (1)The Divine Origin of the Sacrifices.This is evidenced by the nature of sacrifice itself, and also from the fact, that previous to the deluge, animals were classified as clean and unclean. The strongest argument, however, is to be found in the historical record of particular sacrifices. The first is that of Cain and Abel.Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering(Genesis 4:3-4). This scripture taken in connection with Hebrews ii 4, reveals two facts:

one, that the sacrifice was offered in faith; the other, that it was divinely approved. The second is the sacrifice of Noah, which he offered immediately upon leaving the ark.And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake(Genesis 8:20-21). Here it is asserted that the sacrifice was marked by divine approbation. The third patriarchal sacrifice is that of Abraham, as recorded in an interesting account found in Genesis 15:9-21. Here it is expressly stated that Abraham offered up animal sacrifices in obedience to the command of God. The acceptance of the offering is indicated by the "burning lamp" which passed between the pieces and hallowed them. (2)The Sacrifices were regarded as Expiatory in Character.This is evidenced primarily by the prohibition of blood in the use of animal food.But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat(Genesis 9:4). To this was added later, the Mosaic explanation,I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls."Furthermore, the end of Abel's offering was pardon and acceptance with God, forhe obtained witness that he was righteous(Hebrews 11:4). In the sacrifice of Noah, the ground was no more to be cursed for man's sake; and it is said of Abraham, thathe believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness(Romans 4:3). To this was added, also, the confirmatory and declaratory witness of circumcision, asa seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised(Romans 4:11). While these sacrifices had no power in themselves to atone for sin, as is clearly set forth in Hebrews 10:1-4; yet it is wrong to speak of the Old Testament sacrifices as purely ceremonial. Their efficacy lay in the power of Christ's sacrifice, to which as types and symbols, they pointed forward in faith

2. The Sacrifices of the Law include those of the Mosaic economy. In Israel the consciousness of a need for reconciliation took on an earnest and energetic manifestation. This is shown in its distinction between evil and sin. Instead of regarding evil as unavoidable suffering, as is done in the dualistic theories; or identifying it

[A type, in a theological sense, is a sign or example prepared and designed by God to prefigure some future person or thing. It is required that it should represent this future object with more or less clearness, either by something which it has in common with the antitype, or in being a symbol of some property which it possesses; that it should be prepared and designed by God thus to represent its antitype, which circumstance distinguishes it from a simile and from a hieroglyphic; that it should give place to the antitype as soon as it appears; and that the efficacy of the antitype should exist in the type in appearance only, or in a lower degree. - Wakefield,Christian Theology, p. 352.] with finitude or corporeity in creation, Hebraism refused to stop at physical evil and traced it back to its root in sin. It was the work of the patriarchs to keep alive this sense of dependence upon God, as the Creator of a universe at harmony with Himself. Hence the presence of evil they regarded as being due to the disorganization and ill-adjustment consequent upon disobedience and sin. It was this consciousness of dependence upon God's power, that made possible the further advance to a stage of law, in which it becomes a dependence upon God's will. Thus it took on a moral character. In the new economy, also there was a further appeal to man's freedom. The universal law of conscience necessarily took on added importance, and at the same time developed a consciousness of sin and a need for atonement. We may note three things in this connection. (1)The Law demanded Holiness. It said, Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my

judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them(Leviticus 18:5). This might have been understood to mean that man was to obtain righteousness solely by his own efforts, had the law regarded him as being free from sin. But this the law did not do. It regarded all men as guilty before God, and demanded an expiation for past sins. Since holiness was demanded by present obligation, past guilt could not be expiated by mere amendment of life. It necessitated forgiveness. It was found also, that the law but increased the knowledge of sin, and therefore revealed increasingly, the need for expiation. (2)The Institution of Sacrifice. It was

[It was the object of God in appointing these sacrifices, (a) That they should release from the civil punishment of certain crimes. The commission of a crime rendered one unworthy of the community of holy people, and excluded him from it. The offering of sacrifice was the means by which he was externally readmitted to the Jewish community, and rendered externally pure; although he did not, on this account, obtain the pardon of his sin from God. It was designed that all who offered sacrifice should by this act, both make a public confession of their sins, and at the same time see before them, in the sacrifice, the punishment which they had deserved, and to which they acknowledged themselves exposed. Hence sins were said to be laid upon the victim, and borne away by it when sacrificed. (b) Another end of the sacrifices appointed by Moses was, as we are taught in the New Testament, to point the Israelites to the future, and to prefigure by types the greater divine provision for the recovery of the human race, and to excite in the Israelites a feeling of their need for such a provision. - Knapp,Chr. Th., p. 381.] through the stated sacrifices for the people that the entire national life of Israel was environed by a gracious presence of the divine Spirit. There is deep significance in the fact that the atonement attached to the religious community, and that the sacrifices did not avail for those who separated themselves. It is indicated here that there is a common racial depravity out of which all personal transgressions spring; and that it was for this "sin of the world" that the Lamb of God was to make atonement. Dr. Dorner thinks that the notion of expiatory sacrifice as a real self-efficient substitute for man is baseless. Also that the idea is false which would make the words "to cover" apply in the sense of an equivalent, and thus pay the debt bymulcta. This he says, would break down completely, the idea of expiatory sacrifice; for one could scarcely speak of forgiveness if full satisfaction had been made (cf. Dorner,Syst. Chr. Doct., III, pp. 404, 405). The word which is translated sacrifice, or atonement, signifies in Hebrew "to cover" or "to hide." Since the holiness of Jehovah is His unapproachable majesty, it is thought that the word "to cover" is intended to convey the idea of a defensive covering for those who would approach Him. The primary idea of sacrifice then, is propitiation. After the imposition of hands, the slaying of the sacrifice had reference to the significance of death as a fundamental concept of the Old Testament. Following this, the offering of the blood had a two-fold significance: it was a representation of the pure life which the sinner should have; and it was an atonement made expiatory through death only. Thus the sacrificial lamb became a symbol of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, whose life poured out in its richer, fuller measure, atoned for the sin of the world. Him, God hath set forth to bea propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God(Romans 3:25) But we must not pass by the fact also, that it was the life poured out that was pleasing to God. It was the life separated from the body that commanded the attention of God as He saw it in the blood. This was a "sweet savour" to him. The continuation of the penalty of death in respect to the body. Thus St. Paul declares thatthe body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness(Romans 8:10). But he follows

this immediately with another declaration, that in the resurrection of Jesus, the consequences if sin still remaining in the physical realm, shall be removed in the restoration of all things.But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you(Romans 8:11);For the earnest expectation of the creature[the whole creation]waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.... Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God(Romans 8:19; Romans 8:21). (3)The Messianic Idea.The animal sacrifices of the Mosaic economy, not only pointed to Christ as the great antitype, but they were a revelation of a true nature of human sacrifice. They taught not merely the sacrifice of man himself in a subjective sense, but also that he himself should be the offerer, that is, self-sacrifice. Human sacrifices were prohibited, for these would merely have sacrificed other, and thus have been a mere caricature of the sacrificial idea. And even were it possible for man to offer himself as a perfect sacrifice, he is not qualified as a perfect offerer. Hence, from both the objective and subjective viewpoint, no man could atone for his own sins. Further still, it was impossible upon this ground, for the Old Testament priesthood and kingship to furnish expiatory security for the nation. This could be done only by the Righteous Servant of Jehovah. Hence there developed in Israel, the Messianic idea. It was the Messiah alone who could become the security for the nation, because he was absolutely the Righteous One. He alone could satisfy the righteousness of God, for He only as the incarnate One could personally manifest the unity of God and man. Thus the nation’s center must be in Him as the personal manifestation of the covenant, the seed that should come. Since then, the divine thought of the nation centered in Him, there was given to Him also, the power to call forth a new and holy race - not now limited to Israel only, but extended to all mankind. It was only as Christ became a light to lighten the Gentiles, that He became the glory of Israel. The sacrifices of the law revealed the vicarious death of the Messiah, but this was fully developed only in the prophetic era. Outwardly, the Messiah bore the punishment due our sins, and inwardly suffered the chastening of His Spirit in intercession. But since He answered for man’s guilt, righteousness may also be implanted by Him. Thus through the restoration of the Holy Spirit, given again to the race in Christ, holiness and righteousness are again made possible, and the idea of kingship is reborn by the inner communication of strength through the Spirit

3. The Predictions of the Prophets supplemented the sacrifices of the law. The prophets developed more fully the Messianic idea, and with it the idea of His sacrificial sufferings and death. They saw in Him a living totality of truth. Being the God-man, in whom are conjoined Deity and humanity, there is in His consciousness the full range of all truth. His individual words and acts, therefore, spring from that indivisible whole. Thus

[There is one other application of the high-priestly function of our Lord to which it is important in this place to refer, however slightly. The entire scheme of the Christian atonement belongs to this office of Messiah. Not as the Teacher, nor as the Ruler, does He save the world: save as teaching the principles of His sacrificial work and administering the blessings it has purchased. It will hereafter be shown how much the doctrine of the atonement is bound up with the divine government of a Lawgiver who administers His law in a new court, the Court Mediatorial. There He exacts and receives what theological language terms satisfaction. But it must always be remembered that the temple is the true sphere of atoning sacrifice. The evangelical hall of judgment is no other than a court of the temple. And it is something more than a mystical fancy

which regards the veil as separating between the outer sanctuary where the oblation that satisfies justice is offered, and the holiest where it is presented for divine acceptance. Our Lord's Atonement is the sacrificial obedience, or the obedient sacrifice which hath put away sin: the obedience was rendered in the outer court where blood reigns unto death, the sacrifice was offered in the inner shrine where mercy reigns unto life. In Christ all these things are one. And the unity is the main object of the evangelical discussion of the Epistle to the Hebrews. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 247, 248.] particular truths are blended with the universal, and the individual is set in proper relation to the race. It was for this reason that it is written,He knew what was in men. It is because all men have an essential relation to Him, that His words have so piercing and familiar a tone. "This is the wondrous charm of His words," says Dorner, "their unfathomable, mysterious depth despite all their simplicity, that they are ever uttered, so to speak, from the heart of the question; for the harmony which binds together and comprehends in one view the opposite ends of things, is livingly and consciously present to Him, since everything is related to His kingdom. Other words of men this or that man might have spoken; nay, most that is spoken or done by us is merely a continuation of others through us, we are simply points of transmission for tradition. But the words which He drew from within - these precious gems, which attest the presence of the Son of man, who is the Son of God - have an originality of a unique order; they are His, because taken from that which is present in Him" (Dorner,Syst. Chr. Doct.,III, pp. 397, 398). For this reason, He fills out the Old Testament types and forms, giving to them their true spiritual content. He is the manifestation of personal truth and eternal life, and therefore becomes the goal toward which all men should strive. This profound truth He himself declared when He said,I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me(John 14:6)

Perhaps the highest reach of spiritual truth in the Old Testament is to be found in Isaiah's remarkable prophecy concerning the suffering Servant of Jehovah. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all....Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities(Isaiah 53:4-6; Isaiah 53:10-11). Nothing greater has ever been written. While Isaiah speaks of Christ primarily under the figure of a lamb there is doubtless also an allusion to the scapegoat upon which the priest laid his hands, confessed over it the sins of the people and sent it away into the wilderness. But no language can be plainer than that He bore the punishment due our sins, and hence His sacrifice was vicarious and expiatory. He was stricken, smitten, wounded, bruised, and chastised - language which can only indicate that His sufferings were penal inflictions for our sins. And since by His stripes we are justified and healed, His death must in the truest and deepest sense be regarded as propitiatory The New Testament Conception of Sacrifice. The conception of Christ's atoning sacrifice as found in the New Testament is simply the completion of that foreshadowed in the Old Testament. For this reason, Christ is described as having died according to the Scriptures. Our Lord himself represents His death as a ransom for men. He laid down His life voluntarily, for no man had power to take it from Him. Hence we must regard the crucifixion not merely as an occurrence brought

about by mere circumstances, but as the great end for which He came into the world. He was not merely a martyr to truth; His death was sacrificial and propitiatory. Perhaps the most elaborate treatment of the expiatory death of Christ, is that set forth by St. Paul in Romans 3:21-26. Here Christ is regarded as a propitiatory sacrifice which is accepted of God for all men in such a manner that He is Himself shown to be just, and yet can be the Justifier of all those who put their faith in the efficacy of that

[It is therefore evident that the Prophet Isaiah, six hundred years before the birth of Jesus; that John the Baptist, on the commencement of His ministry; and that St. Peter, His friend, companion and apostle, subsequent to the transaction; speak of Christ's death as an atonement for sin, under the figure of a lamb sacrificed. - WATSON,Dictionary.] death. The word which is here used for propitiation ishilastrion(ilasthpion), a word which was employed by the Septuagint to signify the lid of the ark, or the mercy-seat. As this was sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice, so the mercy-seat of the gospel is that which is sprinkled with the precious blood of Christ. The substitute endures the punishment which otherwise would fall upon the guilty themselves. According to this use, the blood of Christ becomes an expiation or a covering which protects the offerer from the wrath of God through the substitution of another life. While the voluntariness of Christ's sacrifice is held out as a constraining motive for the loving self-surrender of men to God, we must never relax our belief in the priestly work of Christ, as offering less than a real objective sacrifice to God. The death of Christ is never represented as merely a means of propitiation, but as an actual propitiatory sacrifice. That the Passover lamb was an objective sacrifice cannot be doubted, and the sprinkling of the blood essential to salvation. So also it is said, that Christ appearsin the presence of God for us(Hebrews 9:24), or in our behalf. There is no vicarious substitution in the sense of a discharge of all its beneficiaries from an obligation to righteousness. Christ appears for us, that is as the second Adam, the representative of the human race, and the Head of the new creation. It is on this basis of representation that the idea of substitution must be considered. It is impossible, therefore, to interpret the atoning work of Christ apart from His person. The Scriptures

[Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, as it were on the 14th Nisan, and rose the First Fruits, as it were on the 16th Nisan - and marking that the Synoptists speak of the day of crucifixion as the preparation of the great Sabbath of 15th Nisan, and not on the feast day itself, we are led to the conclusion that the Last Supper was, as St. John records, before the Feast of the Passover, and that the Crucifixion took place on Friday, the 14th Nisan. The disciples who, according to the Synoptists, on the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, put their question, "Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Passover?" prepared the meal on the 14th Nisan, but before the 13th had ended, that is, on the evening of Thursday, the 13th Nisan, and on that same evening the Lord anticipated the Passover which He so much desired to eat with them. The exact date of the world's redemption may, with near approach to absolute certainty, be assigned to the Friday, 18th of March, 14th Nisan, in the year of Rome 782, A.D. 29. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 160.] nowhere teach that the sinlessness of Christ merely gave Him a unique position as an individual in the race. They teach that Christ takes the place of sinners as a whole. His sacrifice was the equivalent for all who had come under the penalty of death by reason of sin. His death, therefore, has a universal significance, and this because of His divine nature. By virtue of this divine nature, the sinless humanity of the God-man reaches as far and as wide as the humanity to which it belongs. The death of Christ is not, therefore, to be limited merely to moral influence as an

external and constraining power, but must be regarded as a propitiatory offering which avails for the remission of sins. Since the doctrine of the atonement must be drawn largely from the teachings of the New Testament, we shall give the subject more extended treatment in our next division THE BIBLICAL BASIS OF THE ATONEMENT

It is to the Scriptures that we must turn in order to establish the Christian idea of atonement through the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. Having considered first, the Foreshadowing of the Atonement in the Old Testament; and second, made some general statements concerning the New Testament Conception of Sacrifice, we turn now to a more critical examination of the Scriptures on this important subject. We shall consider (1) The Motive of Atonement; (2) its Vicariousness; and (3) its Scriptural Terminology The Motive for the Atonement Is Found in the Love of God.This is sometimes known as the moving cause of redemption. The most prominent text in this connection is the epitome of the gospel found in John 3:16.For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son;and again in the following verse,For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved(John 3:17). This is shown also in the following verses from the epistles of St. Paul and St. John.But God commended his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us(Romans 5:8); andIn this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him(1 John 4:9) The atonement, whether in its motive, its purpose, or its extent must be understood as the provision and expression of God’s righteous and holy love. Christ’s life and death are the expression of God’s love for us, not the producing cause of that love The Death of Christ Was a Vicarious Sacrifice.In the words of Mr. Watson, "Christ suffered in our room and stead, or as a proper substitute for us." This is shown by those scriptures which declare that He died for men, or that connect His death with the punishment due our offenses. There are two Greek prepositions which are translated "for" in the Scriptures. The first is hyper (uper) and is found in the following verses:It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people(John 11:50);Christ died for the ungodly While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us(Romans 5:6; Romans 5:8);if one died for all, then were all dead[or died]....And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again....For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him(2 Corinthians 5:14-15; 2 Corinthians 5:21);who gave himself for our sins(Galatians 1:4);Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us(Galatians 3:13);hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour....Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it

[The second Adam also takes the place of humanity; and His sacrificial work must be looked upon as the actual work of humanity itself (satisfactio vicaria). But our innermost consciousness demands that the righteousness and obedience rendered, should not only be without us in another, but should also become personally our own. Now this demand is satisfied by the fact that Christ is our Redeemer as well as our Reconciler: our Savior who removes sin by giving a new life to the race, by establishing a living fellowship between Himself and mankind. All merely external and unspiritual confidence in the atonement arises from a desire to take Christ as Reconciler without taking Him as Redeemer and Sanctifier. The gospel, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," must not be separated from the following call, "Be ye reconciled to God!" that is, "appropriate to yourselves the reconciliation accomplished in Christ, by the healing and

purifying, the life-giving and sanctifying power which emanates from Christ!" - Martensen,Chr. Dogm.,pp. 307, 308]

(Ephesians 5:2; Ephesians 5:25);our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us(1 Thessalonians 5:9-10);who gave himself a ransom for all(1 Timothy 2:6);that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man(Hebrews 2:9). The second Greek preposition isanti(anti) and is found in such verses as Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45, where Christ is saidto give his life a ransom for many.It is sometimes objected that these Greek prepositions do not always signify substitution; that is, that they do not always mean instead of, but are sometimes used asin behalf of, or on account of. Thus we have the expression "Christ died for our sins," which cannot of course mean instead of in this instance. However, that these prepositions are generally used in the sense of substitution, both Watson and Wakefield clearly show (Cf. Note, WAKEFIELD,Chr. Th., p. 359). The vicarious or substitutionary death of Christ is known in theology as the "procuring cause" of salvation The Scriptures regard the sufferings of Christ as a propitiation, a redemption, and a reconciliation. As being under the curse of the law, the sinner is guilty and exposed to the wrath of God; but in Christ his guilt is expiated and the wrath of God propitiated. The sinner is under the bondage of Satan and sin, but through the redemptive price of the blood of Christ, he is delivered from bondage and set at liberty. The sinner is estranged from God, but is reconciled by the death on the cross. These scriptures are peculiarly rich and satisfying

1. Propitiation is a term drawn from the Kapporeth or Mercy-seat as used in the Old Testament scriptures. To propitiate is to appease the wrath of an offended person, or to atone for offenses. The termhilasmos(ilasmoV) is used in three different senses in the New Testa-

[With reference to the use of the Greek prepositions translated "for," Dr. Wakefield makes the following statement: "All this may be granted but it is nevertheless certain that there are numerous texts of scripture' in which these particles can be interpreted only when taken to mean 'instead of,' or 'in the place of.' When Caiaphas said, 'It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not' (John 11:50) he plainly taught that either Christ or the nation must perish; and that to put the former to death would be to cause Him to perish instead of the latter. In Romans 5:6-8 the sense in which 'Christ died for us' is indubitably fixed by the context." - Wakefield,Chr. Th., p. 359.] ment. (1) Christ is the ilasmoV , at once the Propitiator and the virtue of that propitiation.He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world(1 John 2:2);He loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins(1 John 4:10). (2) He is thehilastarion(ilasthpion) or Mercy-seat as the word is used in the Septuagint.Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood(Romans 3:25). (3) Where the adjective is used, then the termthuma(quma) is understood as in Hebrews 2:17, where the High Priest is saidto make reconciliation for the sins of the people.Here the term ishilastarion(ilasthpion) and the correct meaning is"to make propitiation for the sins of the people."

2. Redemption is from the word which means literally ""to buy back." The termslutroo(lutrow) andapolutrosis(apolutrwsiV) meaning to redeem and redemption respectively, were used by the ancient Greeks and also by the New Testament writers, to signify the act of setting a captive free through the payment of alutron(lutron) or redemptive price. The terms therefore came to be used in the broader sense of a deliverance from every kind of evil, through a price paid by another. This is the true scriptural meaning as shown in the following texts:Being justified freely by his grace

through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus(Romans 3:24);For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit which are God’s(1 Corinthians 6:20);Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that han geth on a tree(Galatians 3:13);In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace(Ephesians 1:7);Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot(1 Peter 1:18-19);For thou wast slain, and has redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation(Revelation 5:9). The death of Christ is the redemptive price, who gavehis life a ransom(lutron)for many(Matthew 20:28); and Hegave himself a ransom(antilutron)for all(1 Timothy 2:6). Here the idea of substitution is clearly evident - one thing is paid for another, the "blood of Christ" for the redemption of captives and condemned men

3. Reconciliation is from the verbskatallasso(katallassw) orapokatallasso(apokatallassw), both of which are translated "to reconcile." Primarily they denote a change from one state to another, but as used in the Scriptures, this is a change from a state of enmity to one of reconciliation and friendship. The Apostle Paul uses this term freely.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. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement[or reconciliation, katallaghv] (Romans 5:10-11);And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation(2 Corinthians 5:18-19);And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby(Ephesians 2:16);And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight(Colossians 1:20-22). Here it is clearly evident that the reconciliation between God and men is effected by Christ. But reconciliation means more than merely laying aside our enmity to God. The relation is a judicial one, and it is this judicial variance between God and man that is referred to in the idea of reconciliation. Moreover, the reconciliation is effected, not by the laying aside of our enmity but by the non-imputation of our trespasses to us. This previous reconciliation of the world to Himself by the death of His Son, is to be distinguished also from "the word of reconciliation" which is to be proclaimed to the guilty, and by which they are entreated to be reconciled unto God EARLIER HISTORY OF THE ATONEMENT The Patristic Doctrine. The apostolic fathers taught that Christ gave himself for our sins, but they did not formulate their views into any definite theory of the atonement. Their successors held every variety of opinion, and on this subject variety was tolerated. The most popular view was that which regarded the atonement as a victory over Satan. This position seems to have been first advanced by Irenæus (100: 200 ?) and was based upon such scriptures as Colossians 2:15 and Hebrews 2:14. It was Origen (185-254), however, who first converted the idea into the theory of a ransom paid to Satan. He held that men had surrendered to Satan and could not, therefore, be delivered from captivity without his consent. Satan was deluded when he accepted Christ as a ransom. The humanity of Christ was the bait, and His divinity the hook by which Satan was caught. Fearing the effect on his

captives of the life and teachings of Jesus, and seeing the divine glory of the Lord through the veil of His flesh so obscurely as to be deceived, Satan undertook to rid himself of the danger by putting Christ to death. But to cause the crucifixion was

[The earlier fathers followed very closely the words of scripture in their references to the atonement. Thus Clement of Rome, sometimes identified with the Clement mentioned by St. Paul in Php 4:3, says, "On account of the love He bore us, Jesus Christ gave His blood for us by the will of God; His flesh for our flesh, and His soul for our souls" (Chap. xlix). The doctrine of Paul is faithfully reproduced also in the Epistle of Barnabas, where it is stated that "The Lord endured to deliver his body to death, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins which is the shedding of that blood" (Epistola, 5). Ignatius (100: 116) the pupil of St. John declares that we "have peace through the flesh and blood, and passion of Jesus Christ" (Ad Ephesos, 1). Polycarp (100: 168) likewise acquainted with St. John is more specific. "Christ is our Savior; for through grace we are righteous, not by works; for our sins, He has even taken death upon Himself, has become the servant of us all, and through His death for us our hope, and the pledge of our righteousness. The heaviest sin is unbelief in Christ; His blood will be demanded of unbelievers; for to those to whom the death of Christ, which obtains the forgiveness of sins, does not prove a ground of justification, it proves a ground of condemnation" (Ad. Philippos, 1: 8).] to accept the ransom; the captives were released and the Deliverer escaped. This position finds even more exact statements in Gregory of Nyssa (100: 395). Dr. Banks thinks that this theory in its unqualified form was held only by Gregory, and that it was qualified in the writings of Irenæus and Augustine, either by being shorn of its objectional features, or by being held in conjunction with a propitiation made to God. Dorner, Kahnis and Sheldon hold to the same opinion. Thus, Augustine says, "God the Son, being clothed with humanity, subjugates even the devil to man, extorting nothing from him by violence, but overcoming him by the law of justice; for it would have been injustice if the devil had not had the right to rule over the beings whom he had taken captive." While the approach to this subject is made through the concepts of war and conquest, there are two terms which stand out clearly, that of "honor" and "satisfaction"; and in the later period of chivalry, these took on even greater meaning in their religious application. In the Latin Church, however, the theory of a ransom offered

[The position of Irenæus (100: 200) is thus given in his own words. "The Word of God (the Logos), omnipotent and not wanting in essential justice, proceeded with strict justice even against the apostasy or kingdom of evil itself (apostasiam) redeeming it (ab ea) that which was Ills own originally, not by using violence, as did the devil in the beginning, but by persuasion (secundum suadelam), as it became God, so that neither justice should be infringed upon, nor the original creation of God perish" (Adversus Hæreses 1:1). Dr. Shedd points out that two interpretations of this phraseology are possible. The "persuasion" may be referred to Satan, or to man; and the "claims" alluded to, may be regarded as those of the devil, or of law and justice. Against the first interpretation which is urged by the rationalistic school, Dr. Shedd in common with most orthodox writers, maintains that the second interpretation is without doubt the correct one

Christ's sacrifice is frequently referred to as offered to God for a propitiation. Eusebius says, "That as a victim of God, as a great sacrifice, He might be offered to the Most High for the whole world." Basil also says, "The only begotten Son, who gives life to the world, since He offers himself to God as a victim and oblation for our sins, is called the Lamb of God." "The blood of Christ," says

Ambrose, "is the price paid for all, by which the Lord Jesus, who alone has reconciled the Father, has redeemed us." "We were enemies of God through sin, and God had decreed that the sinner should die. One of two things, therefore, was necessary: either God, remaining true, must destroy all, or, using clemency, must annul the sentence issued. But behold the wisdom of God. He maintained both the sentence and the exercise of His goodness. Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, so that we, through His death, dead to sins, might live unto righteousness." -City of Jerusalem.] to Satan never became current, although it was generally admitted that Satan had usurped rights over the apostate race. Leo regarded this usurpation as a tyrannical right, and Gregory the Great held that it was only a seeming right. They maintained, however, that these rights were lost, not by virtue of a contract but through the death of Christ. "Certainly it is just," says Augustine, "that we whom he held as debtors should be dismissed free by believing in Him whom he slew without any debt" (De Trin. 13: 14)

Athanasius (325-373) is supposed to have been the first to propound the theory that the death of Christ was the payment of a debt due to God. His argument may be briefly stated as follows: God having threatened death as the penalty of sin, would have been untrue, had He not fulfilled His promise. But it would have been unworthy of divine goodness, had He allowed rational beings to whom He had imparted His Spirit to incur death as a consequence of an imposition practiced on them by Satan. Seeing, then, that nothing but death could solve the dilemma, the Word, who could not die, assumed a mortal body, and having fulfilled the law by His death, offered His human nature a sacrifice for all

It is during this earlier period also, that we first notice a trend toward belief in predestination and a limited atonement. Apart from Augustine and his followers, it was the common belief that Christ died for all, and that it was the unfeigned will of God that all men should partake of salvation through Him. The fact that some are saved and some are not, was explained by reference to man’s free agency and not by electing grace. Augustine, himself, distinctly advocated this position at first, but in his controversy with the Pelagians adopted a strictly monergistic system. He held to the total inability of man to exercise good works, and hence, until the individual

[Dr. Sheldon thinks that it is a gross and amazing persistent slander, that for a thousand years the Church knew no other theory of the redemptive work than that which teaches the payment of a ransom to Satan. He says that in both the Greek and Latin churches, the relation of the redemptive work to Satan was only one aspect among many which received attention. - Cf. Sheldon, Hist. Chr. Doct., I, pp. 121-124, 251-257, 362-367.] was regenerated, there was no power to exercise faith. Grace, therefore, was bestowed solely upon the elect through effectual calling, and the atonement limited to those for whom it availed. Previous to this time, synergism had been the dominant theory, 1: e., that the individual in his recovery from sin, works with God through grace universally bestowed as a free gift, in such a manner as to condition the result The Anselmic Theory of the Atonement. Anselm (1033-1109) in the latter part of the eleventh century, published his epoch-making book "Cur Deus Homo," in which he gave the first scientific statement to those views of the atonement, which from the beginning had been held implicitly by the fathers. Here the idea of satisfaction to divine justice became the leading formula, and the "satisfaction theory" of the atonement is still called by his name. While giving even a more prominent place than the earlier fathers to such terms as "honor," "justice," ""satisfaction" and "merit," Anselm rejected wholly, the theory of a ransom paid to Satan. This he disposed of in the following brief words:

"Was it the law of Satan we had transgressed? Was he the judge that cast us into prison? Was it he to whom we were indebted? Was it ever heard that the ransom price of redemption was paid to the jailer? Whether any of the ancients said so or not, I shall not now trouble myself to inquire, or in what sense they said it; the thing in itself is ridiculous and blasphemous." Anselm's own theory may be stated as follows: Sin violates the divine honor, and deserves infinite punishment since God is infinite. Sin is guilt or a debt, and under the government of God, this debt must be paid. This necessity is grounded in the infinite perfections of God. Either adequate satisfaction must be provided, or vengeance must be exacted. Man cannot pay this debt, for he is not only

[The church at large, as in the previous period, regarded predestination, so far as it is connected with man's moral destiny, as conditioned by foreknowledge. Augustine himself at one time distinctly advocated this position, saying that God chose those who He foreknew would believe, and conjoining with this statement that believing lies in man's power. First man believes, he said, and then God gives grace for good works. - Sheldon,Hist. Chr. Doct, I, p. 258.] finite, but morally bankrupt through sin. Adequate satisfaction being impossible from a being so inferior to God as man is, the Son of God became man in order to pay the debt for us. Being divine, He could pay the infinite debt; and being both human and sinless, could properly represent men. But as sinless He was not obliged to die, and owing no debt on His own account, He received as a reward of His merit, the forgiveness of our sins. "Can anything be more just," he says, "than for God to remit all debt, when in this way He receives a satisfaction greater than all debt, provided it be offered only with the right sentiment?" It should be noted here, that Christ renders satisfaction to divine justice, not by bearing the penalty of a broken law in the sinner's place, but indirectly by the acquisition of merit. The sacrifice of Christ being infinite, was of greater value than the demerit of sin, and consequently this merit accrues to Christ, and overflows to all who believe. This merit when received in faith becomes the justification of men, and is transferred to them or placed to their account. As such it offsets the demands of justice, in so far as those demands were a fixed barrier against the forgiveness of sins. Thus the divine justice was satisfied, but only in the sense that it secured the honor of that justice, notwithstanding the offer of the forgiveness of sins. Anselm, it will be seen, makes the redeeming work of Christ to center in His voluntary death

[Dr. A. A. Hodge states Anselm's doctrine of the atonement as follows: "He taught that sin is debt (guilt); that, under the government of God, it is absolutely necessary that his debt should be paid, 1:e., that the penalty incurred by the guilt of sin should be suffered; that this necessity has its ground in the infinite perfections of the divine nature; that this penalty must be inflicted upon the sinner in person, unless a substitute can be found having all legal qualifications for his office. This was alone realized in Jesus Christ, a divine person embracing a human nature."

Dr. Sheldon states the theory in these words: "Christ incarnate, then, appears as perfect God and perfect man. As a sinless being, He is under no obligation to die. Consequently, in voluntarily surrendering Himself to death He establishes a merit - a merit proportioned to the dignity of His person, and fully adequate to offset man's demerit. So great a merit deserved an extraordinary reward. But Christ, as being already possessor of all things, needed no gift for Himself. It remained accordingly, that He should be allowed to elect man to receive the benefits which had been purchased by His sacrifice. - Sheldon,Hist. Chr. Doct., I, p. 363.] The Theory of Abelard. Abelard (1079-1142) differed widely from Anselm in his theory of the atonement. He maintained that it was the rebellion of man that needed subduing, and not the wrath of God that needed propitiating. In

place of a satisfaction to divine justice, he held that the atonement should be regarded as a winning exhibition of the divine love. To him, benevolence was the only attribute concerned in redemption. Redemption like creation was by divine fiat, and therefore sin could be abolished and the sinner restored to favor by the will of God, without any need of satisfaction or propitiation. Christ died for the twofold purpose of subduing the opposition of sinners and removing their guilty fears, through a transcendent exhibition of divine love. Abelard's position became the basis of the later Socinianism, and was adopted also by those trinitarian divines, who in modern times have held some form of the moral influence theory of the atonement

Scholastic Developments. In the history of the atonement, the scholastic period is of importance in that it marks the beginning of those trends which later devel-

[Dr. Sheldon says that Abelard did not discard altogether the sacrificial aspect of Christ's work, or the idea of imputed merit. He recognized in some sense, a vicarious efficacy in the merit acquired by Christ, inasmuch as this comes into supplement, in the sight of God, the deficiency of merit in the elect, or the imperfection of that love which is called forth in them by the revelation of divine love. But this is a subordinate consideration. Love revealed and drawing to returning love, this is the essence of Abelard's theory of the redemptive work of Christ. "Our redemption," says Abelard, "is that supreme love wrought in us by the passion of Christ, which not only frees us from the servitude of sin, but acquires for us the true liberty of the sons of God; so that we fulfill all requirements rather through love than the fear of Him who has exhibited toward us so great a grace - a grace than which there is no greater, according to His own testimony, cannot be found." - Sheldon,Hist. Chr. Doct., I, p. 365

Abelard was the chief opponent of Anselm; and may be said to have been the founder of a theory of the atonement which shuts out the deepest mystery of the cross. He referred the Christian redemption only to the love of God as its source; and taught that there could be nothing in the divine essence which absolutely required satisfaction for sin. Redemption like creation was a fiat: equally sure, equally free, and equally independent of anything in the creature. The influence of the work of Christ, as accomplished on the cross, and carried on in His intercession, is moral only subduing the heart, awakening repentance, and leading the soul to the boundless mercy of God whose benevolence is the only attribute concerned in the pardon of sin. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, 305.] oped into the Tridentine Soteriology of the Roman Catholic Church, and the strict penal satisfaction theory of the earlier Protestant reformers. Peter Lombard (1100-1164) accepted the position of Abelard and opposed that of Anselm. He held that the work of Christ must be supplemented by baptism and penance, and in this we find the secret of the popularity of hisLiber Sententiarumin the Roman Catholic Church. Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153) and Hugh of St. Victor (100: 1097-1141) adopted in the main, the position of Anselm. Bernard, however, hesitates to denominate sin as an "infinite evil," and as a consequence does not distinctly assert the intrinsic necessity for an atonement. He prefers to hold with Augustine, a relative necessity founded upon the optional will and arrangement of God. Hugo more nearly approached the Anselmic position, combining both the legal and sacrificial elements in his idea of propitiation. "The Son of God," he says, "by becoming a man, paid man's debt to the Father, and by dying expiated man's guilt." It was Bonaventura (1221-1274) and Thomas Aquinas (100: 1225-1274) who largely shaped the theology of the Roman Catholic Church. The teachings of the two are very similar, but Thomas Aquinas being the stronger systematizer, occupies the more prominent position. Several new

developments are found in his theology. (1) He held that merit and demerit are strictly personal, and therefore in order to substantiate the idea of vicarious satisfaction, he advanced his idea of theunio mystica, or mystical union existing between Christ and the

[Aquinas attached great importance to the substitutionary value of the pain which Christ endured. In one of his eucharistic hymns he says, "Blood, of which one drop, for human-kind outpoured, Might from all transgression have the world restored." This was characteristic of the age immediately preceding the Reformation. In several hymns of the fifteenth century, not only the cross, but the nails, the spear and other instruments of His passion appear as the actual objects of worship. Later in Protestantism, the suffering of Christ attaches more to His mental anguish. Æpinus (1533) declares that Christ's soul endured the punishments of hell while His body lay in the grave! The Heidelberg Catechism (1563) affirms that He bore the divine wrath during the whole period of His earthly life. Calvin rejected altogether, the ancient doctrine of Christ's descent into hell, explaining the passages bearing on this point as referring to the extreme anguish of His soul. (Cf. Crippen, Hist. Chr. Doct., pp. 136, 138.)]

Church. He based his doctrine upon the statement in Ephesians 5:30, maintaining that this relation is different from any existing in secular life. It is not the external relation which exists between individuals, but is one in which there is a communion of interest and moral life. Thus a sinner united by faith to the Savior may become the ground and cause of judicial infliction upon his atoning Substitute, and in turn, the incarnate Word may become the sinner's propitiation. This idea of the mystical oneness of Christ and the Church pervades his soteriology. (2) He made a distinction also, betweensatisfactioandmeritum, the former applying to the sufferings of Christ as a satisfaction to divine justice, the latter to the merit of His obedience, by which the redeemed are entitled to the rewards of eternal life. He thus anticipated the later distinction in Calvinistic theology, between the "active" and "passive" righteousness of Christ. (3) He taught the doctrine of the superabundance of the merits of Christ. While this seemed to honor the atonement, in reality it resulted in a lower estimate of sin, and led directly to the Roman Catholic theory of supererogation, with a treasury of merit at the command of the Church. (4) He departed from the Anselmic theory of an absolute as distinguished from a relative satisfaction. This resulted in a theory of justification, resting partly upon the work of Christ and partly upon the works of the individual. The lax theory gradually gained in the Roman Catholic Church until it finally obtained ecclesiastical authority in the Soteriology of Trent. But there were developing also, those forces which finally led to the Reformation. The mediating theologians, such as Bonaventura, Alexander of Hales, and many of the later mystics paved the way for this reform, (1) by admitting a relative view of the atonement,

[Duns Scotus opposed Anselm, arguing that the passion of Christ owed its efficacy, not to its intrinsic merit, or to its voluntary endurance, but to its voluntary acceptance by God. The controversy ran high between the adherents of Aquinas and Scotus. The Nominalists in philosophy naturally favored the views of Scotus, for his theory was that of a nominal satisfaction in distinction from that which was real and objective. The views of Thomas Aquinas, however, were more nearly in harmony with the Protestant view and feeling.] but showing that it could not supersede the absolute idea of satisfaction without great peril to the Church; and (2) by keeping alive the Anselmic idea of absolute satisfaction through Christ alone The Tridentine Soteriology. The soteriology of the Roman Catholic Church, as we have shown, was largely the outgrowth of

the theological principles of Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas. Theuna mysticagave rise to two fundamental errors: (1) it limited redemption to the believer configured to his Lord, in that the guilt of the sinner was transferred to Christ in the same sense that Christ's merit was transferred to the sinner. This contradicted the universality of the atonement and marked the further development of the theory of predestination. (2) In the case of sin after baptism, the believer must be configured to his Lord by personal penance. This penance was of course imperfect, but it was regarded as an expiation joined to that of Christ. The distinction between. satisfaction and merit, and the further distinction between an absolute and a relative atonement, made possible thesuperabundans satisfactioor the superabundance of Christ's merit. This, added to the idea of a superfluous merit of the saints, constituted the source of the medieval system of indulgences. However, it is chiefly in its subjective character that the error of Roman Catholic theology appears, and this in its individual aspect will be further treated in our discussion of justification The Reformation Period. In their reaction against the theology of the Roman Catholic Church, the Reformers revived the Anselmic theory of the absolute necessity for satisfaction in the divine nature. The ideas of satisfaction and merit as held by Anselm were both retained, but given a distinctly different direction. Thus satisfaction became a penal substitutionary offering instead of an accumulation of merit which was imputed to the elect; and merit was viewed in the sense of becoming the ground of their righteousness. That is, the voluntary death of Christ removed the penalty from the elect, and His active obedience assured their personal righteousness. The Reformed churches differed from the Lutheran in this, that while the Lutherans held that the satisfaction of Christ was sufficient for all sins, both original and actual, the Reformed limited the scope of the atonement to the elect. Both Lutherans and Reformed, however, made the death of Christ the center of the atoning work, flanked by the incarnation and the resurrection on either side. With the voluntary death of Christ as the procuring cause of salvation, they associated the merit of His active obedience to law. This they urged on the ground that He was not a subject but the Lord of the law. Over against the Lutheran and Reformed churches the Socinians revived the theory of Abelard, and in a measure that of Duns Scotus. These find their modern expression in the numerous moral influence theories. The Arminians aimed at a middle ground between the extremes of the penal satisfaction theory and the moral influence theories. Grotius argued against Socinus, that God punishes sin, not as an act of retaliation, but as the Ruler of the universe in the upholding of His government. These theories will be discussed in our next division MODERN THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT

We propose to give in this division, not a chronological history of the various theories of the atonement held in modern times, but rather a classification of the principal forms which such theories have taken. These we shall treat under the following classification: (1) The Penal Satisfaction Theory; (2) The Governmental or Rectoral Theory; (3) The various Moral Influence Theories; (4) The Ethical Theory; and (5) The Racial Theory The Penal Satisfaction Theory. This is the theory held by the Reformed churches, and generally known as the Calvinistic theory. It is sometimes referred to also, as the Anselmic theory; and although related to it, the Anselmic theory underwent important changes at the hands of the Reformers. In the first place, Anseim taught that the sacrifice of Christ secured such merit as was capable of being imputed to the guilty; while the Reformers held that the satisfaction of Christ was to be considered in the sense of a penal substitution for the sinner. Thus they took over from Anselm the idea of satisfaction but gave it the meaning of substitution instead of merit. In the second place, the Reformers included Christ's active obedience as a part of the redemptive price, as well as His voluntary death, while Anselm

maintained that the satisfaction which Christ offered could not have been His obedience, for this He owed to God as a man. We may say then, that while the Socinian theory sets forth the sufferings of Christ as designed to produce a moral effect upon the heart of the individual sinner; and the governmental theory claims that it was designed to produce a moral effect upon an intelligent universe; the Satisfaction theory maintains that the immediate and chief end of Christ's work was to satisfy that essential principle of the divine nature which demands the punishment of sin. Dr. A. A. Hodge, a Calvinist theologian of the federal type, sums up this theory in the following essential points: (1) Sin for its own sake deserves the wrath and curse of God. (2) God is disposed, from the very excellence of His nature, to treat His creatures as they deserve. (3) To satisfy the righteous judgment of God, His Son assumed our nature, was made under the law, fulfilled all righteousness, and bore the

[The Penal Theory is sometimes known also as the "Judicial Theory," in that God is considered in the character of a judge, and satisfaction must be rendered to His justice. Men appear before Him as guilty, but having agreed to accept satisfaction in the person of a substitute, God is obliged on the ground of justice to acquit those for whom it was made. Dr. Charles Hodge says that, "All the benefits which accrue to sinners in consequence of the satisfaction of Christ are to them pure gratuities; blessings to which in themselves they have no claim. They call for gratitude and exclude boasting. Nevertheless it is a matter of justice that the blessings which Christ intended to secure for His people should be actually bestowed upon them. This follows for two reasons: First, they were promised to Him as the reward of His obedience and sufferings. God covenanted with Christ that if He fulfilled the conditions imposed, if He made satisfaction for the sins of His people, they should be saved. It follows, secondly, from the nature of satisfaction. If the claims of justice are satisfied they cannot again be enforced. This is the analogy between the work of Christ and the payment of a debt. The point of agreement between the two cases is not the nature of the satisfaction rendered, but one aspect of the effect produced." - Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p. 472.] punishment of our sins. (4) By His righteousness, those who believe are constituted righteous, His merit being so imputed to them that they are regarded as righteous in the sight of God (A. A. Hodge,Outline of Theology,p. 303). Dr. J. p. Boyce, the eminent Baptist theologian, says that the Calvinistic theory of the atonement is, that in the sufferings and death of Christ, He incurred the penalty of the sins of those whose substitute He was, so that He made a real satisfaction to the justice of God for the law which they had broken. On this account, God now pardons all their sins, and being fully reconciled to them, His electing love flows out freely toward them. The doctrine as thus taught involves the following points: (I) That the sufferings and death of Christ were a real atonement. (II) That in making it Christ became the substitute of those whom He came to save. (III) That as such He bore the penalty of their transgression. (IV) That in so doing He made ample satisfaction to the demands of the law, and to the justice of God. (V) That thus an actual reconciliation has been made between them and God (cf. Boyce,Abstract of Syst. Th., p. 317) This type of theory contains a valuable element of truth. Any theory of vicarious satisfaction must admit the idea of the substitutionary work of Christ, but it matters much whether this substitution be regarded merely externally as "instead of," or whether it may be said to be "in behalf of" also. Both Arminian and Calvinistic divines admit that the theory conceives of substitution in too formal and external a manner, and as exalt-

[To the Calvinistic principle that sin must be punished, either in the principal or the substitute, Dr. Miley attaches the following consequences. "Nothing could be punished in Christ which was not transferred to Him, and in some real sense made His. Hence, if sin, with its demerit, could not, as now admitted, be put upon Christ by imputation, no punishment which He suffered fell upon such demerit, or intrinsic evil of sin. And we think it impossible to show how sin is punished according to its demerit, and on that ground, in the total absence of such demerit from the substitute in punishment." To the distinction which the Federalists make between guilt as liability to punishment, and guilt as demerit or culpability, he says, "With the imputation of such an abstract guilt to Christ, while sin, with its turpitude and demerit, with all that is punishable and all that deserves to be left behind, how can the redemptive suffering which He endured be the merited punishinent of sin?" - Miley,Syst. Th., II, pp. 146, 147 ing the divine honor instead of the divine holiness in which it is grounded. Dr. Miley calls attention to the perplexities in its treatment, and the vacillations and diversities of opinion given in its explanation. He says, "The effect of the imputation of sin to Christ, and the nature and degree of His penal sufferings, are questions entering deeply into the difficulties of the subject. Did imputation carry over sin, with its turpitude and demerit, or only its guilt to Him? Did He suffer, instead of the elect, the same punishment, otherwise, they must have suffered? Did He endure penal suffering equal in amount though differing in kind, to the merited punishment of the redeemed? Did He suffer an equivalent punishment, less in amount but of higher value, and thus a penal equivalent with justice? Did He suffer the torment of the finally lost? Was His punishment potentially or intensively eternal? Such questions have been asked and answered affirmatively; though a negative is now mostly given to those of more extreme import. The boldness of earlier expositors is mainly avoided in the caution of the later. The former are more extravagant, the latter less consistent. But the theory, in every phase of it, asserts the just punishment of sin in Christ; and therefore, asserts or implies all that is requisite to such punishment. A denial of any such requisite is suicidal" (Miley,Syst. Th., II, p. 142). While these questions will be treated more at length in our consideration of the nature of the atonement, it is necessary here to state broadly, some of the weaknesses of this theory

1. A study of the principles of Calvinism as found in the various creedal statements reveals that it is fundamental to the theory, that sin must be punished on its own account. If it ought to be punished, then God is under obligation to punish it. It is a necessity of the judicial rectitude of God. The divine justice must have penal satisfaction. For this reason the position of Calvinism is sometimes known as the "judicial theory." The penalty must be inflicted upon the sinner or a substitute. Christ, the Son of God, became our Substitute. Whether He bore the identical penalty or its equivalent, Calvinists have never been able to decide, but it is not essential to the theory. The inconsistency lies in this, that if sin is to be punished on its own account, and if Christ became our Substitute, then our sin must in some sense have been transferred to Him, or He did not merit the punishment inflicted upon Him. Now Calvinists are generally careful to maintain the distinction between the demerit or culpability of sin (reatus culpo), and guilt as liability to punishment (reatus pona), a distinction which it is proper to observe. But this very distinction nullifies their idea of substitution, for the Substitute becomes liable to penalty without demerit, and, therefore, the sin is not actually punished. Its substitute is only an innocent victim. It is in this attempt to impute our sin to Christ as His own, that the weakness of this type of substitution appears. Even the Calvinistic Dr. Strong admits that this theory " "is defective in holding to a merely external transfer of the merits of Christ’s work, while it does not clearly state the internal ground of that transfer, in the

union of the believer with Christ" (Strong,Syst. Th., II, p. 748)

2. It is frequently claimed by its advocates, that the penal substitutionary theory is the only theory which admits of the substitutionary work of Christ, and therefore to deny it, is to deny Christ as our Substitute. But the Governmental or Rectoral theory holds this fact as fully and as firmly as does the Penal theory. Dr. Miley, its strongest representative among modern theologians, gives proper emphasis to Christ's substitutionary work

[Dr. Miley in his criticism of this theory states "that the necessary satisfaction of justice, as maintained in this theory, respects not merely a punitive disposition in God, but specially and chiefly an obligation of His justice to punish sin according to its demerit, and on that ground. It is because the punishment of sin is a necessity in the rectitude of divine justice that the only possible atonement is by penal substitution." - Miley,Syst. Th., II, p. 143

Ebrard says, "If I bear the chastisement of another instead of him, the same suffering which for him would have had the moral quality of a punishment has not for me, who am innocent, the moral quality of a punishment. For the notion of punishment contains, besides the objective element of suffering inflicted by the judge, also the subjective element of the sense of guilt or of an evil conscience endured by the guilty, or the relation between the evil act committed and the consequent suffering inflicted." (Cf. Van Ooterzee,Chr. Dogm., p. 603.)] Nor is the idea of penal substitution a distinctive fact of this theory. Other theories admit also of the penal sufferings of Christ as the conditional ground of forgiveness. The moderate rectoral theory of Mr. Watson holds firmly to the vicariousness of Christ's sufferings, but grounds this in the ethical character of God as well as in the essentials of government. The deeper and more scriptural approach to this subject is recognized instantly in the words of Dr. Pope. '"As the atonement avails for the human race, and is therefore ours, it must be viewed as a vicarious satisfaction of the claims of divine justice or the expiation of the guilt of sin, and propitiation of the divine favor....The substitutionary idea is in their case qualified by that of representation on the one hand, and the mystical fellowship of his saints on the other....The doctrine is not that a penalty has been endured by Christ instead of His people; that He has occupied their legal place and borne their legal responsibility; and, therefore, that they are forever discharged. It is rather that a sacrificial offering has been presented by Him instead of the race; and that He, making the virtue of His atonement the strength of His plea, represents all that come unto God by Him. The propitiation offered for all men, and accepted, becomes effectual only for the penitent who embraces it by trusting in Him whom God has set forth to be a propitiation in His blood through faith" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 271)

3. The Penal substitutionary theory leads of necessity, either to universalism on the one hand, or unconditional election on the other. Dr. Miley makes the charge that ""such an atonement, by its very nature, cancels all punitive claims against the elect, and by immediate result forever frees them from all guilt as a liability

[Watson holds that the design of God in the gift of His Son is "that he should die in the place and stead of all men as a sacrificial oblation, by which satisfaction is made for the sins of every individual, so that they become remissible upon the terms of the evangelical covenant, 1:e., upon the condition of faith." - Watson,Theol. Inst., II, chap. 25

Dr. A. A. Hodge says that "the Arminian view, therefore, differs from the Calvinistic in two points. They maintain that Christ died, first, for the relief of all men; second, to make salvation possible. We hold, on the other hand, that Christ died, first, for His elect; second, to make their salvation certain." - HODGE,Outlines of Th., p. 313.] to the penalty of sin. We know that such a consequence is denied, though we shall show that it is also fully asserted." In proof of his assertion he cites such authorities as Hodge, Dick, Symington and Turretin. Thus Dr. Charles Hodge says, "If the claims of justice are satisfied they cannot again be enforced. This is the analogy between the work of Christ and the payment of a debt. The point of agreement between the two cases is not the nature of the satisfaction rendered, but one aspect of the effect produced. In both cases the persons for whom the satisfaction is made are certainly freed. Their exemption or deliverance is in both cases, and equally in both, a matter of justice." So also, Dr. Symington declares that "the death of Christ being a legal satisfaction for sin, all for whom he died must enjoy the remission of their offenses" (Miley,Syst. Th., II, p. 151; Hodge,Syst. Th., II, p. 472; Symington,Atonement and Intercession, p. 190). It is evident then, that the penal substitutionary theory of the atonement involves the question of its extent also. If Christ died for all men, then all are unconditionally saved as 'universalism maintains. If all are not saved, as the Scriptures clearly teach, then the only alternative is a belief in the atonement as limited to the elect. Thus there is developed as a natural consequence of the theory, an unscriptural and false notion of its application. It must accept either universalism or a limited atonement. This fact is also borne out by the history of Christian doctrine

4. In its historical development, the penal theory is associated with the Calvinistic ideas of predestination and limited atonement. We object to the theory on the ground that its application necessarily represents the atonement as limited to the elect, whereas the Scriptures declare that Christ died for all. We object further,

[The following statement from Dr. A. A. Hodge confirms the above position. He says, "If it is involved in the very nature of the atonement . . . . that all the legal responsibilities of those for whom he died were laid upon Christ; if he suffered the very penalty which divine justice exacted of them, then it follows necessarily that all those for whom he died are absolved, since justice cannot demand two perfect satisfactions, nor inflict the same penalty once upon the substitute and again upon the principal." - A. A. Hodge,Outlines of Theology, p. 313.] on the ground that the Scriptures declare that the propitiatory offering of Christ became effective through faith (Romans 3:22-25); whereas this theory depends solely upon effectual calling, or God's electing grace. This Dr. Boyce admits in his argument against Arminianism. He says that "it does not accord with justice that any should suffer for whom a substitute has actually borne the penalty and made full satisfaction"; and again, ""It makes salvation the result in part of faith; but faith is the result of reconciliation, not its cause; it is the gift of God." He then states his own position in these words, ""That this limitation is one of purpose; that God designed only the actual salvation of some; and that, whatever provision has been made for others, He made this positive arrangement by which the salvation of certain ones is secured (Boyce,Abstract of Systematic Theology,p. 337). Here we see the substitutionary theory in its unadulterated form. Christ died in the place of some, who must therefore be saved, since it would be wrong to punish both the sinner and his substitute. Christ died for the elect, who are not only foreknown, but foreordained to this state of salvation by the decree of God. Those who are so predestinated, are unconditionally saved by the bestowal of regenerating grace, out of which arise repentance, faith, justification, adoption and sanctification 5. Our final objection to the

satisfaction theory is based upon the fact that it leads logically into antinom-

[Dr. Gammertsfelder offers the following objections to the penal theory: (1) It holds that justice lies deeper in the nature of God than love and mercy, while the Bible as well as reason teaches that love and not justice was the moving cause of redemption. (2) It violates the moral principle which holds that guilt and penalty are not transferable. Salvation is an ethical process and cannot be determined by mere commercial, governmental or juridicial principles. The demerit of sin cannot be transferred; neither can righteousness be transferred. (3) Another objection to the theory is, that no place is left for forgiveness. Now if sins are removed by penal substitution, there is no room for forgiveness. If a debt is paid, there is no room for remission. If God must punish, then He must punish according to absolute justice and cannot punish by fiction. Forgiveness and penalty mutually exclude each other. (4) The fourth objection is found in the quality of unreality in the whole procedure. The satisfaction for sin on which the theory rests, is an unreal satisfaction. Mere physical suffering can never atone for sin; for penalty is more than physical suffering. There must be all the elements of sorrow, shame and contrition enter into it, and these are not transferable. -Gammertsfelder,Syst. Th., pp. 277-279.] ianism. This its advocates usually deny, but historically, antinomianism has always been held in connection with this type of belief in the atonement. (1) It holds that Christ's active obedience is imputed to believers in such a manner that it is esteemed by God as done by them. They are, therefore, righteous by proxy. (2) This imputation in reality makes Christ's sufferings superfluous; for if He has done for us all that the law requires, why should we be under the necessity of being delivered from penalty by His death. (3) If Christ's active obedience is to be substituted for that of believers, it shuts out the necessity of personal obedience to the law of God. Thus it transfers the requirement of obedience from the subjects of the divine government, to Christ as the substitute, and leaves man without law and God without dominion. Man is therefore left in the position of being tempted to license of every kind, instead of being held strictly accountable for a life of righteousness. (4) This type of satisfaction cannot be called such in truth, for it is merely the performance of all that the law requires by one person substituted for another THE PRINCIPLES OF CALVINISM

[We give the following brief summary of the principles of Calvinism, for the purpose of showing the entire system in its logical arrangement. This summary is condensed from the positions of A. A. Hodge, a Calvinist of the federal type. It is against the ideas of predestination, limited atonement, effectual calling and final perseverance as here set forth, that Arminianism has so strongly objected

1. The Relation of the Creator to Creation. Calvinism teaches Christian theism. It holds that His creatures are momentarily dependent upon the energy of His will for substance, and for the possession of the powers communicated to them as second causes in all their exercises. Before the apostasy, the spirit of man depended for spiritual life and moral integrity upon the concurrence of the Spirit of God, the withdrawal of which is the immediate cause of spiritual death and moral impotence. This divine influence, in one degree, and in one mode or another, is common to all creatures and all their actions; and it is called "grace" when, as undeserved favor, it is in a supernatural manner restored to the souls of sinful men, with the design of affecting their moral character and action

2. The Design of God in Creation. This is declared to be the manifestation of His own glorious perfections, and becomes a principle of interpretation for all God’s dealings with mankind

3. The Eternal Plan of God. (1) The eternal and immutable plan of God has constituted man a free agent, and consequently can never interfere with the exercise of that freedom of which the exercise of that freedom is itself the foundation. (2) This created free will is not, however, independent, but ever continues to have its ground in the conserving energies of the Creator. (3) In case of an infinitely wise, powerful and free Creator, it is obvious that the certain foreknowledge of all events from the absolute beginning virtually involves the predetermination of each event without exception; for all the causes and consequences, direct and contingent, which are foreseen in creation are of course, determined by creation. (4) Since all events constitute a single system, the Creator must embrace the system as a whole, and every infinitesimal element of it, in one all-comprehensive intention; ends more or less general must be determined by ends which are made dependent upon them; hence while every event remains dependent upon its causes, and contingent upon its conditions, none of God’s purposes can possibly be contingent, because in turn, every cause and condition is determined in that purpose, as well as ends which are suspended upon them; all the decrees of God are hence called absolute, because they are ultimately determined always, by "the counsel of His own will," and never by anything exterior to Him which has not in turn been previously determined by Him. (5) This determination, however, instead of interfering with, maintains the true causality of the creature, and the free self-determination of men and angels. Since the holiness of the created moral agent is conditioned upon the indwelling of divine grace, and its turning from grace is the cause of sin, it follows that all the good in the volitions of free agents is to be referred to God as its positive source; but all the evil (which originates in defect or privation) is to be referred simply to his permission. In this view all events, without exception, are embraced in God’s eternal purpose; even the primal apostasies of Satan and Adam, as well as those consequences which have flowed from them. The charge of fatalism so often made does not really lie against Calvinism; for the energizing will of the personal Jehovah, at once perfect Light and Love, is very different from fate. It is one thing to be borne along by irresistible yet utterly blind force, and quite another to be led by our heavenly Father’s hand

4. God’s Benevolence, Justice and Grace. Justice as well as benevolence is an essential and ultimate property of the divine nature, and hence lies back of and determines the character of, the divine volitions. By the perfection of God’s character He is always benevolent to the innocent, and just as equally certain is he determined to punish the guilty. Hence He has exercised both justice and benevolence - justice to the sin and the law, benevolence to the sinner, which benevolence is undeserving in sovereign grace

5. The Effect of Adam’s Apostasy upon the Race. The entire soul with its constitutional faculties and acquired habits is the organ of volition, the agent willing. It possesses the inalienable property of self-determination, the moral character of which depends upon the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and it needs, therefore, divine help to will rightly. Adam was created in fellowship with God, and hence with a holy tendency of heart, with full power not to sin, but also, for a limited period of probation, with power to sin; and when he sinned the Holy Spirit was withdrawn from the race, and he and his descendants lost the original power not to sin, and gained the necessity to sin; in other words, total moral inability....Hence Calvinists hold (1) Human sin, having originated in the free

apostatizing act of Adam, deserves God’s wrath and curse, and immutable justice demands their infliction. (2) Such, moreover, was the relation subsisting between Adam and his descendants, that God righteously regards and treats each one as he comes into being as worthy of the punishment of that sin, and consequently withdraws his life-giving fellowship from him. The whole race, therefore, and each individual it embraces, is under the just condemnation of God; and hence the gift of Christ, and the entire scheme of redemption in its conception, execution, and application, are throughout and in every sense a product of sovereign grace. God was free to provide it for few or for many, for all or for none, just as He pleased; and in every case of its application the motives determining God cannot be found in the object, but only in the good pleasure of the will of the Divine Agent. (3) As to original sin - since every man comes into the world in a condition of ante-natal forfeiture, because of Adam’s apostasy, he is judicially excluded from the morally quickening energy of the Holy Ghost, and hence begins to think, feel and act without a spontaneous bias to moral good. (4) But since moral obligation is positive, and the soul is essentially active, it instantly develops in action, a spiritual blindness and deadness to divine things, and a positive inclination to evil. This involves the corruption of the whole nature; and the absolute impotency of the will to good is, humanly speaking, without remedy, and necessarily tends to the indefinite increase, both of depravity and guilt. It is therefore said to be total

6. The Nature and Necessity of Regenerating Grace. Grace is free, sovereign favor to the ill-deserving. Calvinists distinguish (1) "common grace," or the moral and suasory influence on the soul, of the Spirit acting through the truth, as the result of Christ’s work, which tends to restrain evil passions, but which may be resisted, and is always prevailingly resisted by the unregenerate, from (2) "effectual calling" which is a single act of God, changing the moral character of the will of the subject, and implanting a prevailing tendency to co-operate with future grace in all forms of holy obedience. By reason of the new creative energy within it, the soul spontaneously embraces Christ and turns to God. Afterwards this same divine energy continues to support the soul, and prepare it for, and concur with it in, every good work. This grace is now prevailingly co-operated with by the regenerated soul, and t times resisted, until the status of grace is succeeded by the status of glory

7. The Application of the Plan of Redemption. Predestination, or the purpose of God to secure the salvation of some men, and not all, has been popularly regarded as the distinguishing feature of Calvinism, and one of the most revolting to the moral sense. Some Calvinists reasoning downward from the nature of God as absolute, and developing this doctrine in a strictly speculative manner, have made it the foundation of their system. These have necessarily conceived of it in the high and logically coherent supralapsarian sense (election before creation; the decree to create, and permit men to fall, in order to carry out their predestined salvation or perdition), which has been rejected by the great body of Reformed theologians as unscriptural, and revolting to the moral sense. The vast majority of Calvinists, however, are influenced by practical, and not speculative considerations, and therefore hold to the infralapsarian (election after creation) view. God, they say, elects His people out of the mass of guilty sinners, and provides redemption for them, thus securing for them faith and repentance whereby they may be saved. These gifts cannot, therefore, be conditions of salvation, as Arminians hold: rather they are its predetermined and graciously effected results. Gottschalk taught a double predestination - the elect to salvation and the reprobate to damnation. But this theory is not taught in the recognized standards of Calvinism.

God elects of free grace all those He purposes to save, and actually saves them; while those whom He does not elect are simply left under the operation of the law of exact justice, whatever that may be. Calvinistic "particularism" admits the actual results of salvation in their widest scope, and refers all to the gracious purpose and power of God, but does not restrict it within the limits determined by the facts themselves.] The Governmental Theory. This theory as developed by Grotius, held that the atonement was not a satisfaction to any internal principle of the divine nature, but to the necessities of government. It arose as a protest against the rigorous penal substitution theory on the one hand, and the Socinian rejection of all vicarious intervention on the other. The theory was first advanced by James Arminius and his follower Hugo Grotius, although later, Grotius departed from the earlier position. Together they agreed to uphold, not the exactitude of divine justice wholly, or even mainly, as in the Anselmic theory, but also the just and compassionate will of God as a true element in the atonement. They thus sought to lay emphasis upon the love of God as well as His justice. Grotius differed from Arminius in the later development of these principles, by limiting the satisfaction which was made by Christ, to the dignity of the law, the honor of the lawgiver and the protection of the universe. The death of Christ and His sufferings became, therefore, not an exhibition of love to draw men to God, as in the moral influence theories, but a deterrent to sin through an exhibition of its punishment

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) was a distinguished Dutch jurist, and patterned his idea of the atonement after the method of civil law. His great work was entitled, "A Defense of the Catholic Faith Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ Against Faustus Socinus" (1617). But while

[The Grotian Theory was adopted in England by Richard Baxter (1615-1691) and Samuel Clarke (1675-1729). His first work published in 1617 was translated into English by Dr. F. H. Foster, the historian of New England Theology, and published at Andover in 1889. Dr. Foster shows, however, that Grotius' theological writings were in Yale College library in 1733. These were published in four folio volumes at London and Amsterdam in 1679 and at Basle in 1732. The theory was advocated by the New England theologians since the days of Jonathan Edwards, but to what extent, it has been difficult to determine. Many of them advocated only the governmental demand for an atonement, making this the point of departure for a further demand. Dr. Dickie states that the New England divines developed their doctrine of the atonement from Grotius, much as the Schoolmen used the Sentences of Lombard, and were likewise soon lost in the fog of speculation. The leading New England discussions were collected and published at Boston, with an Introductory Essay by Dr. E. A. Park of Andover. The views of Dr. R. W. Dale, and Dr. J. Scott Lidgett are but modernizations of the Grotian Theory.] seeking to defend the orthodox faith, he really transformed it into a new theory, commonly known as the Governmental or Rectoral Theory. Here the central idea of the defense was that God must not be regarded as the offended or injured party, but as the moral Governor of the universe. He must therefore uphold the authority of His government in the interests of the general good. Consequently the sufferings of our Lord are to be regarded, not as the exact equivalent of our punishment, but only in the sense that the dignity of the divine government was as effectively upheld and vindicated, as it would have been if we had received the punishment we deserved. This truth, the great jurist regarded as self-evident in the sphere of jurisprudence, and it is difficult to understand his position unless this fact be taken into account. It was at this point, however, that the satisfactionists urged their criticism of his position. He taught that the law under which man is held, both as to penalty and precept, is a positive

product of the divine will; and therefore He may, as a moral Governor, relax its demands. It was this position as to the relaxation of the demands of the law that subjected him to criticism. He introduced the termacceptilatio, which Duns Scotus had used against the Anselmic position, and was therefore accused of conceding too much to the Socinians. Theacceptilatioin Roman law was an acquittance from obligation by word of mouth without real payment. Grotius, however, insisted that his theory of satisfaction was far more than theacceptilatioof Roman jurisprudence; that it was of infinite value, though not the precise equivalent. Thus there was a relaxation of the claims of the law in one sense, though not in another. Dr. Pope makes the remark that ""the most rig-

[But Grotius, its later representative, did not agree with the Arminian theology when he limited the satisfaction to the dignity of the law, the honor of the Lawgiver, the protection of the interests of the universe, and the exhibition of a deterrent example. Grotius founded what has been called the Rectoral or Governmental Theory of the Atonement, which dwells too exclusively on its necessity for the vindication of God’s righteousness as the Ruler of all. Not to speak of the invincible repugnance felt by every reverent mind to the thought that our Lord was thus made a spectacle to the universe, this theory errs by making a subordinate purpose supreme. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 313.] orous Anselmic theory must admit the principle, so far as the acceptance of a substitute goes; why not then carry the principle a little farther and make the interfering act extend to the value of the thing substituted, as well as to the principle of substitution; especially as the value here is infinite?" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 313). Dr. Miley attributes theacceptilatioto the Anselmic position, rather than to that of Grotius, holding that the latter does not admit of a theory of the atonement based on any such sense of debt and payment

Richard Watson (1781-1823) taught a modified form of the governmental theory. He held that the atonement is a satisfaction to the ethical nature of God, as well as an expedient for sustaining the majesty of His government. This he did on the ground that there should be

[The following summary of the Governmental Theory as held by Grotius is taken mainly from the account of it as stated by Dr. Charles Hodge

1. That in the forgiveness of sin God is to be regarded neither as an offended party, nor as a creditor, nor as a master, but as a moral governor. A creditor can remit the debt due him at pleasure; a master may punish or not punish as he sees fit; but a ruler must act, not according to his feelings or caprice, but with a view to the best interests of those under his authority

2. The end of punishment is the prevention of crime, or the preservation of order and the promotion of the best interests of the community

3. As a good governor cannot allow sin to be committed with immunity, God cannot pardon the sins of men without some adequate exhibition of His displeasure, and of His determination to punish it. This was the design of the sufferings and death of Christ. God punished sin in Him as an example. This example was the more impressive on account of the dignity of Christ’s person, and therefore in view of His death, God can consistently with the best interests of His government remit the penalty of the law in the case of penitent believers

4. Punishment is defined as suffering inflicted on account of sin. It need not be imposed on account of the personal demerit of the sufferer; nor with the design of satisfying justice, in the ordinary sense of that word. It was enough that it should be on account of sin. As the sufferings of

Christ were caused by our sins, inasmuch as they were designed to render their remission consistent with the interest of God's moral government, they fall within the comprehensive definition of the word punishment. Grotius, therefore, could say that Christ suffered the punishment of our sins, as His sufferings were an example of what sin deserved

5. The essence of the atonement, therefore, according to Grotius consisted in this, that the sufferings and death of Christ were designed as an exhibition of God's displeasure against sin. They were intended to teach that in the estimation of God, sin deserves to be punished; and that, therefore, the impenitent cannot escape the penalty due to their offenses. - Hodge, Syst. Th., II, pp. 573-575.] no moral chasm between the laws and the nature of God; and that what satisfies the one is agreeable to the other. Mr. Watson states his position as follows: "The death of Christ, then, is the satisfaction accepted; and this being a satisfaction to justice, that is, a consideration which satisfied God, as a being essentially righteous, and as having strict and inflexible respect to the justice of His government; pardon through, or for the sake of that death, became, in consequence, "a declaration of the righteousness of God,' as the only appointed method of remitting the punishment of the guilty; and if so, satisfaction respects not....the honor of the law of God, but its authority, and the upholding of that righteous and holy character of the Lawgiver, and of his administration, of which that law is the visible and public expression. Nor is this to be regarded as a merely wise and fit expedient of government, a point to which even Grotius leans too much, as well as many other divines . . . . and that it is to be concluded, that no other alternative existed but that of exchanging a righteous government for one careless and relaxed, to the dishonor of the divine attributes, and the sanctioning of moral disorder; or the upholding of such a government by the personal and extreme punishment of every offender; or else the acceptance of the vicarious death of an infinitely dignified and glorious being, through whom pardon should be offered, and in whose hands a process for the moral restoration of the lapsed should be placed" (Watson,Institutes, II, p. 139)

Dr. John Miley (1813-1895) is the outstanding representative of the governmental theory in modern times. In accepting this theory, however, he does so, not in any particular exposition which has been given to it, but that which he constructs himself, out of its fundamental prin-

[Dr. Sheldon says that Watson stood on the ground of the governmental theory, and that this may be regarded as largely current among Methodist theologians. Here he classifies also Dr. Henry B. Smith, and also many of the more orthodox Lutheran theologians of modern time5. These regard the satisfaction of Christ as referring to general rather than distributive justice. In opposition to the Grotian theory, therefore, these theologians agree with Mr. Watson in finding a ground for it in the ethical nature of God, and not merely in the demands of administration. (Cf. Sheldon,Hist. Chr. Doct., II, p. 356.)] ciples. He holds with good reason, that the theory has not always been fortunate in its exposition, particularly in its beginning. Alien elements have been retained, and vital facts either omitted or wrongly placed. From the premises which he lays, Dr. Miley builds up a strong and logical system, although he stands almost alone among modern theologians. He holds, however, that Mr. Watson grounds the necessity of the atonement in the governmental theory, although he differs from him in his exposition of it. He holds further, that while Dr. Whedon has never given his theory of the atonement in the style of the governmental, yet it is in principle the same. Dr. Raymond he understands to hold the same idea of the atonement as Dr. Whedon. Dr. Tigert, in Summers'Systematic Theology, especially criticizes the theory of Dr. Miley, the most

serious objection being his lack of emphasis upon the idea of propitiation

Dr. Miley's governmental theory of the atonement briefly summarized is as follows: (1)Substitution by Atonement. The sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin by substitution, in the sense that they were intentionally endured for sinners under judicial condemnation, and for the sake of their forgiveness. They render forgiveness consistent with the divine justice. (2)Conditional Substitution.The forgiveness of sin has a real conditionality. An atonement for all by absolute substitution would inevitably achieve the salvation of all. Therefore a universal atonement, with the fact of

[The question now arises, Is Dr. Miley's the Methodist doctrine of the atonement? Can we regard it as fortunate that the only express Methodist treatise on atonement should ground its theory exclusively in a governmental necessity? Does Dr. Miley's theory adequately interpret Scripture in those profound texts which represent the demand for propitiation and reconciliation as arising among the divine attributes in the innermost recesses of the divine nature? Or is Dr. Summers nearer the truth of Scripture, and nearer the Methodist doctrine as taught by Watson, the first, and Pope, the last, of great Methodist writers on systematic theology? Can the atonement be represented as a satisfaction to God, a harmonization of the divine nature and attributes, and a reconciliation of God and the world, without the errors of the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution?.... Watson, Pope, and Summers seem to think that those scriptures teach that the atonement is a real satisfaction to the demands of the divine nature, and that this is consistent with the true Arminian doctrine of the atonement, Dr. Miley to the contrary notwithstanding." - Summers,Syst. Th., I, p. 272.] a limited actual salvation, is conclusive of a real conditionality in its saving grace. (3)Substitution in Suffering. The substitution of Christ must be of a nature agreeing with the provisory character of the atonement. It could not, therefore, be a substitution in penalty as the merited punishment of sin, for such an atonement is absolute. The substitution, therefore, is in suffering without the penal element. (4)The Atonement Must Be Related to Public Justice. As in the satisfaction theory, so in the rectoral, the sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin only as in some sense they take the place of penalty. In the one they take its place as a penal substitute, thus fulfilling the office of justice in the actual punishment of sin; in the other they take its place in the fulfillment of its office as concerned with the interests of moral government. (5)Remissibility of Its Penalties. There is no sufficient reason why sin must be punished solely on the ground of its demerit. The forgiveness of the actual sinner, as a real remission of penalty at the time of his justification and acceptance in the divine favor, is proof positive to the contrary. (6)The Place of Atonement.Thus the way is open for some substitutional provision which may replace the actual infliction of penalty upon sin. The theory of satisfaction really leaves no place for vicarious atonement. Its most fundamental and ever asserted principle, that sin as such must be punished, makes the punishment of the actual sinner an absolute necessity. But as penalties are remissible so far as a purely retributive justice is concerned, so, having a special end in the interest of moral government, they may give place to any substitutional measure equally securing that end. Here is a place for vicarious atonement. (7)Nature of the Atonement. The nature of the atonement in the sufferings of Christ follows necessarily from the above principle. It cannot be of the nature required by the principles of the satisfaction theory. In asserting the absoluteness of divine justice in its purely retributive element, the theory excludes the possibility of a penal substitution in atonement for sin. And, therefore, the sufferings of Christ are not, as they cannot be, an atonement by penal

substitution. But while His sufferings could not take the place of penalty in the actual punishment of sin, they could, and do, take its place in its strictly rectoral end. And the atonement is thus determined to consist in the sufferings of Christ, as a provisory substitute for penalty in the interest of moral government (Miley,Systematic Theology, II, pp. 155-156.) The objections to this theory will be given consideration in our constructive treatment of the atonement. It is sufficient here to mention only briefly, the objections which are usually urged against it. (1) It does not attach sufficient importance to the idea of propitiation, and therefore minifies the idea of a real satisfaction of the divine attributes. (2) It emphasizes the mercy of God in much the same sense that Calvinism emphasizes the justice of God. A true theory of the atonement must satisfy all the attributes of the divine nature. (3) It is built upon a false philosophical principle that utility is the ground of moral obligation. (4) It practically ignores the immanent holiness of God, and substitutes for the chief aim of the atonement, that which is only subordinate. Dr. Miley is called in question also by Dr. Tigert, for his assumption that there is no true middle ground between the Calvinistic idea of satisfaction and the strict rectoral theory. He thinks that the satisfaction theory can be held apart from its Calvinistic additions. "Watson, Pope, and Summers are certainly satisfactionists," he says, "but this is not their theory. Miley denies that there is any scientific place for them." They must either be Calvinists or deny their adhesion to the pure rectoral

[Dr. Tigert says, "It is strange that all these Methodist theologians (referring to Watson, Pope and Summers) some of whom are certainly possessed of as much exegetical skill, metaphysical acumen, and logical power as Dr. Miley has manifested in any part of his treatise, should have all lodged in an unscientific and indefensible half-way position, unable to see that If they abandoned the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution their principles must carry them over to the governmental theory of atonement. Dr. Miley is free to essay the rescue of Methodism and of these uncritical theologians from an inconsistent doctrine; but undoubtedly, the whole ground must be carefully reviewed before he can be permitted to hold the field unchallenged. He must make good his position." - Summers,Syst. Th., I, p. 273.] theory. Dr. Strong objects to this theory on the ground that it is an exhibition of justice which is not justice; and an exhibition of regard for law, which will make it safe to pardon the violators of law. But it must be admitted that the governmental factor is essential to any true theory of the atonement. It is only the undue emphasis upon this element to the disparagement of other equally essential elements, which makes the theory wrong. This whole subject will be given further consideration in our next chapter The Moral Influence Theories. The moral influence theories take their name from the basic assumption, that salvation comes through the appeal of divine love. They limit the efficacy of Christ’s death to Adam’s race, making its value consist, not in its influence upon the divine mind, nor upon the universe at large, but upon the power of love to subdue the enmity of the human heart. They do not hold that the sacrifice of Christ expiated sin, or placated the divine wrath by suffering; or that the atonement in any wise satisfied divine justice. They maintain that the sole obstacle to the forgiveness of sins, is to be found in the sinner’s own unbelief and hardness of heart. This Christ’s death was designed to remove by a display of God’s love in the death of His Son. With this hardness of heart removed, God can be just and the justifier of him who believes in Jesus. They look upon God, therefore, as exhibiting nothing but complacent love, upon sin as its own punishment, and upon men as saved by becoming good. The work of Christ tends to save men by assuring them of God’s love, and by persuading them to love Him. These theories are numerous, but they are all one in emphasizing the basic idea of moral influence. We shall mention briefly, only

four general types: (1) The Socinian Theories; (2) The Mystical Theories; (3) Bushnell's Theory of Moral Influence; and (4) The New Theology of McLeod Campbell and the Andover School

1.Socinianism. Socinianism was the precursor of modern unitarianism. Dr. Strong calls it ""The Example Theory of the Atonement," for it altogether denies any idea of propitiation or satisfaction. Its sole method of reconciliation is to better man's moral condition, and this can be effected only by man's own will through repentance and reformation. The death of Christ is regarded as that of a noble martyr. His loyalty to truth and faithfulness to duty provide us with a powerful incentive to moral improvement. Socinianism like Calvinism is based upon the idea of divine sovereignty, but in a very different manner; in Calvinism, predestination applies to the destinies of men; in Socinianism, it governs the attributes of God. That is, it holds that God is free to do that which He wills, and refuses to admit of any immutable qualities in the divine nature, whether of mercy or justice. His occasional will is called out by the conduct of men. He is free to forgive sin without any satisfaction to divine justice, if He desires to do so, simply on the ground of repentance. The death of Christ is designed to remove the hardness of the sinner's heart as the obstacle to repentance. The theory advanced by Lælius Socinus, the uncle, and Faustus Socinus, the nephew, represents the seventeenth century attack of rationalism on the penal satisfaction theory of the atonement. As such it

[Dr. Alvah Hovey characterizes the moral influence theories as those "which affirm that the atonement made by Christ benefits and saves men by its moral influence on their characters, and by that alone."

According to the teaching of early Socinianism - as distinguished from that of modern Unitarianism - the Savior's priestly office was only figuratively on earth, and began in heaven where He uses His exalted authority to plead for mankind. "The sacerdotal office consists in this, that as He can in royal authority help us in all our necessities, so in His priestly character; and the character of His help is called by a figure His sacrifice." But it may be said that forgiveness is never represented as bestowed save through a real sacrifice: God is in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; and for Christ's sake forgives sins which only the Spirit obtained by the atonement enables us to confess and forsake.Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 311 In the Socinian theory Christ is a prophet, a teacher. He saves His people as a teacher saves his pupils - by instruction, He saves them from the evils of ignorance, and blesses them with the immunities and benefits of knowledge. Christ teaches the will of God and the way to heaven, and thus saves them who heed His instructions....But man has other needs besides instruction....The Savior of mankind must be more than a teacher, more than a prophet; He must be a priest, a king; indeed He must be to man all in all. Man as a sinner is lost; so far as his own resources are concerned, irretrievably lost. He is nothing, has nothing, can do nothing, without a Savior. - Raymond,Syst. Th., II, pp. 222-224.] consisted almost wholly of an array of arguments against Anselmic principles

2.The Mystical Theories. These represent the type of the moral influence theory as held by Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Maurice, Irving and others. Dr. Bruce calls it "Redemption by Sample." The mysticism lies in the identification of Christ with the race in the sense that He rendered to God, the perfect devotion and obedience which we ought to render; and which in some sense mankind offered in Him. This it holds, is the only meaning of sacrifice in the Scriptures - self-sacrifice by self-consecration to God's service. These theories are sometimes known also, as

""redemption by incarnation."

Schleiermacher (1769-1834) held that the atonement is purely subjective, and denied any objective satisfaction to God by the substitutionary work of Christ. Such ideas as reparation, compensation, substitution, satisfaction and propitiation, he held to be wholly Jewish. His conception of the work of Christ consisted in this - that being one with God, Christ taught men that they could be one with God; and His consciousness of being in God and knowing God, gave Him the power to communicate it to others. For this reason, He became a Mediator and a Savior

Ritschl (1822-1889) was one of the most influential representatives of the moral influence in Germany. He did not, like Schleiermacher, set aside historical revelation, but nevertheless held inadequate views of the Redeemer. To him, Christ was a Savior in much the same sense as Buddha - achieving His lordship over it by His indifference to it. He was the Word of God only in so far as He revealed this divine indifference to things. The sense of sin was regarded as an illusion which it was the work of Christ to dispel

Maurice (1805-1872) held that Christ was the archetype and root of humanity, and in His own body offered an acceptable sacrifice to God for the race. This was not a substitutionary offering in the commonly accepted sense of the term, but such a mystical union of the race with Christ, that it could make a perfect offering through Him. The sacrifice of Christ consisted in a complete renunciation of that human self-will which is the cause of all men's crimes and miseries. This he held, was the meaning of the ancient sacrifices - not as substitutes for the offerer, but as symbols of his devotion. These found their fulfillment in Christ, who in His life and death, offered up the one and only complete sacrifice ever offered, a perfect surrender to the divine will. Hence in Him, the archetypal man, the race offered a sacrifice acceptable to God

[On Irving's theory, evil inclinations are not sinful. Sinfulness belongs only to evil acts. The loose connection between the Logos and humanity savors of Nestorianism. It is the work of the person to rid itself of something in the humanity which does not really render it sinful. If Jesus' sinfulness of nature did not render His person sinful, this must be true of us, which is a Pelagian element, revealed also in the denial that for our redemption we need Christ as an atoning sacrifice. It is not necessary to a complete incarnation for Christ to take a sinful nature, unless sin is essential to human nature. In Irving's view, the death of Christ's body works the regeneration of His sinful nature. But this is to make sin a merely physical thing, and the body the only part of man needing redemption. Penalty would thus become a reformer, and death a savior - Dorner,Syst. Chr. Doct., III, p. 361

Dr. Strong points out, that according to this theory, the glory of Christ was not in saving others, but in saving Himself, and so demonstrating the power of man through the Holy Spirit to cast out sin from his heart and life. - Strong, Syst. Th., II, p. 746

Freer, one of Irving's followers, modified this doctrine, stating that "Unfallen humanity needed not redemption, therefore, Jesus did not take it. He took fallen humanity, but purged it in the act of taking it The nature of which He took part was sinful in the lump, but in His person most holy." The Mystical Theory, while existing in numerous forms, may be stated as follows: The reconciliation effected by Christ is brought about by a mysterious union of God and man, accomplished by His incarnation. The theory was held by the Platonizing fathers, by the followers of Scotus Erigena

during the Middle Ages, by Osiander and Schwenkfeld at the Reformation, and the disciples of Schieiermacher among modern German theologians. One reason why the mystical theory seems so vague, is due to the fact that it has not been held as an exclusive theory, but differently colored by different writers

Thomas Erskine taught that "Christ came into Adam's place. This is the real substitution....We are separated from each other by being individual persons. But Jesus had no human personality. He had the human nature under the personality of the Son of God. And so His human nature was more open to the commonness of men; for the divine personality while it separated Him from sinners in point of sin, united Him to them in love. And thus the sins of other men were to Jesus what the affections and lusts of his own particular flesh are to each individual believer. Every man was a part of Him, and He felt the sins of every man - just as the new nature in every believer feels the sins of the old nature - not in sympathy, but in sorrow and abhorrence. Erskine, "The Brazen Serpent."]

Irving (1792-1834) held what is commonly known as the "Theory of Gradually Extirpated Depravity." According to Irving, Christ took upon Himself our human nature, not in its purity, but in its likeness after the Fall. Hence there was in Him, a fallen nature with its inborn corruption and predisposition to moral evil. He held that there were two kinds of sin - guiltless sin and guilty sin. Passive depravity did not regard as guilty, but became such only when expressed in action. The passive sin Christ took, and through the power of the Holy Spirit, not only kept His human nature from manifesting itself in actual sin, but through struggle and suffering, gradually purified this passive sinful nature, until in His death, He completely extirpated it, and reunited the spirit to God. This is subjective purification, but there is no idea of a substitutionary atonement

3.Bushnell's Theory of Moral Influence. This is frequently regarded as the clearest and best statement of moral influence in relation to the atonement. Dr. Miley

[Bruce says, "Unless we are to treat the Epistle to the Hebrews as a portion of scripture practically meaningless, as possessing no permanent value for the Church, as being indeed nothing more than an ingenious piece of reasoning for a temporary purpose, we must regard Christ's priesthood as a great reality." - Bruce,Humiliation of Christ

Dr. Miley calls attention to the fact that in the analogy of certain pathologies, such as personal resentment against sin, "the scheme lowers God into the likeness of men; so that in Him, as in them, the great hindrance to forgiveness is in these same personal resentments. Thus 'one kind of forgiveness matches and interprets the other, for they have a common property. They come to the same point when they are genuine, and require also the same preparations and conditions precedent.' The theory commands no lofty view of the divine goodness. Nor can it give any proper significance to the sacred proclamation of the divine love as the original of the redemptive economy. Such a love is held in no bonds of personal resentment. The theory has no profound and glorious doctrine of divine love; and indeed, is found on a true sounding to be shallow." - Miley,Syst. Th., II, p. 118 In recent times Socinian principles have been introduced into the Latitudinarian theology of many who do not reject the doctrine of the Trinity. And it is here that they are most dangerous. In the works of some divines, the love of God alone is introduced into the atoning sacrifice, which on Christ's part is a sublime and supreme act of repentance for man, His amen to the sentence of the law, and to man himself an affecting representative sorrow which he

must make his own by adding to it the personal consciousness of guilt. The latter idea links it with the Romish doctrine of human additional expiation; and, as to the former, a representative sorrow that does not taste the wrath of God against sin falls immeasurably below the scriptural illustrations of the atoning passion in which our Lord was made a curse for us. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 312.] calls it the theory of "Self-propitiation by Self-sacrifice." It belongs to the class of mystical theories, in that it regards the race as identified with Christ, but is given separate mention because of its distinct character. Dr. Bushnell resolves Christ's priesthood into "sympathy"; that is, there are certain moral sentiments similar in God and in man, such as the repulsiveness of sin and resentment against wrong, which must not be extirpated, but mastered and allowed to remain. God, therefore, forgives just as man does. "They come to the same point where they require exactly the same preparations and conditions. So God must propitiate the cost and suffering for our good. This He did in sacrifice on the cross, that sublime act of cost, in which God has bent himself downward in loss and sorrow, over the hard face of sin, to say, and in saying to make good, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee" (Bushnell,Forgiveness and Law, p. 35). There is here no propitiation by Christ's death, but only suffering in and with the sins of His creatures. The theory, therefore, is strictly Socinian and Unitarian, although Bushnell was himself a trinitarian

4.The New Theology. The New Theology is a term applied to the more systematized forms of the mystical theory of the atonement, as found in the writings of McLeod Campbell of Scotland, and the Andover School of New England. The theory is essentially the same as that held by Maurice, Robertson, Bushnell and R. J. Campbell

John McLeod Campbell (1800-1872) in hisNature of the Atonement(1856) advocated that Christ made a perfect confession and an adequate repentance of sin for us. He saw as we cannot, the depths of sin, and therefore was enabled to make full acknowledgment for us, this reparation being in some sense, an act of vicarious re-

[Horace Bushnell's moral influence theory as set forth in his "Vicarious Sacrifice" failed to satisfy his mind, and in his "Forgiveness and Law" he held that "reconciliation" not only applies to what happens in men, but also to that which in a certain measure applies to the divine attitude toward men. That is, as we by making cost to ourselves for an enemy, overcome our reluctance to forgive, so God by entering into a sacrifice for sinners, becomes in His own feeling, fully at peace with Himself in extending grace to them.] pentance. It is for this reason that Dr. Dickie calls it the theory of "Vicarious Repentance." He held also, that Christ became the Head of a new humanity, in which He lives as a quickening Spirit, imparting to it the same attitude toward God's holiness and love, as were realized in His own life of obedience and love. As the root of this new life in humanity, there was revealed in it, an inestimable preciousness, brought into manifestation by the Son of God, for the Revealer of the Father was also the Revealer of man made in His image. "Therefore," he continues, "there must be a relation between the Son of God and the sons of men, not according to the flesh only, but according to the Spirit - the second Adam must be a quickening Spirit, and the head of every man be Christ." This was interpreted to mean, whether rightly or wrongly, that man has in him an element of the divine, and that a difference in degree and not in kind, marked the dividing line between man and Christ. As a consequence, the New Theology came into immediate conflict with the older orthodox beliefs. The attempt to break down the dividing line between man and Christ gave rise to two errors, (1) it lowered the conception of Christ as Deity and led directly to unitarianism; and (2) it precluded the idea of total depravity, and therefore

minified both sin and redemption. Here again we have unitarian principles held by a trinitarian divine The Andover School or "New Theology" is another form of the moral influence theory, and takes its name from the prominence given to the "New Theology" by the Andover divines. The theories held by this school were first advanced in a series of articles on "Progressive Orthodoxy" published in the fourth volume of the Andover Review in 1885. The third of this series is on the atonement. Dr. Dickie connects this theory with the Rectoral or Governmental theory. Dr. Boyce treats it as a separate theory of the atonement, but connects it with the moral influence theory as advocated by Bushnell and McLeod Campbell. It holds more nearly to the cosmological than the soteriological view of Christ's work, regards Christ as a representative of the race in the suffering for sin and repenting of it, denies any imputation or transfer of man's sins to Christ, or Christ's righteousness to man, maintains that love is the source of appeal to man, and holds that even the wrath of God is but one form of the manifestation of His love

Aside from the three historical theories, there are two modern theories of the atonement which combine the three essential elements - satisfaction, governmental and moral influence, in a manner deserving of special consideration. These are the Ethical Theory of Dr. A. H. Strong, and the Racial Theory of Dr. Olin A. Curtis. Both give prominence to the idea of holiness in the nature of God and the necessity for propitiation. The Ethical Theory of Dr. Strong should not, however, be confused with the moral influence theories The Ethical Theory. Dr. A. H. Strong has sought to combine the essential elements of atonement in what he calls the Ethical Theory. He arranges his material according to two main principles. (1)The atonement as related to the holiness of God.The Ethical Theory holds that the necessity for atonement is grounded in the holiness of God, of which conscience in man is a finite reflection. The ethical principle in the divine nature demands that sin shall be punished. Aside from its results, sin is essentially ill-deserving. As those who are made in God's

[The following is a summary of the principles of the Andover School. (1) Christ is the universal Mediator, and therefore must appear wherever there is need for His aid in any portion of the universe; (2) That Christ would probably have come as the incarnate one, even if there had been no sin from which to be redeemed; (3) The work of Christ changed the relation of God to man, and therefore man's relation to God; (4) There is no imputation in the work of the atonement - neither of man's sins to Christ, or of Christ's righteousness to man; (5) Christ as the substitute for the race approaches God as a representative of man through a mystical union, and therefore offers a vicarious suffering and adequate repentance; (6) This substitutionary suffering, however, is not available apart from man's own repentance; (7) The sufferings and death of Christ can be considered vicarious only in the sense that it expressed fully God's abhorrence of sin; (8) The application of the gospel is made by the Spirit who regenerates men, but not apart from their personal knowledge and experience of it; (9) Justice to God's own love requires that the gospel be preached to every sinner; (10) The judgment does not come until the gospel is preached to all nations. This last is interpreted to mean, not merely a proclamation of the truth within certain geographical bounds, but only when in reality all individuals of all nations have known it. (For further study, cf. Boyce,Abstract of Syst. Th.,pp. 298ff.)] image, mark their growth in purity by their increasing hatred of impurity, so infinite purity is a consuming fire of all iniquity. Punishment is, therefore, the constitutional reaction of God's being against moral evil - the self-assertion of infinite holiness against its antagonist and would-be destroyer. In God this demand is devoid of all

passion, and is consistent with infinite benevolence. The atonement then, must be regarded as the satisfaction of an ethical demand in the divine nature, through the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty. On the part of God, it has its ground (1) in the holiness of God, which must visit sin with condemnation, even though this condemnation brings death to His Son; and (2) in the love of God which provides the sacrifice, by suffering in and with His Son for the sins of men, but through this suffering opening a way of salvation. (3)The atonement as related to the humanity of Christ. The Ethical Theory maintains that Christ stands in such relation to humanity, that what God's holiness demands Christ is under obligation to pay, longs to pay, inevitably does pay, and pays so fully, in virtue of His twofold nature, that the claim of justice is satisfied, and the sinner who accepts what Christ has done is saved. If Christ had been born into the world by ordinary generation, He too, would have had depravity, guilt and penalty. But He was not so born. In the womb of the virgin, the human nature which He took was purged from its depravity. But this purging of depravity did not take away guilt, in the sense of liability to punishment. Although Christ's nature was pure, His obligation to suffer still remained. He might have declined to join Himself to humanity, and then He need not have suffered. But once born of the virgin, once possessed of the human nature that was under the curse, He was bound to suffer. The whole weight of God's displeasure against the race fell on Him, when once He became a member of the race. The atonement on the part of man, therefore, is accomplished, (1) through the solidarity of the race; of which (2) Christ is the life, and so its representative and surety; and (3) justly yet voluntarily bearing its guilt and shame and condemnation as His own. Christ as the incarnate One, in some sense, rather revealed the atonement than made it. The historical work was finished upon the cross, but that historical work only revealed to men the atonement made both before and since the extra-mundane Logos. The theory is stated and discussed at length by Dr. Strong in hisSystematic Theology(Vol. II, pp. 750-771) The Racial Theory. This is the theory of Dr. Olin A. Curtis, in his excellent work entitled The Christian Faith (pp. 316-334). As in the Ethical Theory, holiness in God becomes the supreme factor in determining the nature of the atonement. Dr. Curtis introduces the subject by giving an account of his dissatisfaction with the three historical theories, and his attempt to combine the essential qualities of each by the method of eclectic synthesis. The result, however, was so mechanical that it had to be given up. Then came the vision of the full Christian meaning of the human race - a vision which not only vitalized but transformed the entire theological situation. From that time he studied the Bible more profoundly, being impressed with the tremendous emphasis placed upon the event of physical death as abnormal in human experience; and finding in St. Paul's teachings a racial view of our Lord's redemptive work. He found also, to his astonishment, that the elements in the old theories which he desired to preserve, appeared in a stronger light when viewed from the racial standpoint. The satisfaction theory required that justice be

[Dr. Strong holds that the guilt which Christ took upon Himself by His union with humanity was: (1) not the guilt of personal sin - such guilt as belongs to every adult member of the race; (2) not the guilt of inherited depravity - such as belongs to infants, and to those who have not come to moral consciousness; but (3) solely the guilt of Adam's sin, which belongs prior to personal transgression, and apart from inherited depravity, to every member of the race who has derived his life from Adam. This original sin and inherited guilt, but without the depravity that ordinarily accompanies them, Christ takes, and so takes away. He can justly bear penalty, because He inherits guilt. And since this guilt is not His personal guilt, but the guilt of that one sin in which "all

sinned" - the guilt of the common transgression in Adam, the guilt of the root sin from which all other sins have sprung - He who is personally pure can vicariously bear the penalty due to the sin of the fall. - Strong,Syst. Th., II, pp. 757, 758.] exchanged for holiness, and the automatic necessity be exchanged for the personal need of structural expression. The governmental idea required a profounder conception of the moral law, making it reach into the structure of the divine nature, and granting it a racial goal. The moral influence theory required that its conception of love should be so united to moral concern as to furnish a new atmosphere for holiness. That is, it should be holy love The main points of the theory may be summed up as follows: (1) The new race is by the death of Christ, so related to the Adamic race, penally, that it must express in perfect continuity, God’s condemnation of sin; (2) the center of the new race is the Son of God himself, with a human racial experience completed by suffering; (3) the new race is so constituted that it can be entered only on the most rigid moral terms; (4) the race moves through history as the one thoroughly reliable servant of the moral concern of God; (5) this new race makes it possible for each human being to find a holy completion of himself in his brethren and in his Redeemer in perfect service, rest and joy; and (6) this new race will finally be the victorious realization of God’s original design in creation

23. Chapter 24 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS NATURE AND EXTENT

Chapter 24 - THE ATONEMENT: ITS NATURE AND EXTENT

Having considered the biblical basis of the atonement, and having traced the development of its leading ideas in the history of the Church, we are now ready to consider more fully, its nature and extent. The word atonement occurs but once in the New Testament (Romans 5:11), the Greek term katallaghn from which it comes being usually translated reconciliation. The word is of frequent occurrence, however, in the Old Testament, and is fromkapharwhich signifies primarily to cover or to hide. When used as a noun it signifies a covering. In theology it is used to express the idea of satisfaction or expiation. This is the sense in which it is used by the most critical lexicographers. In the English language, it is made to cover a wide range of thought. (1) It denotes that which brings together and reconciles estranged parties, making them at-one-ment, or of the same mind

(2) It denotes also, the state of reconciliation, or the one-mindedness which characterizes reconciled parties. (3) It is sometimes used in the sense of an apology oramendehonorable. This is a penitential confession, as for instance, the suffering in connection with the beloved dead, because we cannot make "atonement" to them for the wrongs committed against them while they were with us. (4) The word is most frequently used in the sense of a substitute for penalty - a victim offered as a propitiation to God and hence an expiation for sin. (5) The Old Testament idea as indicated, is that of a covering, and therefore applies to anything which veils man’s sins from God. (6) It reaches its highest expression in the New Testament where it is used to signify the propitiatory offering of Christ THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT

We shall consider in this division, (1) Definitions of the Atonement; (2) The Ground or Occasion of the Atonement; (3) The Vital Principle of the Atonement; and (4) The Legal Aspects of the Atonement

Definitions of the Atonement. Mr. Watson defines the atonement as follows: ""The satisfaction offered to divine justice by the death of Christ for the sins of mankind, by virtue of which all true penitents who believe in Christ are personally reconciled to God, are freed from the penalty of their sins, and entitled to eternal life" (Watson,Dictionary, p. 108). The definition of Dr. Summers is similar in its import but more specific. "The atonement is the satisfaction made to God for the sins of all mankind, original and actual, by the mediation of Christ, and especially by His passion and death, so that pardon might be granted to all, while the divine perfections are kept in harmony, the authority of the Sovereign is upheld, and the strongest motives are brought to bear upon sinners to lead them to repentance, to faith in Christ, the necessary conditions of pardon, and to a life of obedience, by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit" (Summers,Syst. Th., I, pp. 258, 259)

Dr. Miley’s definition is as follows: "The vicarious sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin as a conditional substitute for penalty, fulfilling, on the forgiveness of sin, the obligation of justice and the office of penalty in moral government" (Miley,The Atonement in

[The idea of the atonement may accordingly be defined as the solution of a certain antithesis in the very life of God as revealed to man, or the apparent opposition between God's love and God's righteousness. Though these attributes are essentially one, yet sin has produced a tension or apparent variance between these two points in the divine mind. Though God eternally loves the world, His actual relation to it is not a relation of love, but of holiness and justice, a relation of opposition, because the unity of His attributes is hindered, restrained. There exists also, a contradiction between the actual and essential relations of God to mankind; a contradiction which can be removed only by the destruction of the interposing principle of sin. - Martensen,Chr. Dogm., p. 303

Dr. E. H. Johnson thus summarizes the atonement: "The Lord Jesus, by what He was and is, by what He did and bore, has made every provision required by the holy nature of God and the fallen estate of man to deliver men from 'sin, its penalties and its power." - Johnson,Outline of Syst. Th., p. 223.]

Christ, p. 23). Dr. Pope does not give a condensed definition of the atonement, but summarizes his position in the following statement: "The teaching of the scripture on this subject may be summed up as follows: The finished work, as accomplished by the Mediator himself, in His relation to mankind, is His divine-human obedience regarded as an expiatory sacrifice: the atonement proper. Then it may be studied in its results to God, as to God and man, and as to man.First, it is the supreme manifestation of the glory and consistency of the divine attributes; and, as to this, is termed the righteousness of God.Second,as it respects God and man, it is the reconciliation, a word which involves two truths, or rather one truth under two aspects: the propitiation of the divine displeasure against the world is declared; and therefore the sin of the world is no longer a bar to acceptance.Third,in its influence on man, it may be viewed as redemption: universal as to the race, limited in its process and consummation to those who believe" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 263). These definitions set forth the main factors in the atonement The Ground or Occasion of the Atonement. "We believe that Jesus Christ, by His sufferings, by the shedding

[We have in our possession, an article entitled "The Methodist Doctrine of the Atonement," by Dr. J. J. Tigert, published in theMethodist Quarterly Review, April, 1884. This gives one of the best comparative studies of the atonement which we have seen. Dr. Tigert compares Dr. Miley's theory with that held by Dr. Summers and Dr. Pope. In this article the following comparisons, or contrasts are made. In his definition of the atonement, Dr. Summers calls it a satisfaction made to God, which form of expression Dr. Miley not only excludes, but carefully avoids, and stringently opposes since he identifies the theory of satisfaction with the penal substitution theory. Again, Dr. Summers gives the atonement relation to original as well as actual sin, as is done in the second article of the creed. This Dr. Miley's definition ignores, and his whole essay does not touch the question except when he glances at the relation of the atonement to infant salvation. Furthermore, Dr. Summers makes the atonement to consist of the entire mediation of Christ, especially of His sufferings and death, while Dr. Miley speaks only of vicarious sufferings, though he is doubtless in accord with Dr. Summers as is evinced by his masterly treatment of the great passage in the second chapter of Philippians

Dr. Raymond states his position as follows: "The death of Christ is declarative; is a declaration that God is a righteous Being and a righteous Sovereign. It satisfies the justice of God, both essential

and rectoral, in that it satisfactorily proclaims them and vindicates them by fully securing their ends - the glory of God and the welfare of His creatures." - Raymond,Syst. Th., II, p. 259.] of His own blood, and by His meritorious death on the cross, made a full atonement for all human sin, and that this atonement is the only ground of salvation, and that it is sufficient for every individual of Adam's race." (Creed: Article IV.) Article II of the Twenty-five Articles as revised by Mr. Wesley, states the purpose of the incarnation in these words: "The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." The ground or the occasion of the atonement then, is the existence in the world of both original and actual sin, together with the necessity for propitiation. As we have previously indicated, it may be said to be grounded in three necessities: (1) the nature and claims of the Divine Majesty; or the propitiatory idea; (2) the upholding of the authority and honor of the Divine Sovereign, or the governmental idea; and (3) the bringing to bear upon the sinner, the strongest possible motive to repentance, or the moral influence theory

1. The atonement is grounded in the nature and claims of the Divine Majesty. The nature of God is holy love. In our discussion of the moral attributes (Vol. I, pp. 365ff), we pointed out that holiness as it relates to

[There are three views of the atonement in Scripture. It is sometimes regarded as the result of a mystery that had been transacted in the divine mind before its manifestation in time. Sometimes, again, it is exhibited as a demonstration of God's love to mankind, and self sacrifice in Christ for their sake: as it were to move the hearts of men with hatred of sin and desire to requite so much mercy. Strictly speaking, this is not given as an explanation of the atonement. The New Testament does not sanction the idea that our Lord's self-sacrifice is made an argument with sinners....Lastly, it is set forth as an expedient for upholding the dignity of the Ruler of the universe and Administrator of law. These three views, or to use modern language, theories of the atonement are combined in the Scriptures: neither is dwelt upon apart from the rest. The perfect doctrine includes them all. Every error springs from the exaggeration of one of these elements at the expense of the others. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 280.] the Father, expresses the perfection of moral excellence, which in Him exists unoriginated and underived; while love is that by which He communicates Himself, or wills a personal fellowship with those who are holy, or capable of becoming holy. By His very nature, He could have no fellowship with sinful beings; and yet His love yearned for the creatures which He had made. Sin rent the heart of God. We may now enter more fully into the profound truth, that sin made man an orphan and left God bereaved. His holiness prevented sinful man from approaching Him, while His love drew the sinner to Him. Propitiation became necessary in order to furnish a common ground of meeting, if holy fellowship was again to be established between God and man. The thought of drawing near is involved in the very nature of propitiation. God himself provided the propitiatory offering. Holy love devised the plan.Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins(1 John 4:10). The Son voluntarily offered himself to do the will of the Father. To His distressed disciples on the way to Emmaus He said,Ought not Christ to have

suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?(Luke 24:26). The atonement, therefore, had its origin in God, and propitiation satisfies the infinite depths of His nature as holy love. That propitiation is intended to satisfy the vindictiveness of a wrathful Being, is the false charge of those who would make the nature of God to consist in benevolence instead of holy love, and who, therefore, exalt His goodness to the disparagement of His holiness. Hold firmly to the nature

[The expression, the "wrath of God," simply embodies this truth, that the relations of God's love to the world are unsatisfied, unfulfilled. The expression is not merely anthropopathic, it is an appropriate description of the divine pathos necessarily involved in the conception of a revelation of love restrained, hindered, and stayed through unrighteousness. For this wrath is holy love itself, feeling itself so far hindered because they have turned away from its blessed influence whom it would have received into its fellowship. This restrained manifestation of love, which in one aspect of it may be designated wrath, in another aspect is called grief, or distress, in the Holy Spirit of love; and wrath is thus turned into compassion. It is only when the wrath of God is allowed that any mention can be made of His compassion. - Martensen,Chr. Dogm., p. 303.] of God as holy love, and propitiation becomes the deepest fact of the atonement

2. The atonement is also grounded in a governmental necessity. God as the infinite moral Being, is characterized by the absolute and essential principles of the true, the right, the perfect and the good. These cannot be abrogated, altered or set aside. He has created a race of beings endowed with the same principles of rational intuition. Moral law, therefore, becomes imperative, and moral government a necessity. As moral Governor, God cannot dispense with the sanctions of those eternal and immutable laws under which alone, His creatures can exist. To repeal the sanctions would be to break down the distinctions between right and wrong, give license to sin, and introduce chaos into a world of order and beauty. God cannot, therefore, set aside the execution of the penalty. He must either inflict retributive justice upon the sinner himself, or maintain public justice by providing a substitute. The governmental theory of the atonement, therefore, makes prominent the sacrifice of Christ as a substitute for penalty. It maintains that the death on the cross marked God's displeasure against sin, and therefore upholds the divine majesty and makes possible the forgiveness of sins. On

[Dr. Summers presents this phase of the atonement in a strong statement as follows: "Mankind constitute a species: all are 'made of one blood'; they are viewed as a solidarity; all were seminally contained in the primal pair. When our first parents fell, the species fell. If the penalty of the law had been enforced the species would have been cut off. To prevent this disastrous result the atonement was provided. This secured the perpetuation of the species. But it did not so take effect that Adam's posterity are not born in sin. They all partake of his fallen nature. The depravity of mankind is inherited, inherent, universal. But as it would be unjust and cruel to bring multiplied millions of responsible and immortal beings into existence, in this miserable condition, without furnishing them a remedy, the atonement was so devised as to meet all the demands of the case. There is no inherited and inherent depravity in man for which atonement has not been made by Christ. But with the nature they possess and the influences brought to bear upon them, actual, personal transgressions will certainly be committed by them, and this liability to sin will remain as long as they remain in their probationary state. Hence, it were better for them that they had never been born - that everyone had died seminally, as he sinned seminally, in Adam - than that they should be brought into the world with this liability to actual sin, if no provision were made to reach

the case; therefore, the atonement is made 'not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men'." - Summers,Syst. Th.,I, pp. 261, 262.] this theory, the sacrifice of Christ is regarded as the substitute for public rather than retributive justice

3. The atonement is further grounded in the appeal of divine love.Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us(1 John 3:16). Love is the strongest force in the universe. We love him, because he first loved us(1 John 4:19). Love is not only God's appeal to the sinner; it is also a transforming power within him.God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love(1 John 4:16-18). The cross of Christ represents at once, the greatest exhibition of God's love for man, and the culmination of man's rebellion against God. Those who view this cross from the standpoint of rebellion shall feel the weight of its eternal condemnation; those who view it from the standpoint of love, find Him to be the propitiation for their sins, and not onlyso, but also for the sins of the whole world(1 John 2:2) The Vital Principle of the Atonement. We must consider the atonement also, as God's method of becoming immanent in a sinful race. We distinguish here between metaphysical and ethical immanence. God is everywhere present in nature; and in so far as his bodily and spiritual constitution are concerned, is immanent in man also. This is the deep meaning of the Apostle

[Dr. Sheldon points out that the governmental theory has great advantage over the judicial in that it holds that the work of Christ instead of satisfying distributive justice for any man or number of men, established simply a suitable basis for the proffer of salvation to all men upon equal conditions. But he indicates also that it is quite possible to push the theory too far. He insists that there is no occasion for any disjunction between the personal and governmental in God. In self-consistency He is in the identical plane as Moral Ruler and Divine Person. What is agreeable to His feeling in the one character is agreeable to that feeling in the other. If the ends of good government forbid an unconditional display of indulgence, so also does His personal holiness and justice. He concludes that the governmental theory ought to be so modified in so far as it gives place to the anthropomorphic conception that God is other in His governmental position than He is in His intrinsic nature, or that there is only a lax connection between the two. (Cf. Sheldon, Syst. Chr. Doct., pp. 399, 400).]

Paul when he says,in him we live, and move, and have our being(Acts 17:28). This immanence is not pantheistic. Man is not a mode of the divine existence. He has substantial being in himself, having been created through the Divine Word. But God is not immanent in man's sin or guilt consciousness. Sin has separated between them. And yet, if man is to become God's spiritual son, this divine immanence must be re-established. There must come into his innermost consciousness, the Spirit of His Son,crying, Abba, Father(Galatians 4:6). This vital element in the atonement can be brought back into the race only through Jesus Christ. We may further consider this principle under the following aspects:

1. The pre-existent Logos is the ground of unity between Christ and the race, and therefore a fundamental factor in the atonement. As Romans 3:24-26 most completely sets forth the atonement from its God-ward and ethical side, so Colossians 1:14-22 most perfectly expresses

the cosmical or metaphysical relations between God and man. St. Paul introduces the subject by a reference to the redemptive power of Christ, and then describes His cosmical relations to the world and man as the pre-existent Logos. Christ isthe image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: for 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. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself: by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven(Colossians 1:15-20). Here we have given us, the metaphysical ground of the atonement, in the relations of the Logos to the race. These relations are the closest that can possibly exist short of pantheistic identification. Mankind as a race depends upon Him, (1) for its origin (through the creative Word); (2) for its continued existence (consistere, to stand together, or subsist); (3) for its goal or purpose (all things were made for him); and (4) for its completion or perfection (that He might have the preeminence). These relations, it will be seen, are all-inclusive up to the point of His interposition for the redemption of mankind. Certainly they are deep enough, and wide enough to lay a foundation for anything the Logos may undertake in behalf of men. It is on the ground of this solidarity of the God-man and the race of mankind, or His consubstantiality with us, that it is possible for Him to become a true Representative of the race, and, therefore, bear the penalty due its sin; and (5) having become incarnate, He brings back into the race, the Spirit, of which it had been deprived - the Spirit of life and holiness. Becoming immanent in the race, Christ becomes the efficient ground of both our justification and our sanctification

2. The Incarnate Logos, or the Word made flesh, represents this vital principle of the atonement in another aspect. What He now undertakes in this immanent relation to mankind, has particular reference to the redemption of the race whose nature He has

[Dr. Johnson states, that while we need not be embarrassed by the speculative realism of the scholastics, there is nevertheless, a scientific realism which sees in human nature the common basis of all human existence - auniversalia in re, a realism which finds in Christ’s assumption of our nature, the condition of bearing our evils, and even of drawing more closely that earlier and divine bond, by virtue of which, personally He might stand in our place before God....Natural science is essentially realistic. The descent of individuals from a common origin, testifies that species is more than succession of individuals; it is an entity perpetuated through individuals. The real existence of species is testified positively by the persistence of type, negatively by the uniform inability of animal hybrids to perpetuate a breach of type. This physical evidence for the entity of race is corroborated by the moral sentiment of solidarity. Nor does it rest solely on the physical fact of a common origin. It would acknowledge as a man a creature just like ourselves from any other world. It is a prudent sentiment because the highest and best of our faculties as earthly beings are the social faculties whose actions knit us together. We are next to nothing except as parts of a whole. In no hazy, speculative sense then, but in conscious and felt reality, human nature is a vast unit, capable of receiving the Divine Logos, and suitable for Him to put on. As He did so, pre-existent relations of His being to ours, made it impossible for Christ to be merely a specimen man, or less than the Son of man, the second Adam, the true Representative of all mankind. -

Johnson,Out. Syst. Th., p. 230ff.] assumed. For this reason it is known as the procuring cause of redemption, when applied to its culmination in the death on the cross. All-inclusive as His pre-existent relations were, there is not one which did not through the incarnation attain a new and higher significance. As the Logos, He was the Creator of all things; as the incarnate Christ, He creates men anew. As He gave existence to the race, so now He gives it life. The unjust objection to the atonement as a transfer of penalty from the guilty to the innocent, loses its force when it is seen that this new Representative is the Creator of all men. We are made in His image; we are constituted persons only in Him. We are, therefore, bound to Him in a unique manner, and this new relationship underlies His whole redemptive work. But the pre-existent Logos not only created the universe and man as a part of it, He has so constituted it also, that it must express the holiness of His nature. This He did by connecting happiness with righteousness, and suffering with sin. Therefore, as the Incarnate One, Christ not only brings life back into the race; but having assumed the likeness of sinful flesh, He must endure also, the penalty which comes from the reaction of God’s holiness to its sin

3. The restoration of the Spirit is a further aspect of this vital principle in the atonement, and is generally known as the efficient cause of salvation. As depravity is a consequence of the deprivation of the Spirit, so the bestowal of the Spirit restores man’s inner spiritual relations with God. This is shown (1) in the re-establishment of the moral ideal. Man in his fallen condition perceives the right as an ideal, but finds no way to perform that which is good. Depravity did not root out the

[The second Adam also takes the place of humanity; and His sacrificial work must be looked upon as the actual work of humanity itself (satisfactio vicaria). But our inmost consciousness demands that the righteousness and obedience rendered, should not only be without us in another, but should also become personally our own. Now this demand is satisfied by the fact that Christ is our Redeemer as well as our Reconciler: our Savior who removes sin by giving a new life to the race, by establishing a living fellowship between Himself and mankind. All merely external and unspiritual confidence in the atonement arises from a desire to take Christ as Reconciler without taking Him as Redeemer and Sanctifier." - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 307.] ideal for which man hungers and thirsts, but it did bring him into the bondage of sin and death. Consequently the moral ideal transcends him. It is beyond his experience at every point. The incarnation, then, must be regarded as the supreme embodiment of the moral ideal in human form. The death on the cross was the overcoming of the principle of sin and death in the race, and the establishing of the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. (Romans 8:2). Thus the divine immanence through the incarnation, becomes a new life force, operating in an ethical and spiritual manner for the redemption of mankind. (2) Furthermore, the gift of the Spirit made possible the inner reconciliation of the individual believer with God, through sanctification.For both he that sanctifleth and they who are sanctified are all of one(Hebrews 2:11). Pentecost is the necessary sequel to Calvary. The atonement made objectively by Christ, is applied subjectively by the Spirit. The historic act issues in personal experience. The atonement became a reconciliation within as well as without. By His incarnation and death on the cross, Christ became one with sinners; in justification and sanctification, He becomes legally and vitally one with every individual believer. Thus through redeemed individuals, Christ builds up a new race after the pattern of His own resurrection The Legal Aspects of the Atonement. We have dealt with the vital principle in the atonement as God’s

immanence in the race, through the pre-existent Logos, the incarnation and the bestowal of the Spirit. There is a legal aspect also. By this we do not mean any artificial or merely external arrangement, but simply that the vital principle is the expression of moral and spiritual law. Upon this view, the atonement becomes the transformation and glorification of law. Two questions arise, (1) In what sense did Christ fulfill the law? and (2) In what sense does He absolve us from it?

1. Christ fulfilled the whole range of moral demand. It was the satisfaction of those laws which were involved in the atoning act itself, or which He encountered in the work of redemption. We may, however, regard the law as a unity, or a single moral demand, in which case we must consider it in at least four different aspects. (1) Christ fulfilled the moral law generally, including the Mosaic expression of it. The principles of truth, righteousness, perfection and goodness were embodied in Him as a perfect expression of the moral ideal. (2) By taking upon Himself the likeness of sinful flesh, He came under the operation of the law of sin and death. Regarded negatively, this is the law of holiness. Christ suffered death at the hands of sinners, and bore in Himself the consequences of their sin. (3) He obeyed the law of filial love and devotion. Though a Son, He was made perfect through sufferings, and in no instance did His perfect Sonship please the Father more than in His vicarious death for sinners. (4) Thus He fulfilled at once the claims of love and of justice

2. Christ delivers us from the law. But in what sense? Certainly not in the antinomian sense of abrogating all law. Why abrogate that which He came to fulfill? St. Paul gives us the true sense.God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons(Galatians 4:4-5). The atonement therefore does not do away with the law, but it does deliver men from its legal consciousness by becoming the ground of justification. Thus the idea of justification in the New Testament is lifted above mere external legalism in that it is "by faith." Justification by faith is God’s plan of enabling sinful men to pass from the legal to the filial consciousness - a redemption from the law in order to the adoption of sons. This is St. Paul’s way of deliverance from Jewish legalism. The faith principle changes the formal and legal side of justification into something vital and spiritual. The vital - life-union is thus combined with the formal declaration and the whole process is lifted from the lower plane of legal bondage, to the new and higher plane of spiritual sonship THE VICARIOUS EXPIATION By vicarious suffering or punishment, we do not mean merely that which is endured for the benefit of others, but that which is endured by one person instead of another. The two ideas of substitution and satisfaction necessarily belong to the word in its common acceptation. We have seen, both from the Scriptures and from the history of Christian doctrine, that the idea of satisfaction rests in the twofold nature of Christ as a theanthropic Being. It was upon this basis of the surrender and obedience of Christ that the scholastics built up their theory of merit. Reacting against the exaggerated position given to the church in Roman Catholicism, the Protestant Reformers again fell back upon the teachings of the Scriptures and the early fathers, and Christ alone was made the central principle of redemption. Satisfaction, therefore, was rendered by One who was both God and man. His human nature involved the penal suffering of which the divine was incapable; and the Divine Person gave infinite worth to the sacrifice

[Dr. E. H. Johnson takes the position that Christ bore our sins (I) Historically, in that coming to recover a revolted race, He declared the law of God fully, and consequently received the full force of sin’s opposition. It was a bearing of all sin, not through a reckoning to Christ of our several acts

of sin, but by virtue of the fact that the principle of sin as antagonism against God, went all the length against Him whom God had sent (Cf. John 6:29; John 3:18). (II) Ethically, Christ bore the sin of the world. (1) As one of the limitations imposed by the human upon the divine in His person, Christ accepted whatever moral evils were compatible with His paternity. The only such evil of which we have evidence was that of temptation. Note how extreme were the temptations in the wilderness renewed at the close of his mission, each corresponding to each, in the suggestion that possibly the cup might pass from Him; in the knowledge that twelve legions of angels were ready to deliver Him; and in the particular satanic challenge of priests and scribes, "Let him now come down from the cross" (Matthew 27:42). That to be thus tempted was inconceivably painful, none can doubt. He "suffered being tempted" (Hebrews 2:18). (2) But that union which imposed limitation upon the divine, so enlarged the powers of the human, that Christ bore the burden of human sin upon His sympathies to an extent impossible to man. He felt the extent of the calamity which He sought to repair. (3) A woe for which we cannot with certainty account, and at which He was Himself astonished, deepens the mystery of His death. He lost the sense of His Father’s presence. The fact is not affected by the attempted explanations. It is certain that His soul was filled with the horror of "outer darkness." In any case it was occasioned by the sins of men. Human guilt could lay upon Him no further burdens. He had tasted of the second death, and the sacrifice was complete. - Johnson,Out. Syst. Th., p. 230ff.]

Guilt was regarded as of infinite magnitude, in that it was an offense against the absolute holiness of God. Christ as the God-man, was then, the only being capable of making an atonement for sinners This argument was sustained by a further reference to the incarnation. These two natures, the human and the divine, were in His person, perfect and complete. His Godhead was neither impaired nor reduced by His personal union with human nature; and His humanity was likewise full and complete, in that no quality was omitted in order to make place for the divine nature. Therefore, in Him, humanity had received God, and God had received humanity. Consequently He represents before God, all that sinful humanity is to God and owes to God; and He represents to man, all that God means to him in redeeming grace. This representation the Scriptures regard as both subjective and vital, and as outward and legal. Subjectively, Christ is perfectly identified with the human race and therefore qualified in every way to be its true Representative; objectively, by His death on the cross, He fully propitiates the divine nature, and thereby expiates human sin. Propitiation, therefore, becomes the dominant idea of the atonement; and this because it is the ground of restored fellowship, is seen to be the deepest fact in holy love. The Scriptures declare of Christ, that He is our propitiation, and through faith in His blood, there is granted the remission of sins that are past (Cf. Romans 3:25) The Propitiatory Aspect of the Atonement. In asserting that the propitiatory aspect of the atonement gives us the true idea of satisfaction and expiation, we do not deny that other aspects are involved. But we do hold that these grow out of, and are subsidiary to, the dominant idea of propitiation. We give as our reasons, the following:

1. Propitiation has reference to the divine nature. This nature is holy love. God cannot tolerate sin, nor can He hold fellowship with sinners. This is true, not on the mere caprice of will, but as an essential and eternal verity.For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?(2 Corinthians 6:14). God’s nature being that of holy love, He cannot exhibit this love apart from righteousness, and therefore, must maintain the honor of His divine sovereignty. This He does, not from any external expediency, but from His essential

and eternal nature. Furthermore, love cannot be exhibited apart from holiness. The moral influence theories, therefore, which overlook the fact that there can be no fellowship between God and man except on the plane of holiness, are to say the least inadequate if not false. There can be no possible objection then, to the governmental idea, if it is not given prominence above propitiation; nor can there be any criticism of the idea of the moral influence, if this be considered as holy love That the idea of propitiation is the dominant note in the Wesleyan type of Arminian theology is shown by the following statement, and the appended notes. "Our Savior's sacrifice on the cross finished a perfect obedience which He offered in His divine-human person. This was His own obedience, and therefore of infinite value or worthiness; but it was vicarious, and its benefit be-

[The necessity for propitiation arises out of the separation produced by sin between God and man. As this separation certainly concerns God as well as man, the necessity for propitiation is not only a human but a divine necessity....The living action of God's love in His world has been hindered and stayed by sin; and consequently it hovers round the divine holiness and rectitude as a demand which has not been fulfilled in the world of unrighteousness; a requirement which finds expression in this - that the divine love, which must be manifested actively, must yet remain in abeyance; that God must retain the revelation of His love in the depths of possibility instead of allowing it to flow forth freely....But though we also teach that the essence of God is unchangeable love, we at the same time maintain that the active life of God's love in the world must needs have been interrupted by sin, and that a love, whose holy and righteous claims could not thus be injured and wounded would not be true love. The notion of God's greatness, which considers Him too high to require an atonement, differs nothing from the notion that He is too high to be grieved by sin, that as the atonement does not affect Him, so neither does sin affect Him. We, on the contrary, believe that sin is against God, that it does concern Him, that it disturbs His divine relations toward us, and therefore we cannot rest satisfied with that seeming reconciliation which is effected on earth but not in heaven. He has only a superficial perception of sin who can rest satisfied with it. - Martensen,Chr. Dogm., pp. 302, 305.] longs absolutely to our race, and on certain conditions, to every member of it. As availing for man, by the appointment of God, it is no less than satisfaction, provided by divine love, of the claims of divine justice upon transgression: which may be viewed, on the one hand, as an expiation of the punishment due to the guilt of human sin: and, on the other, as a propitiation of the divine displeasure, which is thus shown to be consistent with infinite goodwill to the sinners of mankind. But the expiation of guilt and the propitiation of wrath are one and the same effect of the atonement. Both suppose the existence of sin and the wrath of God against it. But, in the mystery of the atonement, the provision of eternal mercy, as it were, anticipates the transgression, and love always in every representation of it has the pre-eminence. The passion is the exhibition rather than the cause of the divine love to man" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 264)

2. Not only is propitiation concerned with the nature of God as holy love, it involves a consideration of the divine attributes as well. The tendency to exalt one attribute above another, has been the source of much error in theology. If we bear in mind that the attributes are to be regarded as modes, either of the relation or the

[In speaking of the death of Christ as a governmental expedient, Dr. Raymond says, "This theory is objectional, not because it teaches that the death of Christ is a governmental measure, but

because it teaches that it is solely that, and implies that it is only one of several expedients that might have been adopted. Beyond all question, the death of Christ secures governmental ends, the same ends as would be secured by the execution of the penalty, and secures them as fully and effectually as the actual infliction of penalty would do, if not more so. But a demonstration that the government of God is a righteous government, or that God is a righteous governor, is not itself necessarily a complete and adequate declaration of God’s righteousness. He is just, not only in the administration of law, but is also essentially just in inherent character." - Raymond,Syst. Th., II, pp. 253, 254

Viewed as His own, the expiatory work of Christ was a perfect spontaneous obedience and a perfect spontaneous sacrifice to the will of the Father imposed upon Him. The two terms may be regarded in their difference and in their unity as constituting the act and the virtue of the atonement. Its worthiness, or what is sometimes called its merit, connects it with the human race, and depends on two other truths: it was not due for Himself, but was the act of infinite charity for man; and that act was divine, both in its value and in its efficiency. The offering of the Redeemer had infinite efficacy for the human race. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 265.] operation of the divine essence, it will be seen that they must of necessity be in harmony with each other. There can be no strife between mercy and justice, no lack of harmony between truth and righteousness.Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other(Psalms 85:10). The nature of God as perfection is all-harmonious. Hence every attribute or perfection of His nature sanctions also His law. Wisdom is vindicated in the creation of moral beings, and power in His sovereign righteousness. Truth cannot be set aside. Goodness and mercy have their place. But true goodness cannot allow anything which in the slightest degree connives at sin or reflects upon the holiness of God. Benevolent love is as much concerned in law and order as are justice and truth. Thus the nature of God as expressed in the revelation of His perfections, not only demands, but devises a method of propitiation."Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins(1 John 4:10) An Exposition of the Scripture Terms Used to Express the Idea of Atonement.In our study of the Biblical Basis of the Atonement, we grouped together certain scriptures according to the Greek terms, or family of terms, from which the translations were made. These terms were propitiation (ilasnoV), redemption (lutrw), and reconciliation (katallassw). We arranged them in this order to show (1) the sacrifice made to God as the ground of redemption, (2) the redemptive price paid for the salvation of men; and (3) the consequent reconciliation effected between God and mankind. It is evident, however, that the word reconciliation, having both a Godward and manward aspect, is in the former sense

[The attributes of God are glorified both singly and unitedly, and in a transcendent manner, by the mediation of the Incarnate. This indeed is included in the meaning of the prayer that the name of God might be glorified in His Son; for that name is not only the triune name, but the assemblage of the divine perfections. Throughout the Old Testament and the New the divine glories, especially those which we may in this connection call the glories of the moral attributes, are condensed over the mercy-seat: receiving from it their highest illustration. There is a gradational display of the eternal majesty. - Pope,Compend., II, p. 277.] closely related to the idea of propitiation. It is for this reason that Dr. Pope says that "there are two Greek terms, or families of terms, on which hang all the details of the doctrine just laid down: ilasnoV and katallagh are their representatives. The

relations of these are clear and distinct in the original scriptures; but they are to some extent confused in our present English translation....Both these verbs have God for the subject and not for the object. The Supreme Being reconciles the world to Himself; it is not said that He is reconciled: this simply gives expression to the great truth that the whole provision for the re-establishment of peace is from above. God is reconciled to man, butin Christwho is Himself God: He therefore is the Reconciler while He is the reconciled. So also the word expiate refers to an act of God: it is not said that He is propitiated, but that He propitiates Himself or brings Himself near by providing an expiation for the sin. Strictly speaking the atoning sacrifice declares a propitiation already in the divine heart" (Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 271, 272) In Romans 3:25, the word for propitiation ishilastenon(ilasthpion), which is the neuter form of the adjectivehilasterios(ilasthrioV), and when used as a noun, is translated propitiatory or expiatory. It refers to the lid or covering of the ark of the covenant which stood in the holy of holies. This is the place where God manifested Himself, the Shekinah appearing between the cherubim and over the mercy-seat. Here it was that the blood was sprinkled, and consequently it came to be known as the propitiatory or place of atonement. Two things must be noted: (1) the atonement or propitiation was made in the presence of God; and (2) the sprinkling of the blood made possible the exhibition of mercy, and a drawing near to God. The word ilasthrion is by Robinson, and most lexicographers, translated sin-offering, or an expiatory sacrifice. Since the word is used in connection with redemption "through faith in his blood," it shows clearly that both propitiation (ilasthrion) and the redemptive price (apolutrwsiV) refer to the sacrificial death of Jesus. The atonement, therefore, is the propitiation made, and the price paid down, for the salvation of men. Christ Jesus is the true propitiatorythe divine and human meeting in Him as the one theanthropic person. The sacrifice was His own blood. Beneath that sprinkled blood, mercy is extended to all mankind. All men may draw near in full assurance of faith. Above that sprinkled blood is the Shekinah, the living flame guarded by holiness and righteousness. Zacharias the priest seems to have blended together all the symbolism of the holy of holies in an interpretative passage of marvelous spiritual insight. Being filled with the Holy Spirit, he prophesied saying,The oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life(Luke 1:73-75) In Hebrews 9:28 we have another expression which clearly shows the expiatory character of Christ’s ministry. Here the word isanaphero(anaferw), which according to Robinson means "to bear up our sins, to take upon oneself and bear our sins, 1:e., to bear the penalty of sin, to make expiation for sin." The reference is to the active phase of Christ’s priestly work. He is regarded as the Offerer rather than as the offering, as Priest rather than as sacrifice. Under the Old Testament economy, it was the function of the high priest to make atonement, or expiation for the sins of the people. By this means they were restored to favor with God, and became the recipients of the blessings of the covenant. So also Christ laid hold of our nature, that in all thingshe might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation[ilaskesqai or propitiation] for the sins of the people (Hebrews 2:17). Thus He secured for them the blessings of a better covenant of which He became the Mediator, that is, the promise of the Spirit, and the law written within their hearts. The active phase of Christ’s work as propitiator in bringing God near to men, is further set forth by the writer of this epistle in these words,And having an high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assuranceof faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed

with pure water(Hebrews 10:21-22) In Hebrews 10:10, we have the counter truth, or the passive phase of Christ's work as a propitiatory offering. He is here regarded not as a priest but as a sacrifice. It is the subjective rather than the objective aspect of the atonement. Hence a new set of terms is introduced. These deal not so much with justification or the work of Christ doneforus, as with sanctification, or the work wroughtinus by the Holy Spirit. Sin as we have seen, not only entails guilt but defilement. In actual sins, there is guilt in the double sense of culpability (reatus culpo) and liability to punishment (reatus poeno). In original sin there is guilt only in the sense of liability to punishment (reatus pono), the guilt of culpability (reatus culpo) having been removed by the free gift of grace. The defilement which attaches to actual sin is known as acquired depravity. This is removed by initial sanctification, which is concomitant with justification and regeneration. The defilement which attaches to original sin is known as inherited depravity, and is removed by entire sanctification. Hence the guilt of sin, whether as attaching to actual or original sin, is removed by the propitiatory or expiatory offering of Christ's blood; while the consequences or defilement of sin - either acquired or original, is removed by the renewing of the Holy Spirit in His sanctifying power. We have, therefore, another set of terms,katharizein(kaqarizein) andhagiazein(agiazein), one applying to the cleansing from guilt, the other to the cleansing from defilement. ThusThe blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth[kaqarizein] us from all sin (1 John 1:7); that is as a sacrifice which removes the guilt of sin by expiation. Again,By the which will we are sanctified[hgiasmenoi]through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all(Hebrews 10:10). This latter is the cleansing from the defilement of original sin or depravity, as is shown further by the statement thatby one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us(Hebrews 10:14-15). Here is a removal of defilement by the renewing of the Holy Spirit in his sanctifying offices The last set of terms we shall mention in this connection, are those from which we have our word reconciliation. Here the Greek word iskatallassein(katallassein) which means to exchange, or to change the relation of one person to another, generally in the sense of an exchange of enmity for friendship. This is the word from which we have atonement, in its strict literal sense of an at-one-ment, or reconciliation. The word katallaghn is translated atonement in Romans 5:11by whom we have now received the atonement. In reality, it carries with it the idea of reconciliation, and would have been better so translated. In Hebrews 2:17to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,the word ilaskesqai may well have been translated atonement, or to be more exact, propitiation. In Ephesians 2:16, and Colossians 1:20-21, the word used asapokatallattein(apokatallattein) which is an intensive form and signifies to reconcile fully. Dr. Pope indicates that the verbkatallassein(katallassain) signifies the virtue of the mediation of Christ as composing a difference between man and God; whilekatallage(katallagh) applies to the result, or the new relation in which the world stands to God. This term must be given further consideration in a later paragraph THE GODWARD AND MANWARD ASPECTS OF THE ATONEMENT

We have seen that the words propitiation, reconciliation and redemption are used in the scriptures to set forth the atonement, (1) in relation to God; (2) in relation to God and man; and (3) in relation to man. Propitiation deals with the divine aspect of the atonement; reconciliation with the double aspect of its Godward and manward relations; and redemption with the manward aspect. In our discussion of the propitiatory aspect of the atonement, we endeavored to show that the high priestly work of Christ served as the one great oblation both for the remission of sins, and as the satisfaction of the claims of divine justice. We must now consider the atonement as an

accomplished fact, that is, as reconciliation and redemption The Atonement as Reconciliation. Reconciliation is that aspect of the finished work which expresses the restored fellowship between God and man. It must be viewed, therefore, both in its Godward and manward relations. But since God provided the atonement or propitiatory offering, he must be regarded as both the Reconciler and the Reconciled. Man must also be regarded as reconciled, but this aspect of the atonement is best treated under the head of redemption

1. God is the Reconciler and the Reconciled. It is sometimes objected that God could not both demand and provide an atonement, but this objection is only apparent. Man was created both as dependent upon God and as a free and responsible creature. The atonement satisfies both of these relations. The Scriptures are specific at this point.All things are of God, who hath reconciled(katallaxantoV)us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation(katallghV);to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling(katallasswn)the world unto himself; not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation[katallaghV] (2 Corinthians 5:18-19). Here it is said that God has not only provided the propitiatory offering Himself, but He has associated His people with Him in the proclamation, having committed to them the word of reconciliation. Two errors need to be guarded against at this point. (1) We must not regard God as having been angry with us in the sense of a hostility to be overcome by the sacrifice of an innocent victim, for God himself is the Reconciler. (2) We must not suppose that God was induced to feel compassion for man, only after Jesus had by His suffering fulfilled the demands of violated law. It was His love that gave the Son, thatwhosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life(John 3:16). Love has never acted more freely than in providing through the incarnation and atonement, the breaking down of all the barriers between man and God. Here it is "love outloving love," a grace that superabounded where sin abounded

2. The reconciliation refers also to the state of peace existing between God and man. In this sense it is sometimes used as one of the titles of our Lord’s work. Thuswe also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement(or reconciliation) (Romans 5:11). As Christ is called "the Lord of our righteousness," so also He is known as our "reconciliation" or our "peace" (Ephesians 2:14-16). We may say then, that in the Old Testament an amnesty was established,through the forbearance of God(Romans 3:25); but in the New Testament, this amnesty becomes an established peace. Furthermore, we are to understand that through the vicarious sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, God reconciled the world to Himself, removing from it, as a world, His displeasure. Thus a general peace was established as the basis for God’s acceptance of the believer into the rights and privileges of the new order. The reconciliation of individual believers is the acceptance through faith of this general reconciliation, and is therefore always regarded as the revelation of God’s mercy in the souls of believers. This St. Paul definitely teaches us.For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God[kathllaghmen]by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled[katallagenteV],we shall be saved by his life(Romans 5:10). When, therefore, the reconciliation is received in faith, it becomes a personal state of righteousness and peace The Atonement as Redemption.The term redemption from lutrow, to buy back, and lutron, a purchase price, represents Christ as buying back, or laying down a purchase price for the deliverance of men from the bondage of sin. Like reconciliation, redemption also has its objective and subjective aspects. Objectively, the entire race is redeemed in that the purchase price has been paid for all mankind. Subjectively, as it

applies to the individual, redemption is provisional and is made effective only through faith in the atoning blood. Dr. Pope arranges the terms which apply to redemption in four classes as follows: (1) those in which thelutron(lutron) or ransom price is included; (2) those which mean purchase generally, such asagorazein(agorazein); (3) those which imply only release, as fromluein(luein); and (4) those which indicate the notion of forcible rescue, asruesthai(ruesqai). It is evident that we are more concerned with the first class of terms, since we are discussing the atonement solely in relation to the finished work of Christ. We shall consider (1) the ransom price, and (2) the bondage from which men are delivered

1. The ransom price is the blood of Christ, although our Lord speaks of giving Hislife a ransom for many(Matthew 20:28), and St. Paul says, Hegave himself a ransom for all(1 Timothy 2:6). Doubtless the sense of these passages is that He laid down His life as being in the blood, and therefore as the God-man, who "being dead still lived" became the ever-blessed Substitute, suffering vicariously in the stead of all men, and making full satisfaction for the sins of the people. The sacrifice which He offered was not the blood of irrational animals, but His own precious blood (1 Peter 1:18-19). By thisone offering he hath perfected for ever[teteleiwken, made a perfect expiation for]them that are sanctified(Hebrews 10:14). Therefore those who reject this method of salvation must eternally perish, for there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. By this is meant, not that God refuses to save any who come to Him, but those who reject the only way of salvation provided, must by virtue of this rejection, forever remain in their sins

2. The ransom price secured for mankind the deliverance from the bondage of sin. This deliverance is sometimes mentioned as a redemption, (1) from the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13); (2) from the law itself (Galatians 4:4-5, cf. Romans 6:14); (3) from the power of sin (John 8:34, cf. Romans 6:12-23); and (4) from the power of Satan (Hebrews 2:15). If we use the expression "bondage to sin" in the broader sense, we shall see the force of the earlier Wesleyan position that we are redeemed (1) from the guilt of sin; (2) from the reigning power of sin; and (3) from the inbeing of sin. The first results in justification; the second in regeneration, and the third in entire sanctification. Thus we make the transition from our study of the atonement proper, to a consideration of its benefits. In closing this section, we need only mention that Christ does not lay down the purchase price merely to redeem us from wrath and release us to our own ways. He ransoms us back into His own rights over us, which thus marks the connection between His priestly and His kingly offices

Theological Modification of Terms. Our historical survey has given the broader outlines in the doctrinal development of the atonement, and we need now to give only a brief summary of some of the later and more specific changes. (1)Atonement. The word as used in the New Testament is from katallagh which in most places is translated reconciliation. It is, therefore, rather a legal term and in its exact signification is best expressed as at-one-ment, or reconciliation. In theological terminology, however, it has come to mean the whole economy of our Lord’s sacrificial ministry, with special emphasis upon the virtue of the sacrifice by which the reconciliation is effected. Theology, therefore, uses the term in its Old Testament significance. (2)Satisfaction. During the Reformation period the idea of satisfaction was added to that of expiation, and was given a specific meaning. It is not used in theology now to express the general idea of merit, but to express the relation which the work of Christ sustains to the demands of law and justice. The character and degree of this satisfaction as held in theology, ranges from the full exaction of the

penalty of the law inflicted upon a substitute, through the equivalent of that penalty, or a substitute for penalty, on down to theacceptilatioof the Socinians, who held that forgive-

[Propitiation, from prope, near, indicates in the Bible that the favor and good pleasure of God is attracted to the sinner by the mediation of Jesus. He is the propitiation because in Him God is brought nearer to man the sinner than even to man the unfallen. The fact that holy wrath is turned away through the atoning satisfaction is a secret behind the incarnation: in the very essence of the Triune God. - Pope,Compend. Th.,II, p. 275.] ness of sins was merely by word of mouth without the requirement of satisfaction. (3)Expiation. This term differs from that of satisfaction, in that instead of referring the sacrifice to the claims of the law and the honor of the Lawgiver; it refers it to sin and the sinner. By expiation is meant the doing away with guilt and the cancelling of the obligation to punishment. (3)Propitiation. This term bears almost the same relation to expiation as does satisfaction. The wrath or displeasure of God is propitiated, the sin is expiated. But propitiation differs from satisfaction in its primary significance in that it is not a satisfaction of the claims of justice - for justice cannot be propitiated, but is an appeasement of wrath or an allaying of displeasure. The word comes fromprope, meaning near, and indicates that God and man are brought near to each other through the satisfaction of the atonement THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT The atonement is universal. This does not mean that all mankind will be unconditionally saved, but that the sacrificial offering of Christ so far satisfied the claims of the divine law as to make salvation a possibility for all. Redemption is therefore universal or general in the provisional sense, but special or conditional in its application to the individual. It is for this reason that the universal aspect is sometimes known as the sufficiency of the atonement. While the claims of reason may anticipate the universality of the atonement, it is to the positive assertion of Scripture that we must turn for our final authority. Two scripture texts taken in their relation to each other, stand out with peculiar distinctness. The first is the statement of our Lord, thatthe Son of man came....to give his life[juchn]a ransom[lutron]for many[pollwn] (Matthew 20:28). The second is generally considered to be the last statement of St. Paul on this subject, and is evidently a quotation from the previous Scripture.Who gave himself[eauton]a ransom[antilutron]for all[pantwn] (1 Timothy 2:6). Note that each of the principal words is given in a stronger connotation - the life becomes the self, the purchase price, the personal Redeemer, and the many, the all The scripture passages bearing upon this subject have already been presented in a general way, and we need here merely to give additional references. We group them according to the following simple outline. (1) Those scriptures which speak of the atonement in universal terms: (John 3:16-17; Romans 5:8; Romans 5:18; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15; 1 Timothy 2:4; 1 Timothy 4:10; Hebrews 2:9; Hebrews 10:29; 2 Peter 2:1; 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:14). (2) Those which refer to the universal proclamation of the gospel and its accompaniments: (Matthew 24:14; Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:47. Cf. also Mark 1:15; Mark 16:16; John 3:36; Acts 17:30); (3) Those which distinctly declare that Christ died for those who may perish: (Romans 14:15; 1 Corinthians 8:11; Hebrews 10:29)

Arminianism with its emphasis upon moral freedom and prevenient grace, has always held to the universality of the atonement; that is, as a provision for the salvation of all men, conditioned upon faith. Calvinism on the other hand, by its doctrine of the decrees, its unconditional election, and its penal satisfaction theory, has always been under the necessity of accepting the idea of a limited atonement. Thus Turretin says, "The mission and death of Christ are restricted to a limited number

- to His people, His sheep, His friends, His Church, his body; and nowhere extended to all men severally and collectively" (Turretin,The Atonement, pp. 125, 126). It should be said, however, that the Calvinistic idea of a limited atonement does not grow out of a belief in its insufficiency; for Calvinists as well as Arminians believe in the sufficiency of the atonement. "All Calvinists agree," says Dr. A. A. Hodge, "in maintaining earnestly that Christ's obedience and sufferings were of infinite intrinsic value in the eyes of the law, and that there was no need for Him to obey or suffer an iota more nor a moment longer, in order to secure, if God so willed, the salvation of every man, woman and child that ever lived" (A. A. Hodge, TheAtonement, p. 356). The difficulty, therefore, does not lie in the insufficiency of the atonement, but in their belief in predestination. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death" (Westminster Confession). The primary question, then, concerns the doctrine of grace and not the sufficiency of the atonement. We shall, therefore, take up the subject of predestination in connection with our discussion of prevenient grace and effectual calling The Benefits of the Atonement. Closely related to the question as to the extent of the atonement, is that of the benefits of the atonement. Within the range or scope of the redemptive work, all things are included, both spiritual and physical. Every blessing known to man is the result of the purchase price of our Lord Jesus Christ, and comes down from the Father of lights. These benefits are generally considered under two main heads, (1) The Unconditional Benefits; and (2) The Conditional Benefits

1. The Unconditional Benefits include, (1) The continued existence of the race. It is hardly conceivable that the race would have been allowed to multiply in its sin and depravity, had no provision been made for its salvation. Yet had it not been for the divine intervention, the immediate death of the first pair would doubtless have taken place, and with it the termination of their earthly career. (2) The restoration of all men to a state of salvability. The atonement provided for all men unconditionally, the free gift of grace. This included the restoration of the Holy Spirit to the race as the Spirit of enlightenment, striving and conviction. Thus man is not only given the capacity for a proper probation, but is granted the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit. Both of these subjects have been given extended treatment in our discussion of the problem of sin. (3) The salvation of those who die in infancy. We must regard the atonement as accomplishing the actual salvation of those who die in infancy. This we may admit is not stated explicitly in the Scriptures, and in the past, has been the subject of much debate. The general tenor of the Scriptures, however, when viewed in the light of divine love and the universal grace of the Spirit, will allow no other conclusion. When our Lord declared thatExcept ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven(Matthew 18:3); and again,Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven(Matthew 19:14), there can be no reasonable doubt as to His meaning. Dr. Raymond sums up the generally accepted Arminian position as follows: "The doctrine of inherited depravity involves the idea of inherited disqualification for eternal life. The salvation of infants, then, has primary regard to a preparation for the blessedness of heaven - it may have regard to a title thereto; not all newly created beings, nor those sustaining similar relations, are by any natural right entitled to a place among holy angels and glorified saints. The salvation of infants cannot be regarded as a salvation from the peril of eternal death. They have not committed sin, the only thing that incurs such a peril. The idea that they are in danger of eternal death because of Adam's transgression, is, at most, nothing more than the idea of a theoretic peril. But if it be insisted that "by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to (a

literal and actual) condemnation,’ we

[Dr. Fairchild, a Calvinistic theologian, takes this position on the question of infant salvation. "The case of infants dying before moral agency begins is not set forth in the Scriptures. Our ideas on the subject must be wholly speculative, inference from our ethical philosophy. In the first place we can affirm, without misgiving, that such an infant is not a sinner, and cannot need forgiveness; yet he may have a share in the atonement in a variety of ways....If the race had been propagated without an atonement, it would have been a doomed race. No one could be punished without sin; but all, upon attaining responsibility, would fall into sin, and die without hope. We may conceive that the benefit of the atonement reaches the infant in the other world. He passes into that world without an established character of righteousness; he finds himself in the society of the redeemed, of those who in this life have been recovered from sin, and forgiven through the atonement. The character and experience of these saints may be of advantage to him; he may be brought up in righteousness under their care, and thus become directly a partaker of the atonement....Without the atonement, heaven might have been to infants what Eden was to the human race: a place where there was no experience, and where the moral influences were feeble; but received into the family of the redeemed in heaven, these infants are surrounded by all the experiences and moral forces which have accumulated in the Church below and the Church above. Thus the infant, dying before moral agency begins, may have a part in the song of Moses and the Lamb." - Fairchild,Elements of Theology, pp. 165, 166.] insist that from that condemnation, be it what it may, theoretic or literal, all men are saved; for by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, so that the condition and relations of the race in infancy differ from those of newly created beings solely in that, by the natural law of propagation, a corrupted nature is inherited. As no unclean thing or unholy person can be admitted into the presence of God and to the society of holy angels and glorified saints, it follows that if infants are taken to heaven some power, purifying, sanctifying their souls, must be vouchsafed unto them; the saving influence of the Holy Spirit must be, for Christ’s sake, unconditionally bestowed. Not only their preparation for, but also their title to, and the enjoyment of the blessedness of heaven comes, as came their existence, through the shed blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Raymond,Systematic Theology, II, pp. 311,312)
2. The Conditional Benefits of the Atonement are

(1) Justification, (2) Regeneration, (3) Adoption, (4) The Witness of the Spirit, and (5) Entire Sanctification. These must furnish the subjects for our discussion of the states of salvation. Before taking up these subjects, however, we must first give attention to the offices and work of the Holy Spirit as the Administrator of the great salvation purchased through the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ The Intercession of Christ. There is another transitional point which needs to be mentioned, in addition to the conditional benefits of the atonement enumerated above. This is the intercession of Christ. The New Testament does not teach that the work of Christ ceased with the coming of the Holy Spirit. It teaches that His finished work of atonement was only the ground for the work of administration, which He himself was to continue through the Spirit. He died for the sins of the past, that He might establish a new covenant; He arose that He might become the executive of His own will. His continued activity consists in carrying into effect through the Spirit, the merits of His atoning death.He ever liveth to make intercession for them(Hebrews 7:25);It is Christ that died.... who also maketh intercession for us(Romans 8:34); andIf any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father(1 John 2:1). As a consequence of Christ’s intercession for us, the

Holy Spirit is given as an intercessory presence within the hearts of men.Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God(Romans 8:26-27). The intercession of Christ at the right hand of God, and the intercession of the Spirit within, are in perfect harmony, for the Spirit takes the things of Christ and shows them to us. It is to this rich field of the Holy Spirit's offices and work, that we now turn our attention

24. Chapter 25 - THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Chapter 25 - THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT As the incarnate Son is the Redeemer of mankind by virtue of His atoning work, so the Holy Spirit is the Administrator of that redemption; and as there has been in the Holy Scriptures a progressively unfolding revelation of the Son, so also, there has been a corresponding revelation of the Spirit. We may note then, in an introductory manner, the four following propositions concerning the Holy Spirit. First, the Holy Spirit is a Person. That He is not merely a sacred influence, but the third Person of the adorable Trinity, is everywhere admitted in the Scriptures and in the creeds. For while both the Father and the Son are holy; and while both are called Spirit, yet the term "Holy Spirit" as a title is applied to neither of them. Second, the Holy Spirit has been progressively revealed to the Church. The Holy Spirit could not be fully revealed until after the Incarnation, and that for two reasons, (1) the Holy Spirit is the Person who completes the Godhead, as indicated in our study of the Trinity; and therefore of necessity is the last to be made manifest. (2) There is no analogy or counterpart in nature, as in the case of the Father and the Son, to assist us in interpreting the ineffable distinction of the Holy Spirit. Hence it was only as a resting-place for human thought had been provided by the Incarnation, that the threefold distinctions of the Godhead could come clearly into view, and thus the personality of the Holy Spirit be made known. Third, the Holy Spirit could not come as the Administrator of Christ’s atoning work until His earthly ministry was completed. Hence the Holy Spirit not be fully revealed until after the death, resurrection and glorification of Christ. Fourth, the Holy

[William Newton Clarke says that a practical definition of the Holy Spirit is "God in man." It is God working in the spirit of man, and thereby accomplishing the results that are sought in the mission and work of Christ. - William Newton Clarke, Outline of Chr. Th., p. 369.]

Spirit as a Person was fully revealed at Pentecost. We must therefore regard Pentecost as the inauguration day of the Holy Spirit, at which time He came in His own proper Person as the inner Advocate of the Church - the Paraclete or Comforter. We may therefore in the words of the creed, declare that "In no respect do we separate the Holy Spirit, but we adore Him, together with the Father and the Son, as perfect in all things, in power, honor, majesty and Godhead" (Creed of 369 A.D.) The Holy Spirit as a Person. The Scriptures abound with references to the personality of the Holy Spirit, but these have been previously considered in our discussion of the Trinity, and need not be repeated here. One question, however, which often proves troublesome, needs explanation. "Why is the Spirit sometimes referred to in the neuter gender?" Dr. George B. Stevens states that "since the word pneuma or spirit is grammatically neuter, all pronominal designations of the Spirit which have pneuma for their immediate antecedent, must, of course, be neuter. These words obviously have no bearing upon the question of the personality of the Spirit. That which is of especial importance in this connection is that as soon as pneuma ceases to be the immediate antecedent of pronouns designating the Spirit, masculine forms are employed" (Stevens, Johannine Theology, pp. 195, 196). As an illustration of this, two scripture references may be cited (John 14:26; John 15:26), which show the force of this change in pronouns - the Holy

Spirit which [o] the Father will send in my name, he [ekeinoV] shall teach you all things; and the Spirit of truth, which [o] proceedeth from the Father, he [ekenioV] shall bear witness of me (R.V.). It is evident that when

[According to William Adams Brown, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, historically considered is an inheritance from Israel. Originally denoting the energy of God which came upon men to fit them for special work connected with the upbuilding of the divine kingdom (Exodus 31:3; Judges 6:34; Judges 14:6), the Spirit came to be conceived as the immanent life of God in the soul of man. Its marks became prevailingly ethical and spiritual, and the convincing proof of its presence is a character acceptable to God. The conception of the Spirit of God as an abiding presence is further developed in Christianity, and finds its clearest expression in the writings of John and Paul. - William Adams Brown, Chr. Th., in Outline, p. 397] not prevented from doing so by the grammatical construction, St. John always designates the Spirit by masculine pronouns which denote personality. We may say, then, that the personality of the Spirit as separate and distinct from Christ, may be summed up in two general statements: (1) the Holy Spirit is described by personal designations; and (2) various personal activities are predicated of Him The Holy Spirit in His Preparatory Economy. While the full dispensation of the Holy Spirit does not begin until Pentecost; the Spirit himself, as the Third Person of the Trinity, was from the beginning, operative in both Creation and Providence. It was the Spirit who brooded over the waters, and brought order and beauty out of chaos (Genesis 1:2); and it was the Spirit who breathed into the face of man and made him a living soul (Cf. Genesis 2:7, Job 33:4). He has been the Agent in the production of all life, and is therefore, by prophetic anticipation, the Lord and Giver of life. But it is in the specific preparations of the gospel economy that His agency is set forth. We have seen in our discussion of the Person of Christ, that the revelation of the Son was mediated by the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets (1 Peter 1:10-12); and that the record of the gospel in the Old Testament was given by His inspiration. The Spirit, therefore, no less than the Son, was the promise of the Father, and this in a twofold manner. There is both a forward and a backward look - the Spirit being given in fulfillment of the promise; and given also as the earnest of a promise yet unfulfilled. The crowning promise of the Father was the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost The work of the Holy Spirit in His relation to mankind after the fall assumes four principal forms, of which Abel, Abraham, Moses and the prophets are representa-

[Dr. George B. Stevens tells us that the rendering 'the Comforter" for o parpklhtoV , dates back to Wycliffe's translations, and has been perpetuated in almost all later versions of English Bibles, including our Revised Version. It is formed from the Latin "con" and "fortis," "confortere" and means "one who strengthens." While in these various versions the word paraklhtoV , is rendered "Comforter" in the Gospel of John, it is translated "Advocate" in the First Epistle (2:1), a fact which is probably due to a similar variation in the rendering found in several ancient versions. - Stevens, Johannine Theology, p. 190.] tive types. There is first, the direct striving of the Spirit with the consciences of men, in a purely personal and private manner. Abel yielded to these strivings and offered the sacrifice of faith, thereby obtaining witness that he was righteous; while Cain, offering the fruits of his own labor, was rejected. The wickedness of men increased, until at the time of the flood, the condemnation of God was expressed in these fearful words, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh (Genesis 6:3). The family of Noah linked the old world to the new, and the Spirit still continued his striving under new and less degenerate conditions.

Second. there is the operation of the Spirit through the family. The promises were made to Abraham and his seed (Galatians 3:16); and hence Abraham looked forward to the "City of God" (Hebrews 11:8-10). The family forms a new order, a new locality for the Spirit's communications, and implies a more definite hold upon the race. The success of the Spirit in the Chosen Family is thus summed up by St. Paul, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever (Romans 9:4-5). The called out family was the ecclesia or the Church in germ; and therefore the first historical beginning of a religious community The third stage in the operations of the Spirit is to be found in the giving of the law. To the internal strivings, therefore, was added an external mode of appeal The moral law within man's nature demanded an objective stimulus in order to revive its operations and set it forth in clearer light. Hence St. Paul declares that the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator (Galatians 3:19). In the process of history, the inner light became dim and variable, and the Chosen Family enslaved and degraded. God therefore sent Moses to deliver His people from social bondage and give them the guidance of a written law to supplement the inner workings of the conscience, which no longer operated with strength and precision. This law was moral, ceremonial and judicial. That portion known as the Ten Commandments is said to have been given by "the finger of God," an expression which is interchangeable with "the Spirit of God" (Cf. Matthew 12:28 and Luke ii 20). The law served to give permanence to the moral ideal. Further, its violation involved guilt, for by the law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 3:20). The law being given by the voice of God from heaven, sin not only clashed with the sense of right within, but also with the external voice of the law. It became, therefore, in a very manifest sense, an offense against God. Man's sense of sin having been dulled, God in the law gave him a written transcript from His own moral nature. The fourth and last method of the Spirit's operations in the preparatory economy, is found in the voice of the prophets, Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (2 Peter 1:21) The law being a fixed instrument, men soon began td give more attention to its outward forms than to its inward spirit. Hence the prophets arose, who appealed to the hopes and fears of men, and thus gave inward content to the outward forms. While these revelations were transient, given at sundry times and in divers manners, the body of prophecy itself was cumulative and expansive. The prophetic order, therefore, marked a distinct advance by appealing to the law, by furnishing a devotional literature and especially by directing men's attention to the promised Redeemer. The order became permanent only in Christ to whom all the prophets pointed and in whom all their prophecies were fulfilled (Luke 1:70) The Holy Spirit and the Incarnation. Having traced the operations of the Spirit to the time of the Incarnation, we must now consider His part in this great mystery for which all other dispensations were but preparatory. The Incarnation was accomplished by the Holy Spirit. As the bond of union between the Father and the Son, it was appropriate that He should effect the high and singular union between the uncreated and the created natures in the One Person of Christ. And being the bond of love between the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit as the Minister of this union, becomes thereby the highest expression of the love of God for His creatures. And further still, the Holy Spirit being the perfecting Person of the Godhead, prepares and perfects the Mediator for His official work, and thereby effects the salvation of men. In this way alone are men restored to communion and fellowship with God The mystery of the Incarnation made possible the unveiling of the Holy

Spirit as the Third Person of the Trinity. Until the Annunciation, the Holy Spirit had never been revealed as a distinct Personal Agent. Never before had He been called by His own name. Previous to that time He was always mentioned in connection with the other Divine Persons. In the penitential Psalm it is take not thy holy spirit from me (Psalms 51:11); and in Isaiah, they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit (Isaiah 63:10). Consequently the term is used relatively and not in the absolute sense. The full disclosure of His personality and perfections was not made until the set time for His inauguration. Only when Christ had been fully glorified at the right hand of the Father could the Holy Spirit come in the fullness of His pentecostal glory The Holy Spirit and the Earthly Ministry of Jesus. During His mediatorial ministry, the Son alone did not act through His humanity. This humanity was also the temple of the Holy Spirit, which God gave to Him without measure (John 3:34). We may say, then, by way of

[Paræus in his Notes on the Athanasien Creed, gives the following reasons for the incarnation of the second Person of the Trinity, rather than the first or the third. First, that by the incarnation the names of the Divine Persons should remain unchanged; so that neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit should have to take the name of a Son. Second, it was fitting that by the Incarnation men should become God’s adopted sons, through Him who is God’s natural Son. Third, it was proper that man, who occupies a middle position between angels and beasts, in the scale of creatures, should be redeemed by the middle Person in the Trinity. Last, it was proper that the fallen nature of man which was created by the Word (John 1:3) should be restored by Him. In addition to these reasons, it is evident that it is more fitting that a father should commission and send a son upon an errand of mercy, than that a son should commission and send a father (Cf. Shedd, Dogm. Th., II, p. 266).] discrimination, that whatever in the Incarnation belonged to the Son as the Representative of Deity, was the act of His own eternal Spirit as the Son; whatever belonged to Him as the Representative of man was under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit. Not only was Christ’s body prepared for Him by the Holy Spirit, but His entire earthly ministry was likewise presided over by the Spirit. Hence, as Christ was the theanthropic or Godman, made like unto His brethren in order to become a merciful and faithful High Priest (Hebrews 2:17); so the Holy Spirit, who guided and sustained Him in every experience of His earthly life, became in a peculiar sense the Spirit of the incarnate Christ. Dwelling in the human nature of the theanthropic Person, the Spirit searched not only the deep things of God (1 Corinthians 2:10-13), but also the full depths of human nature. As the Son was perfected officially for His mediatorial ministry through suffering (Hebrews 2:10-13), so the Holy Spirit became the prepared Agent, who as the Spirit of Christ was able to take hold of the whole being of man "by its very roots." While this subordination of the Son to the Spirit ceased when the Redeemer laid down His life of Himself, and through the eternal Spirit - or His own essential deity, offered Himself without spot to God (Hebrews 9:14); it was not until the session that He was restored to the full glory which He had with the Father before the world was (John 17:5). Here He received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit; and by a strange reversal, He who was presided over by the Spirit during His humiliation, now in His exaltation becomes the Giver of that same Spirit to the Church (Acts 2:33) The Holy Spirit as the future Agent of Christ’s ministry was the object of prophecy during our Lord’s

[Christ was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit during His earthly life rather than under the independent agency of His divine personality. Our Lord’s human nature was sealed and consecrated and enriched with sevenfold perfection by the Spirit given to Him not by measure.

This particular subordination ceased when the Redeemer laid down His life of Himself, and through the Eternal Spirit, His own essential divinity, offered Himself to God for us. Until then, however, the Son as such did not act through His human nature alone. His own divine supremacy is in abeyance, and, as the Representative of man, He is, like us, led of the Spirit - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 155.] earthly life. This appears first in the words, How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him? (Luke 11:13), which, as Dr. Pope indicates, bears the same relation to the Holy Spirit as the protevangelium bears to the work of the Son. It is the dawn of the pentecostal day. The second prediction took place at the close of the great day of the feast, when Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink (John 7:37). In a parenthetical expression St. John explains that our Lord referred to the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given: because that Jesus was not yet glorified (John 1:39). The full and complete foreannouncement, however, was not given until the eve of the crucifixion, and is found in the farewell discourses of Jesus (John 14:16-17; John 14:26). Here it is distinctly declared that the Comforter, as the Spirit which dwelt in Christ, should dwell in His people also. This Comforter or Paraclete, is the Spirit of truth, and as such is the Revealer of the Person of Christ. He will not speak of Himself during the Pentecostal age, but will glorify only the Son, taking the things of Christ and making them known to the Church. As the Son came to reveal the Father, so the Holy Spirit comes to reveal the Son. The farewell discourses of Jesus, therefore, in a peculiar sense, furnish us with a revelation of the Trinity - the unity of the one God in the distinction of the three Persons THE DISPENSATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Pentecost marks a new dispensation of grace - that of the Holy Spirit. This new economy, however, must not be understood as in any sense superseding the work of Christ, but as ministering to and completing it. The New Testament does not sanction the thought of an economy of the Spirit apart from that of the Father and the Son except in this sense - that it is the revelation of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit, and therefore the final revelation of the Holy Trinity. Here, too, the economical aspect of the Trinity is the more prominent as emphasizing the distinction in offices. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you (John 16:15). As the Son revealed the Father, so the Spirit reveals the Son and glorifies Him. No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost (1 Corinthians 12:3). The mediatorial Trinity, one in essence and distinct in office, affords the true explanation of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. His work as the Third Person of the Trinity is therefore in connection with His offices as the Representative of the Savior. He is the Agent of Christ, representing Him in the salvation of the individual soul, in the formation of the Church, and in the witnessing power of the Church to the world. But He is not the Representative of an absentee Savior. He is our Lord’s ever-present other Self. This is the meaning of the promise, I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you (John 14:18). It is through the Spirit, therefore, that our Lord enters upon His higher ministry - a ministry of the Spirit and not merely of the letter. For this reason He said, It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you (John 16:7). In the Old Testament God used history to teach spiritual truth by means of divinely given symbols; in Christ as the historical Person, this truth was actualized in human experience; in the New Testament the fullness of grace and truth revealed in Christ is through the Holy Spirit universalized and made available to the Church

[There is a sense in which Pentecost introduced a new economy: that of the Holy Ghost, as the final revelation of the Holy Trinity. The One God, known in the Old Testament as Jehovah, a name common to the Three Persons, was then made known in the Third Person: the Lord the Father, the Lord the Son, is the Lord the Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:17). Hence the glory of the Day of Pentecost, excelling in glory every former manifestation of the Supreme. The Shekinah, the ancient symbol of the future incarnation of the Son tabernacling in flesh, becomes the fire of the Holy Ghost, disparted into tongues, and without a veil, resting on the entire Church. The perfect God is perfectly revealed; but revealed in the Trinity of Redemption, the Economical Trinity. The Church is the "habitation of God through the Spirit." From that day forward the Holy Ghost is essential to every exhibition of God as revealed among men. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., H, p. 326 The Inaugural Signs. Pentecost was the inauguration day of the Holy Spirit. As in the Old Testament the Passover marked the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and Pentecost celebrated the giving of the law fifty days later; so in the New Testament Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, and the Pentecost which followed marked the ushering in of a dispensation of inward law (Hebrews 8:10; Hebrews 10:16). The pentecostal Gift was the gift of a Person - the Paraclete or Comforter. This Gift Jesus promised to His disciples as the Agent through whom He would continue His office and work in a new and more effective manner. As the Advent of Christ was attended by miraculous signs, so also the inauguration of the Holy Spirit was attended by signs indicative of His Person and Work. These signs were three, first, the sound as of a rushing mighty wind; second, the cloven tongues like as of fire resting upon the disciples; and third, the gift of other tongues. We may say, then, that the first sign was the harbinger of His coming; the second indicated His arrival; and the third marked at

[When our Lord cried It is finished! He declared that His work of atonement was accomplished. But it was accomplished only as a provision for the salvation of men. The application of the benefit remained for the administration of the Spirit from heaven; whose sole and supreme office it is to carry into effect every design of the redemptive economy or undertaking. As the Spirit of the Christ had from the foundation of the world administered the evangelical preparations, so now He acts on behalf of the fully revealed Christ. Through Him our Lord continues His prophetic office: the Holy Ghost is the Inspirer of the new Scriptures and the Supreme Teacher in the new economy. Through Him the priestly office is in another sense perpetuated: the ministry of reconciliation is a ministration of the Spirit. And through Him the Lord administers His regal authority. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., II, p. 328 The Holy Spirit is called an Advocate because He transacts the cause of God and Christ with us, explains to us the nature and importance of the Great Atonement, shows the necessity of it, counsels us to receive it, instructs us how to lay hold on it, vindicates our claim to it, and makes intercessions in us with unutterable groanings. Our Lord makes intercession for us by negotiating and managing, as our Friend and Agent, all the affairs pertaining to our salvation. And the Spirit of God maketh intercession for the saints, not by supplication to God in their behalf, but by directing and qualifying their supplications in a proper manner, by His agency and influence upon their hearts; which according to the gospel scheme, is the peculiar work and office of the Holy Spirit. So that God, whose is the Spirit, knows what He means when He leads the saints to express themselves in words, desires, groans, sighs, or tears; in each God reads the language of the Holy Ghost, and prepares the answer according to the request. - Adam Clarke, Chr. Th., p. 174.] once the assumption of His office as Administrator, and the beginning of His operations The first inaugural sign was that of the rushing mighty wind which

filled all the house where they were sitting (Acts 2:2). While the account is brief, we may draw the following conclusions from the data at hand: (1) The sound came suddenly, not as winds ordinarily arise by increased intensity, but was at its height immediately. (2) The sound came from heaven, probably as thunder, heard not only by the disciples but throughout the city. The Revised Version reads as follows: When the sound was heard, the multitude came together (5:6), indicating that it was the sound that attracted them and not the reports of the disciples as is sometimes urged. This sign is indicative of the inner, mysterious, spiritual power of the Holy Spirit which was to characterize His administration in the Church and in the world. There is another rendering of this text which brings out added beauties of the Spirit of grace. It may be translated, the sound of a mighty wind, rushing along, conveying the thought of an intense eagerness on the part of the Spirit, to carry into effect the great salvation purchased by the blood of Christ The second inaugural sign was the appearance of cloven tongues like as of fire which sat upon each of them (Acts 2:3). From the use of the singular pronoun, it has been argued that the holy fire like a living flame hovered over the entire company, parting or cleaving into tongues which reached out to each of the waiting company. The generally accepted position, however, is that a cloven or forked tongue sat independently upon each of the disciples. These tongues "like as of fire" were glowing, lambent and quivering flames which gleamed like a corona above the heads of the spiritual Israel, recalling the signs at Mount Sinai, when the Lord descended in fire and the whole mount quaked greatly (Exodus 19:18). The significance of this symbol is to be found in the purifying, penetrating, energizing and transforming effect of the Spirit’s administration; while the cloven tongues signify the different gifts communicated by the one Spirit to the different members of the mystical body of Christ The third inaugural sign occupies a unique position in the events of the day. It must be regarded not only as a sign of the Spirit’s coming, but in some sense also, as the actual beginning of the Spirit’s operations. It is described as follows: And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:4). It is a significant fact that the words heterais glossais (etepaiV glssaiV) or "other tongues" appear only in this scripture which describes the phenomena of Pentecost. In the account of the gift of the Spirit to the Samaritans, ten years after Pentecost (Acts 10:46); and to the Ephesians, about twenty-three years after Pentecost (Acts 19:6, the word heterais (eteraiV) does not appear. In the Greek language, the word glotta (glwtta) or tongue, always stands in strong contrast with the word logos (logoV) or reason. Hence the contrast between the logos and the glotta, is the difference between that which a man thinks with the mind, and that which he utters with the vocal organs. Ordinarily of course, the glotta follows the logos; but at Pentecost the Holy Spirit by a miraculous operation enabled the disciples to declare the wondrous works of God in such a manner that the representatives of the nations heard them in their own languages. As the word logos (logoV) connotes the idea of reason or intelligence, so the word glotta (glwtta) connotes the idea of rational utterance or an intelligible language. It may and often does signify an ecstatic utterance, but never a mere jargon of sounds without

[The word glwssa or glwtta means "tongue" and is so translated in James 1:26; James 3:5-8. The word glwttai or "tongues" Is hence a language as in Acts 2:11 and 1 Corinthians 12:10; 1 Corinthians 12:28. "A man’s thinking," says Dr. Kuyper, "is the hidden, invisible, imperceptible process of the mind. Thought has a soul, but no body. But when the thought manifests itself and adopts a body, then there is a word. And the tongue being the movable organ of speech, it was said that the tongue gives a body to the thought. Hence in the Greek word, from which this word is

taken, the word glwttai means tongues, and hence language."

Hutchings points out that Protestantism accepted this interpretation, and hence in the Preface for Whitsun-Day, speaks of the Spirit as giving to the disciples "the gift of divers languages.] coherence or intelligibility. The Church has always maintained that the true interpretation of the phenomena of Pentecost is that the "other tongues" referred to the miraculous gift of ""divers languages." The Offices of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is both Gift and Giver. He is the Gift of the glorified Christ to the Church, and abides within it as a creating and energizing Presence. This center of Life and Light and Love is the Paraclete or the abiding Comforter. Following His inauguration at Pentecost, the Holy Spirit be-

[Dr. Kuyper maintains that since speech in man is the result of his thinking, and this thinking in a sinless state is an inshining of the Holy Spirit, speech, therefore, in a sinless state would Le the result of inspiration, the inbreathing of the Holy Spirit. But sin has broken the connection, and human speech is damaged by the weakening of the organs of speech, the separation of tribes and nations, by the passions the Holy Spirit upon the human mind, should have manifested itself, and the empirically existing languages which separate the nations. But the difference is not intended to remain. Sin will disappear. What sin destroyed will be restored. In the day of the Lord, at the wedding feast of the Lamb, all the redeemed will understand one another. In what way? By the restoration of a pure and original language upon the lips of the redeemed, which is born from the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the human mind. And of that great, still tarrying event, the Pentecost miracle is the germ and the beginning; hence it bore its distinctive marks. In the midst of the Babylon of the nations, on the day of Pentecost the one pure and mighty human language was revealed which one day all will speak, and all the brethren and sisters from all the nations and tongues will understand. And this was wrought by the Holy Spirit. They spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. They spoke a heavenly language to praise God, not of angels, but a language above the influence of sin. Hence the understanding of this language was also a work of the Holy Spirit. - Kuyper, Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, p. 137ff

Dr. Hutchings in his "Person and Work of the Holy Spirit" states that the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost was a gift of divers languages, and that the difficulty of believing the literal truth will not be great to those who hold that language from the first was the gift of God to man, and who further accept the history of the building of Babel and view the distinctions of language as connected with that event. Those who attempt to minimize the miraculous element in Holy Scripture, reduce the gift of tongues to a sort of ecstatic utterance, the deliverance of certain inarticulate sounds; or suppose that the miracle was in the hearers rather than in the speakers, which, if it were so, would only make it more wonderful. Extraordinary gifts accompanied the founding of the Church, and lingered on through the Apostolic age more or less, and perhaps afterward. As they were the distinct results of the Spirit’s presence and operation, they are still latent in the temple of the Spirit, only their exercise may be suspended. They have, however, their natural counterparts. The Apostle Paul enumerates nine such gifts of the Spirit (p. 114).] came the Executive of the Godhead on earth. While He abides perpetually in the Church, this does not imply that He is not still in eternal communion with the Father and the Son in heaven. As we have previously pointed out, arrival in one place does not with God necessitate the withdrawal from another. It does mean, however, that the Holy Spirit is now the Agent of both the Father and the Son, in whom they hold residence (John 14:23), and through whom men have access to God.

There is therefore a twofold intercession. As the Son is the Advocate at the right hand of the Father, so the Holy Spirit is the Advocate within the Church; and as the Son was incarnate in human flesh, so the Spirit of God becomes incarnate in the Church - but with this difference; in Christ the divine and human natures were immediately conjoined, while in the Church as the body of Christ, they are mediated through the Living Head. Christ is the "only begotten" Son of God; men are sons by the adoption of Jesus Christ to Himself (Ephesians 1:5-6) The Holy Spirit as the Giver, or Administrator of redemption, ministers in two distinct though related fields - that of the fruit of the Spirit, and that of the gifts of the Spirit. In his enumeration of the graces and gifts, St. Paul catalogs nine graces (Galatians 5:22-23), and nine gifts (1 Corinthians 12:8-10), the former referring to character, and the latter to personal endowments for specific vocations

[Dr. A. J. Gordon says that when Christ, our Paraclete with the Father, entered upon His ministry on high, it is said that He "sat down at the right hand of God." Henceforth heaven is His official seat until He returns in power and great glory. So also when He sent another Paraclete to abide with us for the age, He took His seat in the Church, the Temple of God, there to rule and administer tm the Lord returns. There is but one "Holy See" upon earth: that is, the seat of the Holy One in the Church, which only the Spirit of God can occupy without the most daring blasphemy - GORDON, The Ministry of the Spirit, pp. 130, 131

Dr. Abraham Kuyper mentions the presence of the Holy Spirit in three modes: (1) there is the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit in space, the same in heaven and in hell, among Israel and among the nations; (2) there is a spiritual operation of the Holy Spirit according to choice, which is not omnipresent: active in heaven but not in hell: among Israel, but not among the nations; and (3) this spiritual operation works either from without, imparting losable gifts, or from within, imparting the gift of salvation. - Kuyper, Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, pp. 119, 120.] The fruit of the Spirit is the communication to the individual of the graces flowing from the divine nature, and has its issue in character rather than in qualifications for service. It is the outflow of divine life which follows as a necessary consequence of the Spirit’s abiding presence. The apostle may have had in mind the parting parable of our Lord concerning the Vine and the branches. I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit... I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing (John 15:1-5). Here the Spirit is not mentioned, but is assumed as the life of the vine, giving character and quality to the fruit. That which obstructs the free flow of life affects the fruit; hence there must be a purging in order to an increased fruitage. This fruit is not named, but St. Paul catalogs nine graces - a trinity of trinities as follows: (1) in relation to God, love, joy and peace; (2) in relation to others, longsuffering, gentleness and goodness; and (3) in relation to ourselves, faithfulness, meekness and temperance (or self-control). These qualities the apostle sets in strong contrast with the works of the flesh (Galatians 5:19-23). Fruit grows by cultivation. It receives its life from the vine and takes its character from that life. Works are the result of effort and human striving; fruit is the consequence of the Spirit’s abiding. It is not of man’s producing, it grows by the life that is in the Vine The gifts of the Spirit are known in Scripture as charismata (capismata) or gifts of grace. Hence there is an internal connection between the graces and the gifts in the administration of the Spirit. The gifts are the divinely ordained means and powers with which Christ endows His Church in order to enable it to properly perform its task on earth. Paul

summarizes the teachings of the Scriptures concerning spiritual gifts as follows: Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but thesame Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the world of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will (1 Corinthians 12:4-11). There are two other scriptures from the same writer which refer to the gifts of the Spirit in a more official capacity. The first is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians and is concerned with the general order of the ministry. And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers (Ephesians 4:11). The second is concerned with the gifts which attach to the ordinary service of the Church. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given unto us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness (Romans 12:6-8) The gifts of the Spirit, then, are supernatural endowments for service, and are determined by the character of the ministry to be fulfilled. Without the proper functioning of these gifts, it is impossible for the Church to succeed in her spiritual mission. Hence the subject is of great importance, not only to theology, but to Christian experience and work. It will, however, be impossible to deal adequately with the subject here, and hence we can give only a brief summary of the more important truths concerning spiritual gifts. (1) The gifts of the Spirit must be distinguished from natural gifts or endowments, although there is admittedly, a close relation between them. While they transcend the gifts of nature, yet they function through them. Grace quickens the powers of the mind, purifies the affections, and enables the will to energize with new strength; and yet the gifts of the Spirit transcend even sanctified human powers. The strength of the Church is not in the sanctified hearts of its members, but in Him who dwells in the hearts of the sanctified. It is the indwelling Spirit who divides to every man severally as He will, and then pours His own energy through the organism which He has created. (2) There is a diversity of gifts in the Church. Not all members are similarly endowed. Hence in a series of rhetorical questions St. Paul asks, Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? (1 Corinthians 12:29-30). Nine such gifts are mentioned - wisdom, knowledge, faith, miracles, healing, prophecy, discernment of spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues (1 Corinthians 12:7-11). Doubtless the Spirit takes into account the ability of sanctified nature, and its capacity to receive and function spiritually, but the energizing power is not the natural spirit alone, it is the power that worketh in us (Ephesians 1:19). (3) The gifts of the Spirit take their character from the positions which the various individual members occupy in the mystical body of Christ. St. Paul compares the Church as a spiritual organism, to the natural human body with its many and varied members. As the functions of the several members of the body are determined by the nature of the organs - the eye for seeing and the ear for hearing, so it is in the body of Christ. The Spirit who

[Dr. Adam Clarke refers to the parallel drawn by Bishop Lightfoot between the offices and the gifts mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10; 1 Corinthians 12:28-30, these texts being arranged in three columns. Dr. Clarke then remarks that if the reader thinks this is the best way of explaining these

different offices and gifts, he will adopt it, and he will in that case consider, (1) That the word or doctrine of wisdom comes from the apostles. (2) The doctrine of knowledge, from the prophets. (3) Faith, by means of the teachers. (4) That working of miracles includes the gifts of healing. (5) That to prophesy, signifying preaching which it frequently does, has helps as the parallel. (6) That discernment of spirits, is the same with governments, which Dr. Lightfoot supposes to imply a deeply comprehensive, wise and. prudent mind. (7) As to the gift of tongues, there is no variation in either of the three places. (Adam Clarke on 1 Corinthians 12:31.)] creates the spiritual body, of necessity creates the members which compose that body, for the body is not one member, but many (1 Corinthians 12:14). God has set the members in the natural body as it has pleased Him (1 Corinthians 12:18); 50 also the Spirit divides to every man severally as He will in the spiritual body (1 Corinthians 12:11). The gifts of the Spirit, therefore, are those divine bestowments upon individual members which determine their functions in the body of Christ. Consequently the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, 1 have no need of you.... that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another (1 Corinthians 12:21-25). (4) The gifts of the Spirit are exercised in conjunction with, and not apart from, the body of Christ. The human body cannot function through maimed and lifeless members, nor can members separated from the body exist, much less perform their natural functions. So, also, God does not bestow extraordinary gifts upon men to be administered through mere human volition, and for self-glory and aggrandizement. The true gifts of the Spirit are exercised as functions of the one Body, and under the administration of the one

[Dr. George B. Stevens states that the gifts of the ministry here mentioned are to set forth the basis of unity, rather than as a description of the various offices in the Church. Prophecy or preaching - the gift of clear, luminous exposition of Christian truth under the influence of the Holy Spirit was the endowment which Paul most highly prized, and deemed most serviceable to the Church (1 Corinthians 14:1-5; 1 Corinthians 14:24-25). Other charismata are more incidentally alluded to, such as "the word of wisdom" and the "word of knowledge" (1 Corinthians 12:8) - terms which are not easily defined, but which doubtless refer to the enunciation and apprehension of those deep truths and mysteries, such as the sacrifice of Christ (1 Corinthians 1:22-24), that constitute the true Christian wisdom which may be taught to those of spiritual maturity (1 Corinthians 2:6), but which the worldly and carnal mind cannot receive (1 Corinthians 2:14). Paul mentions also, "helps," which most naturally refers to the duties of the diaconate, and "governments" which is best understood as the counterpart of "helps," and would therefore designate the functions of government which are exercised in the local church by the elders or bishops. - Stevens, Pauline Theology, pp. 326, 327

Quesnel observes that there are three sorts of gifts necessary to the forming of Christ’s mystical body. (1) Gifts of power, for the working of miracles, in reference to the Father. (2) Gifts of labor and ministry, for the exercise of government and other offices, with respect to the Son. (3) Gifts of knowledge for the instruction of the people, with reference to the Holy Ghost. (Adam Clarke, Com. 1 Corinthians 12:31.)]

Lord. (5) The gifts of the Spirit are essential to the spiritual progress of the Church. As physical ends can be accomplished only by physical means, or intellectual attainments by mental effort, so the spiritual mission of the Church can be carried forward only by spiritual means. From this it is evident that the gifts of the Spirit are always latent in the Church. They did not cease with the

apostles, but are available to the Church in every age In addition to the gifts and graces of the Spirit, there are certain other acts or functions of His administrative work which demand brief attention before taking up more directly His work as related to the individual, the Church and the world. These pertain especially to the work of salvation, and may be classified broadly under two general heads - the Holy Spirit as "the Lord and Giver of Life," and the Holy Spirit as "a sanctifying Presence." To the former belongs the ""birth of the Spirit" or the initial experience of salvation; to the latter, the "baptism with the Spirit" - a subsequent work by which the soul is made holy. This is known as entire sanctification, which as our creed states "is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service." (Article X.) Analyzing this state of holiness from the viewpoint of the Agent rather than the work wrought, we notice a threefold operation of the Spirit in the one experience of the believer: the baptism, which in its restricted sense refers to the act of purifying, or making holy; the anointing, or the indwelling Spirit in His office work of empowering for life and service; and the sealing, or the same indwelling Presence in His witness-bearing capacity. When, therefore, we speak of the birth, the baptism, the anointing and the sealing, as four administrative acts or functions of the Spirit, we are referring only to the two works of grace, but are considering the latter under a threefold aspect. We are to be understood as referring (1) to the birth of the Spirit as the bestowment of life in the initial experience of salvation - an experience which will be considered later under the head of regeneration and its concomitants, justification and adoption. We shall then consider the subsequent work of the Spirit as sanctifier, under the threefold aspect of (2) the baptism; (3) the anointing, and (4) the sealing - an experience which we shall treat later under the head of '"Christian Perfection" or "Entire Sanctification."

1. The Birth of the Spirit is the impartation of divine life to the soul. It is not merely a reconstruction or working over of the old life; it is the impartation to the soul, or the implantation within the soul, of the new life of the Spirit. It is therefore a "birth from above." As the natural birth is a transition from fotal life to a life fully individualized, so the Holy Spirit infuses life into souls dead in trespasses and sins, and thereby sets them up as distinct individuals in the spiritual realm. These individuals are children of God. To them is given the Spirit of adoption by which they are constituted heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ (Romans 8:15-17). The apostle defines specifically the nature of this inheritance. It is the blessing of Abraham, which God gave to him by promise, that is, the promise of the Spirit through faith (Galatians 3:14-18). While the child of God as an individual possesses life in Christ, there is in him also, the ""carnal mind" or inbred sin, and this prevents him from entering fully into his New Testament privileges in Christ. Jesus as the ""Lamb of God" came to take away ""the sin of the world." There must therefore be a purification from sin. Until then he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father (Galatians 4:1-2). He is an heir, but he has not yet entered into his inheritance. The time appointed of the Father, is the hour of submission to the baptism of Jesus - the baptism with the Holy Spirit which purifies the heart from all sin. With the cleansing of the heart from inbred

[While the baptism with the Spirit is usually considered as the act by which regenerated men are made holy, it is sometimes used also in the broader sense of the state of holiness flowing from that act. The former appears to be the more exact position.] sin, the son is inducted into the full

privileges of the New Covenant; through this baptism he enters into the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ (Romans 15:29)

2. The Baptism with the Spirit, as we have indicated, is the induction of newborn individuals into the full privileges of the New Covenant. This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin (Hebrews 10:16-18). Both the individual and social aspects of personality are involved. As by the natural birth each individual comes into possession of a nature common to others, and thereby becomes a member of a race of interrelated persons; so also the individual born of the Spirit has a new nature which demands a new spiritual organism as the ground of holy fellowship. The old racial nature cannot serve in this capacity, for it is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts (Ephesians 4:22). The new nature in Christ, created in righteousness and true holiness (Ephesians 4:24), can alone supply this spiritual nexus. Hence we are commanded to put off the old man and to put on the new man. The baptism with the Spirit,

[Now this baptism with the Holy Ghost is the blessing of Christ spoken of in the text. Someone may still ask, "Why is it called 'the blessing of Christ'?" Because it is; "why is it?" It is the crowning glory of the work of the soul's salvation. All that ever went before was preparatory for it. Did prophets speak and write; did sacrifices burn; were offerings made; did martyrs die; did Jesus lay aside His glory; did He teach and pray and stretch out His hands on the cross; did He rise from the dead and ascend into heaven; is He at the right hand of God? It was all preparatory to this baptism. Men are convinced of sin, born again and made new creatures that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost. This completes the soul's salvation. Jesus came to destroy sin - the work of the devil - the baptism with the Holy Ghost does that. Jesus sought for Himself fellowship, communion and unity with human souls, by this baptism He is enthroned and revealed in man. - Dr. P. F. Bresee, Sermon: The Blessing To us the clear teaching of the Bible is that a man quits sinning when he begins to repent; that God freely forgives the repentant sinner and that the child of God goes with Jesus without the camp bearing His reproach, and, putting his arms of faith about the will of God, believes God and the old man is crucified by the power of God - the inherited fountain of evil is taken away, and the new man Christ Jesus becomes the fountain of life. This brings an end to sin in the soul. - Dr. P. F. Bresee, Sermon: Death and Life.] therefore, must be considered under a twofold aspect; first, as a death to the carnal nature; and second, as the fullness of life in the Spirit. Since entire sanctification is effected by the baptism with the Spirit, it likewise has a twofold aspect - the cleansing from sin and full devotement to God

3. The Anointing with the Spirit is a further aspect of this second work of grace - that which regards it as a conferring of authority and power. It refers, therefore, not to the negative aspect of cleansing, but to the positive phase of the indwelling Spirit as "empowering the believers for life and service. Prophets, priests and kings were in the Old Testament dispensation, inducted into office by an anointing with specially prepared oil. This administrative act of the Spirit, therefore, bears an official as well as a personal relation to Christ. As previously indicated, purification from sin is in order to the full devotement of the soul to God. But this devotement is not merely human energy exercised toward God. It is the inwrought power of the Holy Spirit - the operation of the abiding Comforter who dwells within the holy heart. Hence we read, that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that

were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him (Acts 10:38). While it is recorded that Jesus was baptized with water by John, it is not stated that He was baptized with the Holy Spirit. This is significant. The reason is plain - baptism implies cleansing, and Jesus had no sin from which to be cleansed; neither could He in this sense be filled with the Spirit, for the Spirit already dwelt in Him without measure. But He was anointed with the Spirit at the time of His baptism by John, and thereby inducted into the office and work of the Messiah or Christ. As we become the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ, so also, because we are sons, God gives us the Holy Spirit as a sanctifying and empowering Presence. This Spirit, our Lord tells us, the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knowethhim (John 14:17). St. John further declares that this anointing abides in us as the personal Paraclete or Comforter, and consequently is ever present to confer authority, and to supply the needed power for the accomplishment of every divinely appointed task

4. The Sealing with the Spirit is a further aspect of this second work of grace. The seal to which St. Paul refers in his letter to Timothy, had two inscriptions - The Lord knoweth them that are his, or ownership; and let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," or holiness. The pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit, which under one aspect is the baptism which purifies the heart; and under another, the anointing which empowers for life and service, is under still another aspect, the seal of God’s ownership and approval. This approval is not only a claim upon the service of the sanctified as involved in ownership, but the seal of approval upon that service as rendered through the Holy Spirit. The seal is also the guaranty of full redemption in the future. Hence St. Paul says that after ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory (Ephesians 1:13-14). Here the Spirit is not only the promised Gift, but the gift of promise, which in connection with the earnest, is the guaranty of future perfection. The ""earnest" was a portion of the inheritance given in advance as a sample and guaranty of that which later was to be had in its perfection - for if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy (Romans 11:16). The earnest of the Spirit then, is given to us for our present enjoyment until the end of the age, and is the seal of assurance that the purchased possession will then be fully re-

[Dr. A. J. Gordon says that the inscription on the seal "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," is in Hebrew substantially the same as that upon the forehead of the high priest - "Holiness unto the Lord." - Gordon, The Ministry of the Spirit The seal is also said to refer to a custom of the Jewish priests, who when they examined the sacrifices offered for worship, stamped those which were acceptable. "But whatever the source of the figure," says Dr. Lowrey, "it represents one of the precious offices of the Holy Spirit. He himself comes into the heart and gives us grace - a pledge of glory, or rather, gives us a part of the glory as a pledge of the whole." - Lowrey, Possibilities of Grace, p. 363 deemed - all of which shall redound to the praise of His glory In this connection, also, it may be well to note the close relation which the work of the Spirit bears to that of Christ. These four administrative acts belong at once to Christ and the Spirit. It is Christ who quickens dead souls into life by the Spirit; it is Christ who baptizes men and women with the Holy Spirit; and it is Christ, also, who both anoints and seals His people with the Spirit The Holy Spirit and the Individual. As the Spirit formed the body of the incarnate Christ, and took up His abode in the new nature thus formed, so He thereby becomes the Intermediary between Christ and the human soul. There are therefore two sources of life in Christ - the fullness of the Spirit, and

the redeemed human nature through which the Spirit is mediated, and by means of which He unites Himself to the individual soul. This will appear more evident, if we take into consideration the fact that while Christ was free from sin

[Dr. Asbury Lowrey says that the anointing is "an inward, evidential, abiding light, which serves as a sure guide to the truth - a spiritual discernment of spiritual things. It does not discount the Word, nor set aside the ordinary means of edification, but it does detect and reject much that claims to be religious thought and instruction. It discriminates between the chaff and the wheat, the form and the power; between the charity that never faileth,' and the 'sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. It accompanies entire sanctification, and is one with it, and in a large measure inseparable from it; and yet there may be, so to speak, reapplications of the anointing oil. This anointing inducts into the office, and confers authority and power. It is the gift which invests a man with ministerial rights, and makes him effective. A man who has not by such anointing received the credentials of the Holy Ghost has no right in the ministry. The apostles were commanded to 'tarry at Jerusalem until they had received this enduement of power. With a perishing world around them they were held back until thus empowered from on high." - Lowrey, Possibilities of Grace, p. 370 The allusion to the seal as a pledge of purchase would be peculiarly intelligible to the Ephesians, for Ephesus was a maritime city, and an extensive trade in lumber was carried on there by the ship masters of the neighboring ports. The method of purchasing was this: The merchant, after selecting his timber, stamped with his own signet, which was an acknowledged sign of ownership. He often did not carry off his possession at the time; it was left in the harbor with other floats of timber; hut it was chosen, bought and stamped; and in due time the merchant sent a trusty agent with the signet, who finding that timber which bore a corresponding impress, claimed and brought it for the master's use. Thus the Holy Spirit impresses on the soul now, the image of Jesus Christ: and this is the sure pledge of the everlasting inheritance." - Bickersteth, The Spirit of Life, quoted in Gordon, The Ministry of the Spirit.] in both nature and act, yet this new Man appeared in the midst of a sinful race, and dwelt in the likeness of sinful flesh (Romans 8:3). He that had no sin, by His birth into a fallen race, thereby took upon Himself the penalty due its sin, and died without the camp that He might sanctify the people with His own blood (Hebrews 13:12; Cf. Titus 2:14). Only by death could He be freed from the old race into which He was born; and only by the resurrection from the dead could He establish a new, unique and spiritual people. He was therefore, the first begotten from the dead, uniting in Himself as did the first Adam, both the individual and the race

If now we refer briefly to the question of original sin already discussed, we may note that the sin of Adam not only brought penalty but entailed consequences, both for himself and for his posterity. Two effects followed the first transgression - a criminal act and a subjective change. When man consented to sin, God withdrew the fellowship of His presence through the Spirit. Deprived of life, only corruption and impurity remained. This fallen nature is continued in the posterity of Adam as "inbred sin or "inherited depravity," an element utterly foreign to the original character and life of man. Sin therefore exists in a twofold manner, as an act and as a state or condition back of that act; and while guilt does not attach to the latter, it is nevertheless of the nature of sin. In Adam depravity followed as a consequence of sin; in his posterity sin exists as a nature before it issues in sin as an act. As a state or quality which is the racial inheritance of every man born into the world, sin is the root or essence of all spiritual impurity and corruption. It is the primal cause of every transgression and the fountain of all unholy activities; but it must not be confused with these

activities, or with any one of them. It is the nature back of the act, the generic or racial idea of sin, to which St. John refers when he says, All unrighteousness is sin (1 John 5:17); and again, the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin (1 John 1:7). It is this to which John the Baptist referred when he cried out and said, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world (John 1:29). St. Paul uses the word in the same sense when he says, Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Romans 6:11); and he refers to the same elementary antagonism to holiness when he uses the terms "the body of sin," the "old man" or the "carnal mind."

We must hold firmly to the fact that in the teaching of Christ there is a moral condition antecedent to the act of sin. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit (Matthew 7:18). There is therefore not only human personality as a free and responsible agent, but there is a nature or character which attaches to this agent, which in thought at least is distinguishable from it - that is, the person may be either good or bad, may exist in the state of holiness or in the state of sin. If we may be permitted to use the technical terms applied usually only to the Trinity; we may say, that as in the Godhead, the Three Persons subsist in one Divine Nature; and as angels subsist in angelic nature; so also human beings are persons who subsist in human nature. Previous to the fall, man subsisted in holy human nature; since that time he subsists in a fallen and depraved human nature. As persons, each human being is by the very nature of personality forever separate and distinct from every other; as members of a common race each individual possesses a nature in common with every other individual, and this furnishes the common bond of racial union. What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God (1 Corinthians 2:11). It is evident, then, that Christ as the theanthropic Person furnishes the source of life for both the person and the race. Since in Him human nature was conjoined in vital union with the divine, this new life becomes in the administration of the Holy Spirit the principle of regeneration in respect to the person; and since Christ not only died for sin but unto sin, His shed blood becomes the principle of sanctification as it respects the sinful nature inherited from Adam. But this matter will be given fuller treatment in our consideration of the states of grace; here it must now be considered in relation to the Church as the body of Christ The Holy Spirit and the Church. Pentecost was the birthday of the Christian Church. As Israel redeemed from Egypt, was formed into a church - state by the giving of the law at Sinai; so also from individuals redeemed by Christ our Passover, the Holy Spirit formed the Church at Pentecost. This was accomplished by the giving of a new law, written upon the hearts and within the minds of the redeemed. As the natural body is possessed of a common life which binds the members together in a common organism; so the Holy Spirit sets the members in the spiritual body as it pleases Him, uniting them into a single organism under Christ its living Head. God did not create men as a string of isolated souls, but as an interrelated race of mutually dependent individuals; so also the purpose of Christ is not alone the salvation of the individual, but the building up of a spiritual organism of interrelated and redeemed persons. This new organism is not destructive of the natural relationships of life, but lifts them up and glorifies them. Hence the Church is a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; and the purpose of this organization is to shew forth the praises of him, who has called us out of darkness into His marvelous light (1 Peter 2:9-10)

[As the Intermediary between the Savior and the individual soul the Spirit has two classes of office: one more external and one more internal. And these functions He discharges in respect to two orders of men: Those not yet in Christ and those who are by faith united to Him. (1) His external function is that of bearing witness, or applying the truth to the mind: to the unconverted for the conviction of sin, the awakening of desire for Jesus and His salvation, and the revelation to penitence of the promises of grace; to the believer for the assurance of acceptance the unfolding of the knowledge of Christ, the application of the several promises of grace, and all that belongs to His personal instruction and guidance through the Word. (2) His internal function is the exercise of divine power on the heart, or within the soul: to the unconverted in infusing the grace of penitence and the power of faith, issuing in an effectual inward conversion; to the believer in renewing the soul by communicating a new spiritual life, and carrying on the entire work of sanctification to its utmost issues. - Pope, Comp. Chr. Th., II, p. 329.] The Holy Spirit is therefore not only the bond which unites the individual soul to Christ in a vital and holy relationship; but He is the common bond which unites the members of the body to each other, and all to their living Head. The spirit is the life of the body, and since His inauguration at Pentecost, has His ""See" or seat within the church. This may be made clearer by an illustration from Dr. Kuyper, who calls attention to the fact that in earlier times, when rain fell, each householder collected the water for himself in a cistern, in order to supply his own needs and those of his family. In a modern city each house is supplied with water from a common reservoir, by means of mains and laterals. Instead then of the water falling upon every man’s roof, it streams through an organized system into every man’s house. Previous to Pentecost the mild showers of the Holy Spirit descended upon Israel in drops of saving grace; but in such a manner that each gathered only for himself. This continued until the time of the Incarnation, when Christ gathered into His one Person the full stream of the Holy Spirit for us all. When, after His ascension, He had received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit; and when the channels of faith were completed and every obstacle removed, the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost came rushing through the connecting channels into the heart of every believer. Formerly there was isolation, every man for himself; now it is an organic union of all the members under their one Head. This is the difference between the days before and after Pentecost (Cf. Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit, pp. 123, 124) The Church in its corporate life is a kingdom of the incarnation as well as a kingdom of the spirit. We must remind ourselves here, that there was in the manhood of Christ, two mysteries, the union of human nature with the divine, and the unmeasured fullness of the Spirit which dwelt in that holy nature; the one administered through the other. When, therefore, the Spirit administers the pure human nature of Christ, He is said to make us members of His spiritual and mystic Body; when He ministers in His own proper Personality as the Third Person of the Trinity, He is said to dwell within the holy temple thus constructed. It may be readily seen, then, that the Church is not merely an independent creation of the Spirit, but an enlargement of the incarnate life of Christ. He is the head of the Church, whether militant, expectant or triumphant. The Church is complete, not through the presence of pure Godhead, but is complete in Christ (Colossians 2:10). Christ is the first begotten of the dead (Revelation 1:5; Romans 1:4; Colossians 1:15); and as such is "the seed" (Hebrews 2:16) from which the Church grows by expansion, through the operation of the Spirit. Christ is a new spring of pure human life. The first Adam was made a "living soul," the last Adam was made a "quickening spirit." Christ is the Lord from heaven (1 Corinthians 15:45-47). He is, therefore, by virtue of His resurrection, a new order of being, a holy humanity, free from every taint of sin and pollution. This new humanity

is the channel of the Spirit's descent; and the rent veil of Christ's flesh forms the new and living way into the presence of God (Hebrews 10:19-22). It is this holy humanity which becomes the spiritual nexus in the corporate life of the Church. The Spirit's illuminations flow through the mind and heart of Jesus, and therefore perpetuate the pure energies of His sacred manhood. He is the firstborn among many brethren The Holy Spirit and the World. The Spirit represents Christ to the world. But since the world does not know the Holy Spirit and cannot receive Him in the fullness of His dispensational truth, Christ is therefore limited in His operations to the preliminary stages of grace. The nature of this work is given to us by our Lord in His farewell address as follows: When he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged (John 16:8-11). The sin referred to here is the formal rejection of Jesus Christ as the Saviour; the righteousness is His finished work of atonement as the only ground of acceptance before a righteous God; while the judgment is the dethronement of Satan as the prince of this world, and hence the final separation of the righteous and wicked at the last day. If the prince be judged, then all of his followers must suffer condemnation. It is evident, therefore, that the Spirit must be regarded in this connection, as primarily the Spirit of truth, and His instrument the Word of God. The relation of the Church to the Spirit's efficiency through the Work, finds its highest expression in the great commission. Here the gospel is the proclamation of salvation, and leads directly to the vocation or call of the Spirit Emblems of the Holy Spirit

[As the names and titles applied to Christ are numerous and varied, so also the emblems used in the Scriptures to portray the office and work of the Holy Spirit are presented in great variety. These can be presented only in a brief manner, but further study will richly repay the efforts of the student

1. The dove is the symbol of the Spirit in both the Old and New Testaments. In Genesis 1:2 the Spirit is said to have "brooded" over the waters, bringing order and beauty out of chaos. There is an interesting parallel between the dove of Noah and the appearance like that of a dove at the baptism of Jesus. (a) The dove when first sent out returned because there was no resting place. So also in the Old Testament the Spirit found no place of rest in the hearts of men because of their sinfulness. (b) The second time the dove returned with an olive leaf "plucked off" - this word signifying in other instances, a violent death. Hence the Spirit gives hope to the world in the violent death of Christ on the cross. (c) At the baptism of Jesus the Spirit like a dove lighted upon Him (Matthew 3:16); or as given in John's account, the Spirit "abode" upon Him (John 1:32). In Jesus the Spirit found an abiding place, and was given to Him without measure. The dove is primarily the symbol of peace, and signifies the gentleness of the Spirit's operations (Matthew 10:16; Php 2:15). It is said that the dove has no gall, and consequently signifies the lack of bitterness. The dove was constant in love (Song of Solomon 5:12); swift and strong of wing (Psalms 55:6); and clean in its nature. Someone has written that under this emblem the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth to sanctify (John 14:17); the spirit of grace to beautify (Acts 6:5; Acts 6:8, R.V.); the Spirit of love to intensify (Colossians 1:6); the Spirit of life to fructify (1 Peter 1:11); the Spirit of holiness to purify (Acts 15:9); the Spirit of light to clarify (Ephesians 1:17); and the Spirit of prophecy to testify (Romans 1:4)

2. Water was used as an emblem of the Spirit by our Lord. He spoke of a well of water springing up into everlasting life (John 4:14). Here it is the sign of effectiveness and sufficiency (John

4:13-14). Jesus indicated the abundance of the spirit as "rivers of living water," living water being that which is ever connected with its source (John 7:38-39). Rain signifies the refreshing and reviving influences of the Spirit (Deuteronomy 32:2; Psalms 72:6; Hosea 6:3; Zechariah 10:1). The dew represents the mellowing and enriching influences of the Spirit (Isaiah 18:4; Hosea 14:5). The baptism with the Holy Spirit is peculiarly set forth by Ezekiel under the symbol of the "sprinkling of clean water" and the impartation of the Spirit (Ezekiel 36:25-27)

3. The fire was one of the emblems of Pentecost. John prophesied of Jesus, saying, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matthew 3:11). Doubtless the pillar of cloud and fire in the Old Testament was a prophetical symbol of Pentecost. This is a reference to an ancient custom of armies carrying lighted torches when crossing an enemy's territory at night. It served the double purpose of lighting the way and of striking terror to the enemies. On the Day of Pentecost tongues like as of fire sat upon each of the disciples, indicating that they were to go forth as an army of living flames. Fire signifies the purifying, penetrating and energizing influence of the Holy Spirit (Malachi 3:1-3; Matthew 3:11-12)

4. The atmosphere is likewise an emblem of the Holy Spirit. On the Day of Pentecost there was the sound as of a rushing mighty wind, which marked the coming of the Holy Spirit. God breathed life into the face of man at his creation (Genesis 2:7); and Jesus breathed upon the disciples and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). As the atmosphere is necessary to sustain life, so in the creeds the Holy Spirit is called "the Lord and Giver of Life." The atmosphere exerts a pressure of approximately fifteen pounds to the square inch, or about 32,000 pounds upon an ordinary man. So the Spirit is said to have fallen upon the disciples, the term indicating pressure (cf. Acts 8:16; Acts 10:44; cf. Mark 3:10). The balance of pressure within and without maintains a proper equilibrium. Without the inward pressure of the Spirit, the outward pressures of life would crush men; with the true inward strength of the Spirit, man needs outward tasks to challenge his efforts. The atmosphere Is the medium of communication, hence there is the communion of the Spirit. The atmosphere revives the earth by drawing up vast stores of water which it returns in refreshing showers

5. Oil is a symbol of the Spirit's official anointing for service. Prophets, priests and kings were inducted into office by a ceremony of anointing with oil. The formula of the anointing oil is given in Exodus 30:23-33, and is as follows: (1) The myrrh of the Spirit's excellence (2) the sweet cinnamon of the Spirit's grace; (3) the sweet calamus' of the Spirit's worth; (4) the cassia of the Spirit's righteousness; and (5) the olive oil of the Spirit's presence. Also there was the shekel of the Spirit's word - the exact measurements given for the compounding of the formula. The anointing oil could not be used for profane purposes, and it was a criminal act to counterfeit it. The oil could never be placed upon the flesh, only as that flesh had been previously touched with the blood of sacrifice. So also the oil of the Spirit's presence must follow the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ

There are many other emblems of the Spirit given in the Old Testament such as the flaming sword at the gate of Eden, the seal, the earnest or pledge and others of a like nature. A knowledge of the divinely given emblems in the Old Testament will give added meaning and value to many of the New Testament Scriptures.]

25. Chapter 26 - THE PRELIMINARY STATES OF GRACE

Chapter 26 - THE PRELIMINARY STATES OF GRACE The finished atonement of Jesus Christ becomes effective for the salvation of men, only when administered to believers by the Holy Spirit. The former is known in theological science as objective soteriology, the latter as subjective soteriology. The work of the Holy Spirit done in us, is as necessary to salvation, as the work of Christ done for us. But it would be truer to fact to say, that the redemption which Christ wrought for us in the flesh becomes effective only as He works in us through the Spirit. It is a mistake to view the work of the Holy Spirit as superseding that of Christ; it is to be viewed rather as a continuation of that work on a new and higher plane. The nature of this work is now to be considered, and consequently we turn our attention to what in theology is generally known as the benefits of the atonement. We shall consider these, first in their objective form as the words of the covenant, and second in their subjective aspect as the inner grace of the covenant. Our subjects then will be: (I) The VOCATION or CALL; and (II) PREVENIENT GRACE. Following this we shall consider (III) REPENTANCE, (IV) FAITH and (V) CONVERSION THE GOSPEL VOCATION The Holy Spirit as the Agent of Christ, makes known His divine purpose for the salvation of the world, through a Proclamation, commonly known in theology, as the Vocation or Call. The word comes from the Greek icX'qois, which means a vocation or calling; hence the word RTLXElY,to call, carries the thought backward to the Agency of that call; while the word KX~7TOV, the called, carries the thought forward to those who have accepted the invitation, and who are, therefore, the elect. In this sense, the Church is the ecclesia, or called out ones. The

Vocation or Call is further distinguished as the Indirect or universal call, and the Direct or immediate call—a distinction similar to that between General and Special Revelation. By the Universal Call, or Vocatio Catholica, is meant that secret influence exerted upon the consciences of men, apart from the revealed Word as found in the Holy Scriptures. We have already pointed out that in the earlier dispensation the Spirit strove with men (Genesis 6:3); and St. Paul later affirms, both that the law of God was written in the hearts of the Gentiles (Romans 1:19; Romans 2:15), and that God has never, in any age, left Himself without a witness (Acts 14:17). The Direct, or immediate call refers to that which is made through the Word of God revealed to mankind. "In the Old Testament it was limited to one race, first elected and then called; in the New Testament it is universally to all men, first called and then elected: a distinction of great importance" (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th. II, p. 338). The call of Abraham is the central point of vocation in the Old Testament (Cf. Amos 3:1-2, Hosea 11:1). However, God's choice of Abraham must be considered, both in relation to moral character, and in its prophetical connection with the universal call of the gospel. In the New Testament, especially after Pentecost, the gospel call is freed from the nationalism of the previous period, and consequently becomes the divine means of election for all people

Election and Predestination—Vocation or Calling is closely related to predestination. Predestination as we have seen, has an intimate connection with the doctrine~ of the atonement in regard to the extent of its benefits. The elect in either the Arminian or Calvinistic view of grace are

the called or chosen ones, but the two systems differ widely as to the manner of this élection. Those who hold to the former view regard it as dependent upon the personal acceptance of a universal call, and therefore conditional; the latter regard it as uncondiitional and dependent upon predestination, or the exercise of sovereign grace. ‘Predestination,” says Calvin, “we call the eternal decree of God, by which he has determined in Himself what He would have become of every individual of mankind, for they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or to death. . . . In conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of Scripture, we assert that, by an eternal and immutable counsel God has once for all determined both whom He would admit to salvation and whom He would condemn to destruction” (CALVIN,Institutes, III, Chap. 21). Dr. Dick says that “It is applicable according to the import of the term, to all the purposes of God which determine beforehand what is come to pass; but it is usually limited to those purposes to which the spiritual and eternal state of man is the object” (DIcK, Lecture

Dr. Wakefield analyzes the Westminster teaching on election as follows: (I) That the decrees of God are eternal, being called “his eternal purpose.” (2) That predestination is all-comprehensive as to its objects, embracing “whatsoever comes to pass in time.” (3) That “some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.” (4) That the decree both of election and reprobation is personal and definite, its objects being “particularly designed, and their number certain.” (5) That election to eternal life is unconditional, being “without any foresight of faith or good works, or any other thing in the creature.” (6) That Christ atoned for those only who were ordained to everlasting life, and (7) That faith and obedience are the fruits of election, while unbelief and sin result from reprobation —Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 389 The extent to which belief in reprobation was carried by earlier Calvinistic theologians may best be illustrated by a paragraph from the lectures of Dr. Hill. He says, “From the election of certain persons, it necessarily follows that all the rest of the race of Adam are left in guilt and misery. The exercise of the divine sovereignty in regard to those who are not elected is called reprobation; and the condition of all having been originally the same, reprobation is called absolute in the sense with election. In reprobation there are two acts which Calvinists are careful to distinguish. The one is called preterition, the passing by of those who are not elected, and withholding from them the means of grace which are provided for the elect, The other is called condemnation, the act of condemning those who have been passed by for the sins which they commit. In the former act God exercises His good pleasure, dispensing His benefits as He will; in the latter act He appears as a judge, inflicting upon men that sentence which their sins deserve, If He had bestowed upon them the same assistance which He prepared for others, they would have been preserved from that sentence; but as their sins proceeded from their own corruption, they are thereby rendered worthy of punishment, and the justice of the Supreme Ruler is manifested in condemning them, as His mercy is manifested in saving the elect.”—Hill, Lectures IV, 7. It was against such positions as these that the Remonstrants objected, and Arminian theologians since that time have lifted their voices in protest

XXV). Predestination, according to this view, includes two great branches of the divine purpose toward man— Election and Reprobation. Election in the Calvinistic sense is defined by Dr. Dick as that “choice which God, in the exercise of sovereign grace, made of certain individuals of mankind

to enjoy salvation by Jesus Christ." This necessarily involves the unctgndjjianaLteprobatien of all the rest. This is stated in the Westminster Confes~ibii ~ follows: "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." In opposition to this, Arminianism holds that predestination is the gracious purpose of God to save mankind from utter ruin. It is not an arbitrary, indiscriminate act of God intended to secure the salvation of so many and no more, It includes provisionally, all men~~•~ in~••~i~ scope, and is conditioned solely on faith in Jesus Christ For 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 3:16). Election differs from predestination i~i this~ that election implies a choice,. whereal predestination does not, In Ephesians 1:4-5; Ephesians 1:11-13 it is said that God hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love. This is election. The gracious plan by which this is to be accomplished is predestination, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will. Thus predestination is God's general and gracious plan of saving men, by adopting. them as children through Christ; election pertains to the! chosen ones who are holy and blameless before Him in! love, The proofs of election are not in the secret counsels of God, but in the visible fruits of holiness. Election is the foundation of the Church, and predestination the basis of providence. The Church is both predestinated and elected, the former referring to the plan of redemption as manifested in the universal call; the latter to the elect or chosen ones who have closed in with the offers of mercy. The elect are chosen, not by absolute decree,

Mr. Wesley published a pamphlet entitled, "Serious Considerations on Absolute Predestination" in which his views on this subject are stated as follows:

I. God delighteth not in the death of a sinner, but would that all should live and be saved, and hath given His Son, that all that believe on Him should be saved. He is the true light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world. And this light would work out the salvation of all, if not resisted

"2. But some assert, that God by an eternal and unchangeable decree, hath predestinated to eternal damnation the far greater part of mankind, and that absolutely, without any regard to their works, but only for the showing the glory of His justice; and that for the bringing this about, He hath appointed miserable souls necessarily to walk in their wicked ways, that so His justice may lay hold on them

"3. This doctrine is novel, In the first four hundred years after Christ, no mention is made of it by any writer, great or small, in any part of the Christian Church. The foundations of it were laid in the later writings of Augustine, when unguardedly writing against Pelagius. It was afterward taught by Dominicus, a popish friar, and the monks of his order, and at last, it was unhappily taken~up by John Calvin. This doctrine is, First, injurious to God, because it makes Him the author of all sin. Second, it is injurious to God, because it represents Him as delighting in the death of sinners, expressly contrary to His own declaration (Ezekiel 33:11; 1 Timothy 2:4). Third, this doctrine is highly injurious to Christ, our mediator, and to the efficacy and excellency of His gospel. It supposes His mediation to be necessarily of no effect with regard to the greater part of mankind.

Fourth, the preaching of the gospel is a mere mockery and delusion, if many of those to whom it is preached, are by an irrevocable decree, shut out from being benefited by it. Fifth, this doctrine makes the coming of Christ, and His sacrifice upon the cross, instead of being a fruit of God's love to the world, to be one of the severest acts of God's indignation against mankind: it being only ordained (according to this doctrine) to save a very few, and for the hardening and increasing the damnation of the far greater number of mankind: namely, all those who do not believe: and the cause of this unbelief, according to this doctrine, is the counsel and decree of God, Sixth, this doctrine is highly injurious to mankind; for it puts them in a far worse condition than the devils in hell. For these *ere some time in a capacity to have stood, They might have kept their happy estate, but would not. Whereas, according to this doctrine, many millions of men are tormented forever, who never were happy, never could he and never can be. Again, devils will not be punished for neglecting a great salvation: but human creatures will. In direct opposition to this, we affirm, that God hath willed all to be saved; and hath given His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him might be saved. There is hardly any other article of the Christian faith so frequently, plainly and positively asserted. It is that which makes the preaching of the gospel 'Glad tidings to all,' (Luke 10:2), otherwise, had this salvation been absolutely confined to a few, it had been 'Sad tidings of great sorrow to most people.' Read Colossians 1:28; 1 Timothy 2:1-6; Hebrews 2:9; John 3:17—12:47; 2 Peter 2:3; 2 Peter 2:9; Ezekiel 33:11; 1 John 2:1-2; Psalms 17:14; Isaiah 13:11; Matthew 18:7; John 7:7-8; John 7:26; John 12:19; John 14:17; John 15:18-19; John 18:20; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 1 Corinthians 2:12; 1 Corinthians 6:2; Galatians 6:14; James 1:27; 2 Peter 2:20; 1 John 2:15; 1 John 3:1; 1 John 4:4-5." but by acceptance of the conditions of the call. And as the character of the elect consists of holiness and blamelessness before Him in love, so election is by those means which make men righteous and holy. Hence our Lord says, I have chosen you out of the world (John 15:19). St. Paul explains it by saying, God hath from the be ginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (2 Thessalonians 2:13). St. Peter's teaching is to the same effect, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctif ication of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:2)

Arminian theology has generally treated the subject of election under a threefold aspect as follows: (1) Election of individuals to perform some particular service. Thus Moses was chosen to lead Israel out of Egypt and Aaron to be the priest of the sanctuary. Cyrus was elected to aid in rebuilding the temple, Christ chose the twelve as apostles, and St. Paul was chosen as the apostle of the Gentiles. These offices were ordained to assist others, and not to exclude them from saving grace

(2) Election of nations or other bodies of men to special religious privileges. Thus Israel was chosen as God's first representative of the visible Church on earth. It is this to which St. Paul refers in Ephesians 1:11-13. The words "who first trusted in Christ" refer to believing Israel; while the words in the following verse "In whom ye also trusted" refer to the extension of the Jewish privileges to the Gentiles. The calling and election of

Nothing is more grievous in the predestination theory than the way in which it shadows the love of God. Between love as a nature or disposition, and an arbitrary choice of its beneficiaries, there is an irreconcilable antithesis. To assign to love its direction by fiat is to displace the very notion of love, and to put caprice in its stead. Suppose a father standing upon the deck of a ship should see

his children struggling in the sea, in imminent peril of drowning. In the worth or worthiness of the children there is no ground of discrimination. The father has ample means to save all, for aplenty of life-preservers is immediately at hand. But instead of saving all he casts means of rescue to only two out of four, thus leaving half of his children to sink into the depths. Who would ascribe parental love to such a father? His unnatural conduct denies the very conception, and leaves in view only mad caprice and appalling eccentricity, It is not the nature of holy love to be subject to arbitrariness any more than it is the nature of sunlight to fill only selected portions of an open expanse.—Sheldon, Syst. Chr. Doct., pp. 43 2-43 3 the Christian Church, therefore, was not the choice of another nation to succeed the Jews, but the election of believers in all nations, wherever the gospel should be preached. Thus the Christian Church rises above the narrow limits of nationalism and extends the call to all nations and tongues and people. (3) The election of particular individuals to be the children of God and hiiioflWnal life, which Arminianism always regards as conditional upon faith in Christ, and as including all who believe. Thus we are brought to the consideration of election as a factor in the beginnings of salvation The Beginnings of Salvation. The first step toward salvation in the experience of the soul, begins with vocation or the gracious call of God which is both direct through the Spirit and immediate through the Word, This is followed by awakening and conviction. Conversion, in the narrower sense of the term, is sometimes used in this connection also The vocation or call is God's offer of salvation to all men through Christ. This is the gracious beginning of salvation. The call is universal and includes three things

—the proclamation, the conditions upon which the offer of salvation is made, and the command to submit to the authority of Christ. Thus St. Peter in speaking of the crucifixion and exaltation of Christ says, We are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him (Acts 5:32;cf, 13: 38-40). Here we have the testimony, the terms or conditions of salvation, and the command to submission. The Agent of the call is the Holy Spirit, and the Word is the instrument of His operations. The Word, however, is not limited to the letter but includes the Spirit of Truth as well. While the scriptures are God's authoritative revelation, and the instrumentality which the Spirit ordinarily uses, these themselves seem to indicate that there is a substantial truth of which the Word itself is but the vehicle. This is indicated in St. Paul's reference to the prophecy of Isaiah. He says, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me (Isaiah 65:1). This seems to indicate that God's Word is in some sense universally uttered, even when not recorded in a written language

Awakening is a term used in theology to denote that operation of the Holy Spirit by which men's minds are quickened to a consciousness of their lost estate. In this quickening, the Spirit not only works through the medium of objective truth, but by a direct influence upon the minds and hearts of men. There are two errors which should be mentioned in this connection. The first denies the personality of the Holy Spirit, and maintains that the truth is effective in and of itself. This reduces the power of the Word to the mere influence of the letter. The second does not deny the personality of the Holy Spirit, but holds that since Pentecost, His operation is limited to a mediate and indirect influence through the Word. In this sense, the influence of a holy life goes on after the death of a saint. Thus Wesley and Fletcher, Luther and Melanchthon are still exerting an influence

through their writings, although they have long since departed this life. The failure here, is to distinguish between a medium as instrumental and passive on the one hand, or as efficient and active on the other, An officer may use his own sword to destroy an enemy, or he may order a company of soldiers into battle. In the first instance, the officer is the sole agent and his sword the passive instrument; in the second, he is only The impulse to turn toward communion with God depends on the impact of divine agency upon the human spirit. This initial agency may be described by the term awakening, which thus denotes a pressure from the divine side which is unsought by men, but whose intent they can either follow or resist. Awakening is not so much regeneration as a preparation for the same, It is true that some theologians, especially of the strict Calvinistic school, have preferred to understand by regeneration the primary act of God in man's spiritual recovery, in which almighty power operates upon a purely passive subject, and creates therein a new spiritual sensibility. But this view, as will be shown a little farther on, is not in harmony with the scriptural representation, which assumes a conditioning agency in man, or a consenting rather than a purely passive subject of regeneration. The office of awakening is to produce the sense of need and the measure of aspiration and desire which are requisite to make one a willing subject in the consummation of his spiritual sonship.—Sheldon, Syst. Chr. Doct, pp. 453, 454 indirectly the agent. So, also, the apostle speaks of the Word as the sword of the Spirit, in which sense the Spirit is the sole Agent of operation, and the Word His instrument. Those, therefore, who hold that the influence of the Spirit is limited solely to the mediate power)f the Word, thereby reject His direct spiritual influence 'ipon the hearts of men. There is a third theory which we believe expresses the true scriptural doctrine. This admits the indirect influence of the Spirit through the Word, but maintains that in addition to this, there is an mmediate or direct influence upon the hearts of men iot only accompanying the Word, but also the prowdences and the various means of grace In support of this, we may refer to the following Scriptures: The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord: as the rivers of water; he turneth it whithersoever he will (Proverbs 21:1); Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law (Psalms 119:18); Create in me a clean heart, 0 God; and renew a right spirit within me (Psalms 51:10). In the New Testament we find the following scriptures: Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures (Luke 24:45); and again, Whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul (Acts 16:14). In these texts it is distinctly declared that the understanding and the heart were opened by the Lord and not by the Scriptures. Here then we have a direct influence exerted, first, in awakening to a knowledge of the truth; and second, in attendance upon the things which were spoken

Conviction is That operation of the Spirit which produces within men, a sense of guilt and condemnation because of sin. To the idea of awakening, there is added that of personal blame. Conviction is specifically stated to be one of the offices of the Spirit during the pentecostal dispensation. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment (John 16:8). The threefold conviction mentioned here has been previously discussed in connection with the offices of the Holy Spirit. There are, however, two things which need additional emphasis. (1) The word "convict" as here used, indicates a moral demonstration, and not merely a convincing of the intellect. It involves personal relations with Christ, and hence applies to the conscience as well as the reason. (2) This conviction is one of hope and not of despair. The Spirit not only reveals the sinfulness of human hearts, but the fullness and freeness of salvation through Christ. His purpose is not only to turn men from sin, but to lead them to a living faith in Christ. The

conviction of the Spirit, therefore, is one of hope for all who truly repent of their sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ

Effectual Calling and Contingency. Those who hear the proclamation and accept the call are known in the Scriptures as the elect. St. Paul speaks of the called of Jesus Christ (Romans 1:6); and St. Peter states that the nature of election is according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:2). In the Old Testament the call was chiefly that of a nation or a people to some specific mission. The call of the individual was subordinate, although we must believe that even then, the matter of character was important. In the New Testament the gospel call is mainly to the individual, the national or racial being subordinate. The gospel is committed to the Church as a whole, but especially to the ministry set apart for its proclamation. The word evanggelion (hiavyyiXtov) signifies a joyful announcement of Good Tidings, and the word evanggelizein (~vavyy€Xt~av) has reference to the preaching of those good tidings. In this sense the gospel has come to indicate the central idea of the Redeemer's mission and work Of a Vocatio Interna, as distinguished from the Vocatio Externa, there is no trace in Scripture: internal calling and effectual calling are phrases never used. The distinction implies such a difference as would have been clearly stated if it existed; and all that is meant by the internal call finds its expression, as we shall see, in other offices of the Holy Spirit of enlightenment, conviction and conversion. Each of these terms carries the meaning of an external summons made effectual by interior grace; but never in the sense that sufficient interior grace is denied to any. It may be said that the true internal vocation is election in the strict sense. Pope, Compend. Chr. Th. II, p. 345

Effectual calling, as the, term is used in Calvinistic theology, denotes an interior grace or compelling power, by which the mind is led to accept the mvitation of the gospel, and yield to the solicitations of the Spirit. A sharp distinction is usually made between the external call which is regarded as universal, and "effectual calling" which pertains only to the elect. Since the elect, in this use of the term indicates only those who by the decree of God are predestinated to salvation, efficacious grace is given only to them, and withheld from those who are not thus predestinated. This is one of the pivotal points in the controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism. We are not to believe that God gives a universal call to all men, and then secretly withholds the power to believe or accept the call from all those He has not especially chosen to salvation. The divine intention is that all men shall avail themselves of their blood bought privileges in Christ Jesus. The call is not fictitious but genuine. It is not only an external offer of salvation, but is accompanied by the internal grace of the Spirit sufficient for its acceptance The element of contingency also enters into the question of vocation or calling. The call may be resisted; and even after having been accepted, obedience may be f orfeited. Of such, the term reprobation is used, but never in the sense of a fiat or arbitrary decree. The reprobate, adokimoi (dS&cq.tot) are those who do not retain the knowledge of God, or who finally resist the truth. Know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? (2 Corinthians 13:5). The word has reference primarily, to failure under test. Since many of the vital problems connected with this subject will appear also in our discussion of "Prevenient Grace," they may be properly reserved for later consideration PREVENIENT GRACE

Before taking up the discussion of prevenient grace, it may be well to call attention to the fact that the grace of God is in itself infinite, and therefore cannot be limited to His redemptive work,

unspeakably great as this may be. (1) Grace is an eternal fact in the inner relations of the Trinity. (2) It existed in the form of sacrificial love before the foundation of the world. (3) Itextended order and beauty to the process and product of creation. (4) It devised the plan for the restoration of sinful man. (5) It is manifested specifically through revealed religion as the content of Christian theology; and, (6) it will find its consummation in the regeneration of all things, of which our Lord testified. The absolute holiness of the Creator determines the nature of divine grace. Its laws ever operate under this standard. Once grasp and hold this conception of the infinity of divine grace, and the regal and judicial acts of God in justification and adoption can never be questioned

Prevenient grace, as the term implies, is that grace which “goes before” or prepares the soul for entrance into the initial state of salvation. It is the preparatory

Augustine and the theologians of his period distinguished five kinds of grace, as follows: (1) Prevenient grace which removed natural incapacity and invited to repentance; (2) Preparing grace which restrained natural resistance and disposed the will to accept salvation by faith; (3) Operating grace which conferred the power of believing and kindled justifying faith; (4) Co-operating grace which followed justification, and served to promote sanctification and good works; and (5) Conserving grace, by which faith and holiness were conserved and confirmed At a later period in the history of Christian thought, the thelogians regarded faith as constituting a fourfold office as follows: (1) Elenchtical, or the ‘awakening to a knowledge of sin; (2) Didactic, or instruction in the way of salvation; (3) Pedagogical, or the conversion of the sinner; and (4) Paracletic, or the consoling and strengthening of the converted The Holy Ghost is here the Author of preliminary grace; that is, of the kind of preparatory influence which is imparted outside of the temple of Christ’s mystical body, or rather in the outer court of that temple. When He bestows the full blessings of personal salvation, as they are the result of a union with Christ, He is simply and solely the Administrator and Giver: the object of this grace in the nature of things can only receive. Forgiveness, adoption, sanctification are necessarily divine acts: nothing can be more absolute than the prerogative of God in conferring these blessings. This does not imply that the influences which prepare the soul for these acts of perfect grace are not from a divine Source alone. It must be remembered that it is “the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ” flowing from and revealing the “love of God” that is dispensed even to the outer world in the communion of the Holy Ghost. But it must also be remembered that this prevenient influence is literally bound up with the human use of it being without meaning apart from that use; and, moreover, that of itself it is not saving, though it is unto salvation. The present department of theology is beset with peculiar difficulties, and has been the arena of some of the keenest controversies.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th. II, pp. 358, 359 grace of the Holy Spirit exercised toward man helpless in sin. As it respects the guilty, it may be considered mercy; as it respects the impotent, it is enabling power. It may be defined, therefore, as that manifestation of the divine influence which precedes the full regenerate life. The subject is beset with peculiar difficulties and should be given careful study. We shall consider, (1) the Historical Approach to the Subject, and (2) the Nature of Prevenient Grace. following this we shall analyze the subject more carefully by considering (3) Prevenient Grace and Human Agency- The Historical Approach to the Subject. The idea of grace or charis (~ctpcc) is fundamental in both the Old and the New Testaments. In the Old Testament it is found in such texts as My spirit shall not always strive with man (Genesis 6:3), and Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts (Zechariah 4:6). In the New Testament, the texts are numerous. Our Lord said, No

man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him (John 6:44), and again, Without me ye can do nothing (John 15:5). St. Paul uses the term frequently. For when we were yet without strength j~a,-Ocv&v, helpless], in due time Christ died for the ungodly that no part is free from sin and, therefore, whatever proceeds from him is accounted sin." The true Arminian as fully as the Calvinist, admits the depravity of human nature, and thereby magnifies the grace of God in salvation. He is in fact able to carry through his system of grace with greater consistency than the Calvinist himself. For while the latter is obliged, in order to account for certain good dispositions and occasional religious inclinations in those who never give evidence of actual conversion, to refer them to nature or "common grace," the former refers them to grace alone The state of nature is in some sense a state of grace, according to Arminian theology. Thus Mr. Wesley says, "Allowing that all the souls of men are dead in sin by nature, this excuses none, seeing there is no man that is in a mere state of nature; there is no man, unless he has quenched the Spirit, that is wholly devoid of the grace of God. No man living is entirely destitute of what is vulgarly called natural conscience. But this is not natural: it is more properly termed preventing grace. Every man has a greater or less measure of this, which waiteth not for the call of man" (WESLEY, Sermon: Working Out Our Own Salvation)

Arminianism holds to a belief in the continuity of grace. This is another point to which Mr. Wesley attaches peculiar emphasis. In his sermon on the ScripArminianism holds "that there is a state of nature, as distinguished from the state of grace and the state of glory, that state of nature, how. ever, being itself a state of grace, preliminary grace, which is diffused throughout the world, and visits all the children of men: not merely the remains of good untouched by the fall, but the remains as the effect and gift of redemption. The special grace of enlightenment and conversion, repentance and faith, it holds to be prevenient only, as resting short of regeneration; but as flowing into the regenerate life. It therefore asserts, in a certain sense, the principle of a continuity of grace in the case of those who are saved. But in its doctrine all grace is not the same grace in its issues, though all is the same in its divine purpose. It distinguishes measures and degrees of the Spirit's influence, from the most universal and common benefit of the atonement in life and its advantages up to the consummation of the energy of the Holy Ghost which fits for the vision of God. It rejects the figment of a common grace not x4'~ oiur4ptos; and refuses to believe that any influence of the Divine Spirit procured by the atonement is imparted without reference to final salvation. The doctrine of a continuity of grace, flowing in some cases uninterruptedly from the grace of Christian birth, sealed in baptism, up to the fullness of sanctification, is alone consistent with Scripture."—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th. 11, p. 390 ture Way of Salvation, he says, "The salvation which is here spoken of might be intended to be the entire work of God, from the first dawning of grace in the soul till it is consummated in glory. If we take this in its utmost extent it will include all that is wrought in the soul by what is frequently termed natural conscience, but, more properly, prevenient grace; all the drawings of the Father; the desires after God, which if we yield to them, increase more and more; all that is light, wherewith the Son of God 'enlighteneth everyone that cometh into the world'; all the convictions which His Spirit, from time to time, works in every child of man; although it is true the generality of men stifle them as soon as possible, and after a while forget or at least deny, that they ever had them at all,"

Synergism, or the co-operation of divine grace and the human will, is another basic truth of the Arminian system. The Scriptures represent the Spirit as working through and with man's

concurrence. Divine grace, however, is always given the pre-eminence, and this for two reasons: (1) The capacity for religion lies deep in the nature and constitution of man. The so-called “natural. conscience” is due to the universal influence othe Spirit. It is preliminary grace in the very roots of man’s nature, to which he may yield, or which he may resist. The fact that man since the fall is a free moral-agent, is as much the effect of grace as it is a necessity of his moral nature. (2) The influence of the Spirit connected with the Word is irresistible as claiming the attention of the natural man, He may resist it, but he cannot escape it. This grace moves upon the will through the affections of hope and fear, and touching the deepest recesses of his nature, disposes him to yield to the appeals of the Word, whether presented directly or indirectly. But this divine grace always works within man in a manner that does not interfere with the freedom of his will. “The man determines himself,” says Pope, “through divine grace to salvation; never so free as when swayed by grace.”

Finally, Arminianism holds that salvation is all of grace, in that every movement of the soul toward God is initiated by divine grace; but it recognizes also in a true sense, the co-operation of the human will, because in the last stage, it remains with the free agent, as to whether the grace thus proffered is accepted or rejected

Prevenient Grace and Human Agency. The relation of free grace to personal agency demands a further analysis. This relation may be briefly summed up in the following propositions: (1) Prevenient grace is exercised upon the natural man, or man in his condition subsequent to the fall, This grace is exercised upon his entire being, and not upon any particular element or power of his being. Pelagianism regards grace as acting solely upon the understanding, while Augustinianism falls into. the opposite error of supposing that grace determines the will through effectual calling. Arminianism holds to a truer psychology. It insists that grace does not operate merely upon the intellect, the feelings or the will, but upon the person or central being which is beneath and behind all affections and attributes. It thus preserves a belief in the unity of personality. (2) Prevenient grace has to do with man as a free and responsible_agent. The fall did not efface the natural image of God in man, nor destroy any of the powers of his being. It did not destroy the power of thought which belongs to the intellect, nor the power of affection which pertains to the feelings. So, also, it did not destroy the power of volition which belongs to the will. (3) Prevenient grace has to do further, with the person as enslaved by sin. Not only is the natural heart depraved, God does not compel man by a mechanical force, but draws him on and moves him by the moral power of His love. Nowhere does either Scripture or the Church teach that the sinner is entirely passive at the commencement of his repentance. The voice which cries awake! comes not to corpses, but to the spiritually dead, in whom a capacity for life remained, a receptivity, even where we cannot think of any spontaneity without the influence of the preparing grace of God. The grace of God leads the sinner to faith, but always in such wise, that the latter’s believing surrender to Christ is his own personal act.—Von Oosterzee, Chr. Dogm. II, p. 682

Never does man appear to be more powerfully determined by God, than in the summons to grace, and yet it is that very summons which calls his freedom from its latent form into actual existence. .—Lange but added to this is the acquired depravity which attaches to actual transgression. This slavery is not absolute, for the soul is conscious of its bondage and rebels against it. There is, however, a sinful bias, commonly known as a “bent to sinning” which determines the conduct by influencing the will. Thus grace is needed, not to restore to the will its power of volition, nor thought

and feeling to the intellect and sensibility, for these were never lost; but to awaken the soul to the truth upon which religion rests, and to move upon the affections by enlisting the heart upon the side of truth. (4) The continuous co-operation of the human will with the originating grace of the Spirit, merges prevenient grace directly into saving grace without the necessity of any arbitrary distinction between “common grace” and “efficacious grace” as is done in the Calvinistic system. Because of their insistence upon the co-operation of the human will, Arminian theologians have been charged with being Pelagian, and of insisting upon human merit rather than divine grace in salvation. But they have always held that grace is, pre-eminent, and that the power by which man accepts God’s proffered grace is from God (Banks); and “the power by which man co-operates with grace is itself grace” (Pope). In opposition to Augustinianism which holds that man has no power to co-operate with God until after regeneration, Arminianism maintains that through the prevenient grace of the Spirit, unconditionally bestowed upon all men, the power and responsibility of free agency exist from the first dawn of the moral life

REPENTANCE The doctrine of repentance is fundamental in the Christian system, and should be carefully studied in the light of God’s Word. Christ said of himself, I am not

Calvinism with its belief in predestination finds it necessary to make a distinction in kinds of grace and thereby breaks the continuity of the Spirit’s manifestations. It holds that the good in man before conversion is due to “common grace,” but holds also that this can never become saving grace. Common grace belongs to all, efficacious grace only to the elect. “Such a distinction,” says Dr. Banks, “can never be reconciled with Scripture, with divine justice or with human responsibility” (Banks, Manual Chr, Doct, p. 228) come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance (Matthew 9:13). Both John the Baptist and Jesus preached repentance as a basic condition of entrance into the kingdom of God (Matthew 3:2; Matthew 3:8; Matthew 4:17). God seeks to lead men to repentance, both by His admonitions (Romans 2:4; 2 Timothy 2:25; Revelation 2:5; Revelation 2:16), and by His judgments (Revelation 9:20-21; Revelation 16:9). As the conditions of salvation, however, repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ are always conjoined. Both proceed from prevenient grace, but they differ in this, that the faith which saves is the instrument as well as the condition of salvation, and as such, must of necessity flow from grace and follow repentance. For this reason it is frequently stated that faith is the sole condition of salvation, and repentance the condition of faith. Thus Mr. Wesley says that “Repentance and its fruits are only remotely necessary; necessary in order to faith; whereas faith is immediately and directly necessary to justification. It remains that faith is the only condition which is immediately and proximately necessary to justification” (WESLEY,Sermon xliii). Both are properly introductory to the state of salvation, but Saving faith is alone the point of transition where conviction passes into salvation The Greek word metanoia (/.tErdvota) which in English is rendered repentance, properly “denotes the soul recollecting its own actions, and that in such a manner as to produce sorrow in the review, and a desire of amendment. It is strictly a change of mind, and includes the whole of that alteration with respect to views, disposition and conduct which is effected by the power of the gospel.” The word metameleia (ji€rajx€’Xaa) is also translated repent, as in Matthew 27:3; 2 Corinthians 7:8; Hebrews 7:21. The distinction between the two verb forms ,icra~JXop.at and p~€ravo~w is this, the former refers more properly to contrition, and signifies a sorrowful change of mind; while the latter carries with it the idea of a sorrow that leads to the forsaking and turning away from sin. Macknight says that “the word metanoia, properly denotes such a change of one’s

opinion concerning some action which he hath done, as produceth a change in his conduct to the better. But the word metameleia, signifies the grief which one feels for what he hath done, though it is followed with no alteration of conduct." In the Vulgate, the word metanoia is rendered "doing penance." When Luther discovered that repentance meant a change of mind instead of "doing penance," it changed his whole outlook upon religion, and was one of the chief factors in ushering in the Reformation

Definitions of Repentance. Among the many definitions of repentance, we may note the following: Mr. Wesley says, "By repentance I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment" According to Mr Watson, "Evangelical repentance is a godly sorrow wrought in the heart of a sinful person by the Word and the Spirit of God, whereby from a séñse of his sin, as offensive to God, and defiling and endangering his own soul, and from an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, he with grief and hatred of all his known sins, turns then to God as his Savior and Lord." "Repentance," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "implies that a measure of divine wisdom is communicated to the sinner, and that he thereby becomes wise to salvation; that his mind purposes opinions, and inclinations, are changed; and that, in consequence, there is a total change in his conduct." Dr. Pope gives us the following statement: "Repentance is a divinely wrought conviction of sin, the result of the Holy Spirit's application of the condemning law to the conscience or heart. It approves itself in contrition, which distinguishes it from mere knowledge of sin; in submission to the judicial sentence, which is the essence of true confession; and in sincere effort to amend, which desires to make reparation to the dishonored law. Hence it must needs come from God and go back to Him: the Holy Spirit, using Dr. Nevin says that "Real repentance consists in the heart's being broken for sin and from sin." Mason, "Repentance begins in the humiliation of the heart and ends in the reformation of the life." Dr. Field says that the two words translated "repent" and the two corresponding nouns derived from them, signify "after-concern" and "after.thought." "After-concern" on account of something that has been amiss; and "afterthought" signifying such a change or alteration of mind as implies a return to right views, right feelings and right conduct." the law, being the Agent in producing this preliminary divine change." These definitions sufficiently set forth the true nature of repentance The Divins and Human Elements, in Repentance. A study of the definitions just given, makes it clear that there are two factors involved in genuine repentance— the divine and the human To suppose that repentance is a purely human act, accomplished by the unassisted exercise of the sinner's own powers, is to presume upon God; while to look upon it as the work of God alone, is to sink in carelessness or despair. A correct understanding of this subject is necessary in order to preserve one from either extreme. God is said to be the author of repentance. But He does not repent for us, He gives or grants repentance (Acts 4:31; Acts 11:18) in the sense of making repentance possible. Thus as our creed expresses it, "The Spirit of God gives to all who will repent the gracious help of penitence of heart and hope of mercy, that they may believe unto pardon and spiritual life" (Article VIII). Several controversial points need attention here

1. Repentance presupposes the sinful condition of mankind It presupposes, also, both the total depravity Df man in his natural state, and the necessity of prevenient. grace. Mr. Wesley and Mr. Watson emphasized both of these elements, never allowing themselves to slip over into the Calvinistic idea of irresistible grace on the one hand, or Pelagian moralism on the other. Allowing for the depravity of mankind, Mr. Watson declares that the "gift" comes upon all in preventing

grace

—“the influences of the Holy Spirit removing so much of their spiritual death as to excite in them various degrees of religious feeling, and enabling them to seek the face of God, to turn at His rebuke, and by improving that grace, to repent and believe the gospel.”

We believe that repentance, which is a sincere and thorough change of mind in regard to sin, involving a sense of personal guilt and a voluntary turning away from sin, is demanded of all who by act or purpose become sinners against God. The Spirit of God gives to all who will repent the gracious help of penitence of heart and hope of mercy, that they may believe unto pardon and spiritual life.—Manunl, Article VIII

2. Repentance is the result of the gracious work of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of men. The goodness of God leads to repentance (Romans 2:4) - The means by which it is effected is the divinely wrought application of the holy law. The first effect of the Spirit’s work is contrition, or godly sorrow for sin. In the Old Testament, this condition was known as “a broken and contrite heart” (Psalms 51:17), the heart being the inmost personality and not merely the affections, the intellect or the will. Thus true repentance is not a sorrow for sin apart from forsaking it, which St. Paul terms “the sorrow of the world” (2 Corinthians 7:10); nor is it a reform apart from godly sorrow which worketh repentance to salvation. Furthermore, contrition is a conviction of sin as universal, and not merely of particular sins, although the latter may be, and generally. are the focal points of the Spirit’s convicting work. In its truest and deepest sense, however, contrition is a new moral consciousness of sin, in which the sinner identifies himself with God’s attitude toward sin, and thinks God’s thoughts about it. He hates sin, and from the center of his being, repudiates and abhors it. Herein lies the ethical significance of true repentance. The second effect of the Spirit’s work takes the form of confession. This in essence, is personal submission to the law as applied by the Spirit,, and must be viewed under two aspects, (1) as condemnation, in which the sinner accepts the judgment as just; and (2) as impotence, or a conviction of his utter helplessness before the law. When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died (Romans 7:9). True repentance therefore, “absolutely withers all hope in self as to present or future ability.”

3. Repentance is finally, an act of the sinner himself in response to the conviction and appeals of the Spirit

Repentance, like conversion, is generic, comprehensive in its character; it covers sin as sin. It is impossible to repent of a particular sin without repenting of sin as such—of all sin. The repentance may begin with a particular sin, probably often does; but when the sin is abandoned it must be abandoned as sin; and this involves a renunciation of all sin; that is, of the carnal mind which is the essence of all sin. .

Hence in repentance it cannot be necessary to recall every past sin; such repentance would be impossible. The sinful mind, the self-indulgent will, is renounced, and thus all sin is repudiated, even if a particular act of sin be not at the moment recalled.—Fairchild, Elements of Theology, p. 250 The power indeed is given to him of God, but the act is necessarily his own. This power is not given arbitrarily, nor is the agency of the Spirit one of compulsion. God by His Spirit, applies the truth to the sinner’s heart, and unveils to his mind the number and aggravations of the sins which he has committed, and the exposure to everlasting wrath which he has incurred. And in view of

this revelation, and of the grace bestowed upon him, he is commanded to repent and turn to God. He may accept the truth or he may resist it; but if he does not repent, it is because he will not. We may say then that repentanee.4mplies (1) a conviction that “we have done the things we ought not to have done, and left undone those things.which we ought to have done”; that we are guilty before God and if we die in this state must be turned into hell; (2) that repentance includes contrition of sin, and that the remembrance of sins will always be grievous and the burden intolerable; (3) that true repentance will produce confession of sin; and (4) that true rejentance implies reformation, a turning from sin to God and a bringing forth of. fruits meet .for. repentance. It is for thi~ reason that Mr. Finney defines repentance as “a turning from sin to holiness, or more strictly from a state of consecration to self, to a state of consecration to God”; while Dr. Steele says that “Evangelical repentance is called a repentance toward God because it consists in turning from sin to holiness, implying a sense of, and hatred of sin and a love of holiness.” The State. of...~enitence. Repentance is an ~ tence is a state of. the soul consequent upon that. .act. Penitence, therefore, is that attitude which belongs to every moral being recovered from sin, and as such will not only exist in every subsequent stage of life, but will have place also in heaven. “It is generally supposed,” says Wesley, “that repentance and faith are only the gate of religion; that they are necessary only at the beginning of our Christian course, when we are setting out in the way to the kingdom. .. . But notwithstanding this, there is also a repentance and faith (taking the words in another sense, a sense not quite the same, nor yet entirely different) which are requisite after we have believed the gospel; yea, and in every subsequent stage of our Christian course, or we cannot run the race which is set before us. And this repentance and faith are full as necessary, in order to our continuance and growth in grace, as the former faith and repentance were, in order to our entering into the kingdom of God” (WESLEY,Sermon: The Repentance of Believers). True repentance works a radical change of mind—a change which is manifested in the intellect, the feelings and the will. In a literal sense of course, the true penitent has the same mind and the same mental faculties as before, but they have undergone an inner revolution. He has the same intellect, but this now functions in a different sphere. As a natural man, he was spiritually blind, but now he sees truths which had never before penetrated his mind. He also sees many things in a new light, for he now sees them in a new perspective. There is also a change--in his feelings or affections. Once he rested in a false security, and was callous to the threats of the law; now his feelings have been strangely reversed. He now hates what he once loved, and loves what he formerly hated. There is a change also in his will. Once he was bound by the chains of darkness and sin, now he finds his will freed from its fetters and able to function in the spiritual realm. Thus true repentance brings a change of mind, which followed by an act of saving faith, brings the soul into the state of initial salvation; and the continuance of penitence as a state makes possible the reception of further benefits and an abiding communion with God The Necessity of Repentance. Repentance is essential to sãiv àHbii. - This has appeared from the previous discussion and needs no extended treatment here. From Christ, our highest possible authority, we have the words, Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish (Luke 13:3). This is not an arbitrary requirement, but arises from the nature of sin itself. Sin is rebellion against God. There can be no salvation, therefore, without a renunciation of sin and Satan. Sin is as inconsistent with happiness as it is with holiness. But there can be no deliverance from either without true repentance. Until there is a deep feeling of the evil of sin, and an utter renouncement of it, the soul is unprepared for spiritual exercises and holy joy. Repentance is indeed bitter; yet the remembrance of the bitter cup

will be an occasion of praise to the redeemed forever. In its adaptation to human needs, therefore, it strikingly exhibits the divine wisdom and benevolence

SAVING FAITH

Repentance leads immediately to saving faith, which is at once the condition and the instrument of justification. Faith therefore forms the connecting link between prevenient grace and the initial state of salvation. The term saving faith, however, is used in a particular sense, and must be distinguished on the one hand, from the principle of faith generally as it belongs to human nature, and on the other, from the assurance of faith which is the outflow of the Christian life. We shall consider then, (1) The Nature of Faith in General; (2) Saving Faith, or Faith as the Condition and Instrument of Salvation; and (3) Faith as a Grace of the Christian life The Nature of Faith in General. Faith has been defined as “credit given to the truth,” or “a full assent of the mind to a declaration or promise, on the authority of the person who makes it” (Cf. WEAVER, Chr. Th., p. 156). It is that principle of human nature which accepts the unseen as existing, and which admits as knowledge, that which is received on evidence or authority. This general principle of faith, when directed to the gospel and exercised under the prevenient grace of the Spirit becomes saving faith. The Christian idea of faith roots

Impenitence is the state opposed to penitence. It is per8istence in sin—in an unbenevolent purpose and life; a state rather than an act; the state of the sinner under light and motives which should induce re~ pentance, and do not (Cf. Romans 2:4-5). Impenitence does not imply any special emotion or positive feeling of resistance or repugnance or opposition to God. Mere immobility, under motives which 8hOuld turn the soul from sin, from worldliness, is all that is necessarily involved. Every sinner has motives before him which should lead to repentance. Every persistent sinner is an impenitent sinner.—Fairchild, Elements of Theology, p. 25 I back into the Old Testament, and has been modified also by Greek and Roman usage. The Hebrew word translated faith in its simple form, means “to support, to sustain, or to uphold.” In the passive form, it means “to be firm, stable and faithful.” The use of the word carries with it in almost every instance, the idea of reliance upon the Jehovah of the ancient covenant. For this reason Dr. Oehler defines faith as it is used in the Old Testament to be “the act of making the heart firm, steadfast and sure in Jehovah.” The Greek word for faith is pistis (lTi’o-Ttc from ~-€Wco, to persuade), which means “t~ti~usf~oi~”to be persuaded” that its pbj~e~,. whether n is trustworthy. The Latin word ede?’e-mea~ns “toj Jiey”cr “to trust” another. From it we have our word ~ of another as true, or the placing confidence in another. This word is usually translated “believe” and refers more especially to the intellectual assent to truth. The word fides is another Latin term, and also means “to exercise trust in” or “place confidence in” another. It emphasizes, not so ~ tional and emotional aspects of faith. In its various forms, the word is usually translated “faith,” “faithfulness” or “fidelity.” The English word “faith” is supposed to have come from the Anglo-Saxon faegan to covenant. From the derivation of these words, it is evident that the primary element of faith is trust. The older theoThough much is said in the sacred Scriptures in regard to faith, there is only one passage in which it is particularly defined. This is Hebrews 11:1, “Now faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen.” As this is the only inspired definition of faith, it will be proper to examine with suitable attention the terms in which it is expressed. The word ~rao~r, which is rendered substance, means literally something placed under—a basis or foundation. But in its metaphorical application it means a certain persuasion, an

assured expectation, a confident anticipation. We think the latter sense, “confident anticipation,” is the true import of the word in the passage before us, as the apostle connects it with “things hoped for.” So also, in Hebrews 3:14, the same term is translated “confidence.” The term Aeyyos, which is rendered evidence, means primarily whatever serves to convince or confute—an argument, proof or demonstration. But when it is used metonymically, it means refutation or conviction—firm persuasion. The last we take as the true import of the word in the present case. The apostle’s definition, therefore, may be stated thus: Faith is the confident anticipation of things hoped for, the firm persuasion of things not seen —Wakefield, Chr. Th, pp. 481, 48L logians commonly defined faith as (1) the assent of the mind; (2) the consent of the will; and (3)’ recumbency or reclining, by which was meant the element of trust. But the comprehensive meaning of faith must ever be trust—that which sustains our expectations and never disappoints us. It is, therefore, opposed to all that is false, unreal, deceptive, empty and worthless. Faith is what it purports to be, and is therefore worthy of both credence and trust

Several deductions must be made in order to better understand the various elements entering into the true nature of belief or faith. (1) Faith implies a previous knowledge of its object. This applies to the intellectual element in faith, or the assent of the mind. It is in this sense of “belief” that knowledge must be regarded as antecedent to faith, but it is only so as to specific acts. A proposition to be believed, must be either expressed or implied; and it must carry with it sufficient evidence, either real or supposed. Faulty judgments are due to a failure to distinguish between real and supposed evidence. Furthermore, the constitution of the mind is such that it cannot withhold assent to a proposition, if it be sustained by a sufficient amount of evidence. (2) Faith operates in the emotional and volitional life to the degree that the, fact. or proposition believed is judged to be irnportant. Thus a thing near at hand may be judged to be of more importance than a greater thing further removed. If faulty judgments arise from a failure to discriminate between real and supposed evidence, so the emotional and volitional elements of the mind may sometimes be moved more by false judgments than the true. Herein is the deceptiveness of the human heart. It puts far

Dr. Whedon says that saving faith is that “belief of the intellect, consent of the affections and act of the will, by which the soul places itself in the keeping of Christ as its ruler and Savior” . . . it is, therefore, “our self-commitment to God and to all goodness.”

Dr. Fairchild says that “there are three elements which may be distinguished in the general exercise called faith. (1) The intellectual element; that is, an apprehension and conviction of the truth, of some truth which involves obligation. (2) The moral acceptance of that truth, a voluntary treatment of it as true. (3) The emotional results, the peace and assurance and confidence which follow a yielding of the heart to truth.”—Fairchild, Elements of Theology pp. 255, 256 away the evil day. It sells its birthright for a mess of pottage. Only grace can awaken the mind to the truth as it is in Jesus. It was under this illumination of the Spirit that St. Paul wrote, We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal (2 Corinthians 4:18). (3) There are degrees in faith. This is due, not only to a limited apprehension of the truth but also to varying degrees of strength in faith itself. Our Lord said to His disciples, Oh ye of little faith (Matthew 6:30); while to the woman of Canaan, He said, 0 woman, great is thy faith (Matthew 15:28). St. Paul likewise speaks of Him that is weak in the faith (Romans 14:1); and again, of the righteousness of God being revealed

from faith to faith, which can only mean, from one degree of faith to another. To his brethren at Thessalonica, he said, your faith groweth exceedingly (2 Thessalonians 1:3). So, also, we find the disciples praying, Lord, Increase our faith (Luke 17:5) From this it follows that we must admit of different degrees of faith in the progress of the Christian life

Saving Faith. By the term “saving faith” we do not mean a different kind of faith, but faith considered as the condition and instrument of salvation. We have seen that the primary element in faith is trust; hence saving faith is a personal trust in the Person of the Savior. We may say in this connection that the efficient cause of this faith is the operation of the Holy Spirit, and the instrumental cause is the revelation of the truth concerning

Mr. Wesley says that the word iXeyxor translated in Hebrews 11:1 means literally a divine evidence and conviction. , . , It implies both a supernatural evidence of God, and the things of God; a kind of spiritual light exhibited to the soul, and a supernatural sight or perception thereof It is by this faith we are saved, justified and sanctified.” “Faith is the condition, and the only condition of justification. It is the condition: none is justified but he that believes: without faith no man is justified. And it is the only condition: this alone is sufficient for justification. Everyone that believes is justified, whatever else he has or ha8 not. In other words: no man is justified till he believes; every man, when he believes, is justified.” As to repentance and its fruits, he says, these “are only remotely necessary; necessary in order to faith; whereas faith is immediately and directly necessary to justification. It remains that faith is the only condition which is immediately and proximately necessary to justification.—Wesley, Sermon on the Scripture Way of Salvation, the need and possibility of salvation. Here we are indebted to Mr. Wesley’s clear thought not only for a correct theological statement, but for such a practical interpretation as renders it vital in the experiences of men. In his sermon on “The Scripture Way of Salvation” he deals with the subject of faith in relation to both justification and sanctification. He says, “Faith is a divine evidence and conviction not only that ‘God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,’ but also that Christ loved me, and gave Himself for me,” Mr. Watson states that “the faith in Christ, which in the New Testament is connected with salvation is clearly of this nature; that is, it combines assent with reliance, belief with trust.” “The faith by which ‘the elders obtained a good report,’ united assent to the truth of God’s revelations, to a noble confession in His promises. ‘Our fathers trusted in Thee,

Man lives and moves and has his being, as a spiritual creature, in an element of belief or trust in the unseen; in that sense also, “We’ walk by faith, not by sight.” Belief is a primary condition of all knowledge and of all reasoning on knowledge. It may be said that without it there can be no full assent given to any proposition that deals with other than the matter of sense. Hence the propriety of Anseim’s “crede ut intelligas,” in opposition to Abelard’s “intellige ut credas”; the two watch. words of Christian faith and rationalism respectively.—Pope, Compend, Chr. Th. II, p. 377

He who will not believe till he receives what he calls a reason for it is never likely to get his soul saved. The highest, the most sovereign reason, that can be given for believing, is that God has commanded it —Dr. Adam Clarke, Chr. Th. p. 135

Faith must be regarded as a form of knowledge. It deals with the invisible, while science deals with the natural and visible world. This, however, does not involve any contradiction between faith and knowledge. The underlying principles of science, such as the uniformity of nature, and the law of causation are, after all, not demonstrated knowledge, but great acts of faith. Faith in spiritual

things, deals with realities as truly as does physical science. It is by faith that we know God, and enter into spiritual union with Christ. No form of knowledge can be more genuine than this

Dr. Fairchild points out that the opposing of faith to reason is entirely without justification. Faith depends on reason, and is only following reasonable evidence; any belief beyond this is arbitrary presumption, or prejudice, not faith. The only foundation for the idea of such opposition is that in the exercise of faith we receive divine revelation, and thus reach truth which lies beyond our reason. We accept God's Word, and take as true what He teaches us, instead relying on our own unaided reason. In doing this we do not abandon reason, or go in opposition to it; we follow it. Reason brings us to God; we accept His Word as truth, because we have reason to do so in the evidence we have of its truth. A child who takes his father's wisdom as his guide is following reason. He who reject8 a higher wisdom, and claims to walk only by his own, is commonly called a rationalist: but he is not following reason (Cf. Fairchild, Elements of Theology, p. 257) and were not confounded'" (WATSON, Institutes, II,p. 244). Dr. Pope bears witness also to this twofold aspect of faith. "Faith as the instrument of appropriating salvation," he says, "is a divinely wrought belief in the record concerning Christ and trust in His person as a personal Savior: these two being one" (POPE, Corn pend, Chr. Th., II, p. 376). We may analyze this subject further, as follows:

1. There is both a divine and a human element in faith. It is a "divine evidence and conviction" or a "~divine1y wrought belief." The question immediately arises, "Is faith the. gift of God,, or. is. it the .act..of the creature?" The question itself is ambiguous, and each of its clauses has been carried to extreme lengths, the former to an Antinomian faith apart from any operation of the believer; the second to a mere mental assent to truth. Between these extremes of Calvinistic Antinomianism, and Pelagian rationalism, both the earlier and later Arminian theologians have sought a mediating position. Dr. Adam Clarke gives perhaps the clearest and best statement of the Wesleyan position. He says, ~ "Is not faith the gift of God? Yes, as to ~ g~çey which it is produced; but the grace 'o power to 'believe, and the act of believing are two different things. Without the grace or power to believe no man ever did or can believe; but with that power the act of faith is a I~ man's own. God never believes for any man, no more than He repents for him; the penitent, through this grace

Dr. Harrison in his "Wesleyan Standards" sums up Mr. Wesley's teaching on faith as follows: (I) A divine evidence and conviction that God hath promised this in His Holy Word. (2) A divine evidence and conviction that what He hath promised He is able to perform. (3) A divine evidence and conviction that He is able and willing to do it now

(4) A divine evidence and conviction that He doeth it. In that hour it is done.—Harrison, Wesleyan Standards, II, p. 340 In Scripture, faith is presented to us under two leading views. The first is that of assent or persuasion; the second that of confidence or reliance. That the former may be separated from the latter, is also plain, though the latter cannot exist without the former. Faith, in the sense of intellectual assent to truth, is allowed to be possessed by devils. A dead inoperative faith is also supposed, or declared, to be possessed by wicked men, professing Christianity (Cf. Matthew 25:41-46). As this distinction is taught in Scripture, so it is also observed in experience, that assent to the truths of revealed religion may result from examination and conviction, while yet the spirit and conduct may be unrenewed and wholly worldly.—Watson, Institutes, II, p. 245 enabling him, believes for himself: Nor does he believe necessarily or impulsively when he has that power; the power to believe may be present long before it is exercised, else, why the solemn

warnings with which we meet everywhere in the Word of God, and threatenings against those who do not believe? Is not this a proof that such persons have the power, but do not use it? They believe not, and therefore are not established. This, therefore, is the true state of the case: God gives the power, man uses the power thus given, and brings glory to God: Without the power no man can believe; with it, any man may" (Cf. CLARKE, Ch. Th., pp. 135, 136. Also Commentary, Hebrews 11:1)

2. Faith has both a negative and a positive aspect, that is, it is both receptive and active. As negative, faith makes the whole soul empty and ready for Jesus; as active, it reaches forth with all its powers to embrace Him and His salvation Faith m its negative aspect may be regarded as the understanding affecting the heart; in its active aspect, it is that of the understanding affecting the will. The former is the operation of the Holy Spirit, convincing the mind of sin and awakening in the heart strong desires after salvation; the latter, the active instrument by which the soul lays hold of Christ, and is enabled to believe unto the salvation of the soul

Bishop Weaver simplifies this position by saying that we have the power to walk;' that power is the gift of God. We have the power to see; this also is the gift of God. But God does not walk for us, nor see for us. We may refuse to walk, or we may close our eyes (Cf. Weaver, Chr. Th,, p. 158). Dr. Ralston, uses practically the same illustration, limiting the "gift of God" to what he terms a "merciful arrangement" not independent of, but in connection with, the free moral agency of man. In this sense, God is "the author and finisher of our faith" because through this merciful arrangement and by the aid of the divine grace imparted, we are enabled to believe. We may say then that in these acceptations faith is the gift of God; but this is far from admitting that faith is in no sense the act of the creature (Cf. Ralston—Elements of Divinity, p. 358)

Christ dwells in the heart only by faith, and faith lives only by love, and love continues only by obedience; he who believes loves, and he who loves obeys. He who obeys loves; he who loves believes; he who believes has the witness in himself; he who has this witness has Christ in his heart, the hope of glory; and he who believes, loves, and obeys, has Christ in his heart, and is a man of prayer.—Dr. Adam Clarke, Chr. Th. p. 141

3. Faith is the act of the entire being under the influence of the Holy Spirit. It is not merely the assent of the mind to truth, nor a feeling arising out of the sensibilities; nor is it alone the consent of the will to moral obligation. True faith is the act of the whole man. It is the highest act of his personal life—an act in which he gathers up his whole being, and in a peculiar sense goes out of himself and appropriates the merit of Christ. It is for this reason that the Scriptures declare, with the heart man believeth unto righteousness (Romans 10:10). Here the heart is understood as the center of personality, and as involving all of its powers. Thus, saving faith is far more than a mere assent of the mind to truth; it is more than the consent of the will giving rise to mere outward reformation; and it is more than a comfortable state of the emotions. It is admitted that saving faith must embrace all of these, but in its highest exercise it is an,unshaken trust in God. ~~...the"acceptance of the propitiatory. offering of Christ which is set forth for the salvation of both Jews and Gentiles, and a firm reliance upon the merits of the blood of atonement. This firm and unshaken trust in the atoning work of Jesus Christ must ever be the crowning exercise of saving faith

4. Saving faith is based upon the truth revealed in the Word of God. It is for this reason that St. Paul defines the gospel as the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth (Romans 1:16). Our Lord laid the foundation for faith in revealed truth when He said, Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word (John 17:20). St. John says of his own gospel, that these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name (John 20:31). St. Paul also declares that God hath chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (2 Thessalonians 2:13); and consequently inquires, How then 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? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God (Romans 10:14-15; Romans 10:17) - God, therefore, gives to mankind, through His providence and His grace, the ground of saving truth in His eternal and immutable Word. He gives, also, the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit, to awaken, convict, and lead the soul to Christ. But the Word must not be understood in the sense of the letter only, which we are told, kills; but in the Spirit which gives life. Thus a firm belief in the Christian revelation leads the soul to trust in the Christ who is the object of that revelation. We may say then, that the proper and ultimate ideal of faith, is a Divine Person. “When a living faith has arisen in a Divine Person,” says Dr. Sheldon, “then, by necessary consequence, there follows reliance upon that which has rational warrant for being regarded as representative of His thought or good pleasure. Faith in the Bible can be, in advance of trust in God who is back of the Bible, only superficial and conventional. The greater here includes the less. Hearty reliance upon God first prepares for genuine repose upon His oracles. Through trustful self-surrender to a personal will we are made ready to rely upon everything which is approved to us as an authentic manifestation of that will” (SHELDON, System Chr. Doct., pp. 438, 439). In this sense, belief is often made perfect by personal trust; and personal trust is the means of strengthening mere belief

Dr. Fairchild defines faith “as the voluntary acceptance of truth which calls for moral action: or as treating truth as true; respecting as truth what we have reason to believe to be true in regard to God and our relations to Him, or to any moral duty. The truth must pertain to God, and to duty, because the acceptance of no other truth touches moral character, or can have any bearing on our acceptance with God,” In this connection, he points out that faith in its subjective moral nature involves not so much any particular form or amount of truth embraced, as the disposition to know and do the truth. The devils have more truth in their knowledge than many of the saints; they “believe and tremble,” but they have no faith; they do not treat the truth as true, are not adjusted to the truth in their voluntary attitude; they resist and reject it. Pilate and Herod knew much about Jesus. Pilate knew Him to be a righteous man; but he did not act according to his knowledge. It is not a question of more or less light or knowledge, but a disposition to obey the light. The feeblest light which is consistent with moral agency lays the foundation for faith. It is not necessary to know the gospel in its highest revelation, in order to the possibility and obligation of faith (Cf. Fairchild, Elements of Theology, pp. 254, 255)

5. Saving faith is vitally related to good works. The relation of faith to works has been the subject of much controversy in the history of the Church. Too frequently, Calvinists in their insistence upon salvation by faith only, have denied works, both as a merit and as a condition, Arminians deny the merit of good works but insist upon them as a condition of salvation. Mr. Wesley’s formula was,

“works, not as a merit, but as a condition.” But it must be borne in mind that the works of which he speaks, are regarded, not as springing from unassisted human nature, but from the prevenient grace of the Spirit. This position is set forth in Article X of Methodism, which with a few verbal changes, is the same as Article XII of the Anglican Confession. “A)thot~gli gqq.d worksr which, are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure

Mr. Wesley wisely omitted Article XIII of the Anglican Creed which follows this and is entitled “Of Works Before Justification.” This was probably written in opposition to the Romanist doctrine of merit, and reads as follows: “Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of hi8 Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ: neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.”

Mr. Fletcher in his “Checks to Antinomianism” has given us perhaps our strongest argument for good works as a condition of salvation. These are not to be understood as meriting salvation; nor are they to be regarded as the immediate condition of salvation, which both Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Wesley held to be faith alone. They are however, remote conditions, and are set over against the Antinomian position, that the sinner is to do nothing toward his salvation. He says, “Please to answer the following questions, founded upon the express declarations of God’s Word. To him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God. Is ordering our conversation aright, doing nothing? Repent ye and be converted that your sins may be blotted out. Are repentance and conversion nothing? Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest—I will justify you. Is coming doing nothing? Cease to do evil, learn to do well. Come now, let us reason together, and though your sins be red like crimson, they shall be as white as snow—you 8hall be justified. Is ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well doing nothing? Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, who will have mercy upon him, and to our God for He will abundantly pardon. Is seeking, calling, forsaking one’s way, and returning to the Lord a mere nothing? Ask and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. Yea, take the kingdom of heaven by force. Is seeking, asking, knocking, and taking by force absolutely nothing? When you have answered these questions, I will throw one or two hundred more of the like kind in your way.” the severity of God’s judgment; yet they are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit.” The good works here mentioned are pleasing to God, (1) beáause they are performed according to His will; (2) because they are wrought through the assistance of divine grace; and (3) because they are done for the glory of God

Throughout the gospel, grace and faith are regarded as correlative terms. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God (Ephesians 2:8). The Jews had come to consider salvation as a matter of works, which carried with it the idea of debt on God’s part. St. Paul, however, set the idea of faith over against that of works, and the idea of grace over against that of debt. Faith on man’s part he did not regard as a work of merit, but as a condition of salvation. Hence man could be saved only by faith, apart from the meritorious deeds of the law. It may be well to note that this principle of faith operated in the Old Testament also. It is sometimes

stated that men were saved by law in the Old Testament, but by grace in the New Testament. But salvation has always been by grace through faith. St. Paul distinctly states that the law could not annul the promise or make it of none effect. For him the idea of obedience as meriting salvation was inconceivable. In Galatians 3:15-22, he sets forth the meaning of the law in relation to the gospel, but makes it clear that no law could have given life, for all are under sin. Hence the law could only serve as a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. If men had possessed the Dr. Pope in his Higher Catechism expresses the relation of faith and works as follows:

(I) Faith is opposed to works as meritorious, and the formula is:

“A man is not justified by works of law, but only through faith in Jesus Christ (Galatians 3:16) (2) Faith lives only in its works, and the formula is: “Faith without works is dead” (James 2:26) (3) Faith is justified and approved by works, and the formula is:

“I will shew thee my faith by my works” (James 2:8)

(4) Faith is perfected in works, and the formula is: “By works was faith made perfect” (James 2:22). (Cf. Pope, Higher Catechism, p. 233.) moral power to perfectly obey the law, even then salvation would have been due to the living union with God through faith. Hence salvation is now, and always has been, by grace through faith. The act of faith by which man is saved, becomes the law of his being as saved; and hence good works flow from the principle of living faith

Faith as a Grace of the Christian Life. Say ing faith is_thai act by which the prevenient grace of the Spirit passes over into the regenerate life of the believer. Thus the faith which saves becomes the faith which is a law of our being. The initial act becomes the permanent attitude of the regenerate man. As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: Rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the faith (Colossians 2:6-7). This faith becomes the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Romans 8:2), which St. Paul declares works by love (Galatians 5:6). He also mentions faith as the seventh fruit of the Spirit (Galatians 5:22), and further catalogs it as one of the gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:9). As the former, it is a quality of the regenerate life and, therefore, a gracious result and an abiding privilege of believers; as the latter, it is a special gift bestowed by the Spirit for the profit of those to whom it is given (1 Corinthians 12:7). Closely associated with saving faith is the so-called “assurance of faith.” Arminian theologians, however, have always regarded assurance as an indirect, or reflex action of saving faith, and not that faith

Concerning assurance, Mr. Wesley 8ays, “But is this faith of assurance, or the faith of adherence? The Scripture mentions no such distinction. The apostle says, ‘There is one faith, and one hope of your calling’; one Christian saving faith: ‘as there is one Lord,’ in whom we believe, and ‘one God and Father of us all.’ And it is certain, this faith necessarily implies an assurance (which is here only another word for evidence, it being hard to tell the difference between them) that Christ loved me, and gave Himself for me. For ‘he that believeth’ with the true, living faith ‘hath the witness in himself’; ‘the Spirit witnesses with His Spirit that He is a child of God.’ ‘Because he is a son, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into his heart, crying, Abba, Father’; giving him an assurance that he is so, and a childlike confidence in Him. But let it be observed, that in the very nature of the thing, the assurance goes before the confidence. For a man cannot have a childlike confidence in God till he knows he is a child of God. Therefore, confidence, trust, reliance, adherence, or whatever else it be called, is not the first, as some have supposed, but the second branch or act of

faith.—Wesley, Sermon: The Scripture Way of Salvation itself. Thus Dr. Pope says, “Assurance belongs to this trust only in an indirect manner, as its reflex action and its gracious result, and its abiding privilege in the regenerate life. As faith is the highest negative work of repentance and passes into the energy of regeneration, so confidence in its object, relying upon it as an objective, passes into the faith of subjective assurance. But the assurance is the fruit, and not the essence of faith

.That He is my actual Savior, and that my belief is saving, cannot be the object of faith direct; it is the reflex benefit and ~gift of the Holy Ghost. It is the full assurance of faith, “the ~Xrjpoçbopta ino-r€’ojc in which worshipers are exhorted to draw near” (POPE, Cornpend. Chr. Th., II, pp. 383, 384). Again, faith as the law of the Christian life, is always operative, “It works by love and purifies the heart.” Otherwise there is danger of faith becoming merely a formal assent to the conditions of salvation. It is this against which St. James warns us. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well. . . . But wilt thou know, 0 vain man, that faith without works is dead? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also (James 2:19-20; James 2:26). True faith is, therefore, a working faith

CONVERSION

Conversion is the term used to designate the process by which the soul turns from sin to salvation. It is commonly used in a narrower sense in theology, but in common speech is used as a general term to express the initial state of salvation, as including in an undifferentiated manner, justification, regeneration and adoption. In the Scripture, however, conversion is generally used in the narrower sense of the term, sometimes being connected with repentance, and sometimes with faith. Once the term is used as the antecedent of repentance, Surely after that I was turned, I repented (Jeremiah 31:19) -More frequently, however, it is used in close connection with repentance, as the human act in turning away from sin. Thus our Lord quotes the prophecy of Isaiah, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them (John 12:40). He also said, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 18:3). To Peter He said, When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren (Luke 22:32). St. Peter himself uses the term twice in his sermon at Pentecost—the first as an exhortation,

Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out (Acts 3:19); and once in recounting the mission of Jesus, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities (Acts 3:26). It is used also in connection with the mission of St. Paul, 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 26:18). Usually, however, it is used in the Acts in connection with faith, to designate the company of believers. Thus, all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, and turned to the Lord (Acts 9:35); and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord (Acts 11:21). St. Peter uses the term in the wider sense, when he said, But ye are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls (1 Peter 2:25); while St. James uses it in the narrower sense of a The term conversion stands here for a few equivalents in Hebrew and Greek which express the same religious idea: that of the change by which the soul is turned from sin to God. The fact that it is thus common to the two Testaments gives it great importance. It is the general description of the restoration of the sinner that runs through the Bible;

4 and, therefore, has been very often regarded as including much more than the mere crisis of moral and religious change. Sometimes it is thought to represent the whole course, through all its stages, of the return of the soul to God: this is the case especially in the works of rnys4 tical writers, and of some who are not mystical. By those for instance, who recognize no saving influence before regeneration, out of which repentance and faith flow, conversion is of necessity made to include all the moral blessings of the state of grace: In fact, it must have a very indeterminate meaning in every system of Calvinism. The theology that may be called Sacramentarian generally regards conversion as the process of recovery from a state in which the regenerating grace conferred in baptism has been neglected and might seem to be lost. Sometimes, by a very loose employment of the term, it is made synonymous with the experience of forgiveness and the assurance of reconciliation. But we must remember that it simply means the turning point of the religious life: its turning from a course of sin to the commencement of seeking God. Hence the crisis that it marks is not in the religious life of a believer, but in the life of the soul, redeemed indeed, but not yet a new creature in Christ.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Tb. II, pp. 367, 368 merely human change, when he says, Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins (James 5:19-20)

Ip Calvinistic theology, “conversion is the human side or aspect of that fundamental spiritual change, whieh, viewed from the divine side, we call regeneration.” Holding as they do that regeneration is an effectual calling by the decree of God, men are first regenerated, and then are able to turn themselves to God. In this sense it is simply man’s turning. (Cf. STRONG, Syst. Th., III, p. 829.) Dr. A. H. Strong defines conversion as “that voluntary change in the mind of the sinner in which he turns, on the one hand, from sin, and on the other hand, to Christ. The former or negative element in conversion, namely, the turning from sin, we denominate repentance The latter or positive element in conversion, namely, the turning to Christ, we denominate faith.” Dr. Pope takes almost the same position, when he defines it as “the process by which the soul turns, or is turned, from sin to God, in order to its acceptance through faith in Christ. This is its strict meaning, as distinguished from that broader sense in which it is applied to the entire history of the soul’s restoration. (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th~II, p. 367.) While these definitions are similar, and are in fact essentially the same, there is a vast difference in the two views. Calvinism~ as indicated, holds that man is regenerated by absolute decree, and then turns to God; Arminianism holds that through grace, preveniently bestowed, man turns to God and is then regenerated. Thus conversion in its truest scriptural meaning, is the pivotal point, wherein through grace, the soul turns from sin, and to Christ, in order to regenerati

26. Chapter 27 - CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Chapter 27 - CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Christian reighteousness or justification by faith is a cardinal doctrine in theology and for this reason occupies a controlling position in the entire Christian system. It is the particular point in saving grace, where the soul is brought into an acceptable relation to God through Christ, and therefore determines all further advances in the Christian life. Martin Luther spoke of justification as the articulus stantis aut cadentis eccleskE or the "article of a standing or falling church." "It spreads its vital influence through all Christian experience, and operates in every part of practical godliness." The practical importance of this truth is ably set forth by Bishop Merrill in his Aspects of Christian Experience. He says, "Here His life and spirit and power come into efficient contact with awakened consciences and penitent hearts, bringing the throbs of a new life and the gleams of a new day to the soul lost in darkness and sin. Destroy this link of the chain and the whole is useless. The name of Christ, if retained, will have lost its charm. His blood will be robbed of its meritorious efficacy, and His Spirit will be reduced to a sentiment or a temper, with no power to quicken the soul into the life of righteousness. Along with this displacement of Christ will come an undue exaltation of human virtues and the diminution of the turpitude of sin, till the presence of guilt shall cease to alarm, and the need of humiliation become a dream. Then the pomp of worship will take the place of inward groaning for salvation, and the services of the sanctuary will be required to charm the senses, to minister to The first reformers regarded justification by faith as the central queltion in their gigantic assault upon corrupt Christendom: induced proximately by the abuse of indulgences, and ultimately by the fervent study of St. Paul’s doctrine of righteousness. They made this the starting point of all controversy, and relied upon its settlement for the removal of every abuse.-Pope, Compend. Chr. Th. II, p. 439 the esthetic tastes, and to nourish the vanity of the heart, without disturbing the emotions or stirring the depths of the soul with longings after God and purity."

Definitions of justification Arminius gives us this definition: "Justification is a just and gracious act of God by which, from the throne of His grace and mercy, \He absolves from his sins man, who is a sinner but who /is a believer, on account of Christ, and His obedience and righteousness, and considers him righteous to the salvation of the justified person, and to the glory of the (divine righteousness and grace." Mr. Wesley defines justification as "that act of God the Father, whereby, for the sake of the propitiation made by the blood of His Son, He sheweth forth His righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of the sins that are past." According to Wakefield "Justification is an act of God’s free grace, by which He absolves a sinner from guilt and punishment, and accepts him as righteous, on account of the atonement of Christ," A definition found in Watson’s Dictionary, and quoted by Wakefield, Ralston and Pope, is that of Dr. Bunting. He says, "To justify a sinner is to account and consider him relatively righteous; and to deal with him as such, notwithstanding his past unrighteousness, by clearing, absolving, discharging and

Watson speaks of justification as "being the pardon of sin by a judicial sentence of the offended Majesty of heaven, under a gracious constitution."-Watson, Institutes, II, p. 215

Wakefield quotes favorably the definition of Dr. Schmucker, that "Justification is that judicial act of God by which a believing sinner, in consideration of the merits of Christ, is released from the penalty of the law, and is declared to be entitled to heaven."-Wakefield, Chr. Th. p. 406

Among the Calvinistic definitions may be mentioned the following:Strong defines justification as "that judicial act of God, by which, on account of Christ, to whom the sinner is united by faith, He declares that the sinner is no longer exposed to the penalty of the law, but to be restored to His favor" (Syst. Th. III, p. 849). Boyce defines it as 'a judicial act of God, by which on account of the meritorious work of Christ, imputed to a sinner and received by him through that faith which vitally unites him to his substitute and Savior, God declares that sinner to be free from the demands of the law, and entitled to the rewards due to the obedience of that substitute." (Syst. Th. p. 395.) According to Fairchild, justification as a fact under the gospel, is "the pardon of sin that is past; and the doctrine of justification is simply the doctrine of the pardon of sin" (Elements of Th. p. 277). E. Y. Mullins defines justification as a "judicial act of God in which He declares the sinner free from condemnation, and restores him to divine favor" (Chr. Relig. p.389) releasing him from various penal evils, and especially from the wrath of God, and the liability to eternal death, which by that past unrighteousness he had deserved; and by accepting him as if just, and admitting him to the state, the privileges, and the rewards of righteousness." Our own Article of Faith, while intended primarily as a statement of belief, is nevertheless definitive in its nature. "We believe that justification is that gracious and judicial act of God, by which He grants full pardon of all guilt and complete release from the penalty of sins committed, and acceptance as righteous, to all who believingly receive Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior" (Article IX). We may now sum up these various aspects of truth and express themjm the following definition "Justification is that judicial or declarative ingly accept the solved from their sins, released from their penalty, and accep±edas righteous before Him" The Scriptural Development of the Doctrine. Concerning the doctrine of justification, varioui opinions have been asserted and defended by theologians. But before considering these positions, it will be well to give attention to those Scriptures which bear directly upon this subject, in order to apprehend as clearly as possible, the light in which divine inspiration has presented it. A variety of terms is used-justification, righteousness, nonimputation of sin, reckoning or imputation of righteousness, and like terms, all of which have substantially the same import, but with various shades of meaning. The seed thought of the new and divine righteousness is given us in the following words from our Lord himself, Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteous- The Wesleyan statement as found in Article IX of the Twenty-five Articles is as follows: "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." This is the same as Article XI of the Thirty-nine Articles, with the omission of the words "as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." The Methodist Catechism has the following statement. "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His 8ight, only for the sake of Christ," ness (Matthew 6:33). This was later developed by St. Paul. The following are the more important passages. (1) Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are

justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses (Acts 13:38-39). Here it is evident that forgiveness and justification are synonymous terms, the one explanatory of the other but with a shade of difference

(2) Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus (Romans 3:24-26). This is considered one of the classical passages on justification, and sets forth the Pauline position in a variety of terms. Another passage also considered classical is the following: (3) But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifleth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin (Horn. 4: 5-8), St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians deals with the subject of justification also, but emphasizes more especially the relation of faith and works THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION The term justification has several applications. First, sonal justification or justification on the ground of perfect obedience or personal worthiness. The word dikaio ~'&KawU)) is frequently used in the New Testament in is forensic sense of pronouncing a person just or right

~. Thus, Wisdom is justified of her children (Matt

11: 19). And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God (Luke 7:29); and the doers of the law shall be justified (Romans 2:13). Second the term may be applied to one agains±_whom_ wcnsptioñ ha&been made but not sustained 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 (Deuteronomy 25:1). This is legal justification on the ground of innocence or the righteousness of the cause. Third, it is applied to one who is accused, is guilty and condemned How can such a óiiébe justified? In one sense only-that of pardon. By the act of God, his sins are pardoned for ChrIst's sake, his guilt canceled, his punishment remitted, and He is accepted before God as righteous. He is therefore declared righteous, not by legal fiction, but by judicial action, and stands in the same relation to God through Christ, as if he had never sinned, This is evangelical justification, and is possible only through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus

Evangelical j ustification is the remission of sins. The importance of acquiring and maintaining this simple and distinct view of justification, will appear on further consideration of the subject. "The fist point which we find established by the language of the New Testament says Mr. Watson, "is that justification, the pardon and remission notn ins the nonimputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are terms and phrases of the same import " (Watson, Institutes, II, p. 212). But this position must be carefully guarded. While the remission of sins is an act of mercy, it is not an ex se of the divine prerogative apart from law, but consistent with law. It is thus distinguished from mere forgiveness. This position must be further distinguished on the one hand, from the mere imputation of Christ's righteousness as taught by the Antinomians; and on the other, from the idea of justification upon the ground of inherent righteousness as held by the Roman Catholic Church. That justification means the pardon or remission of sins, is not only a tenet of Arminianism, but is the "vital fact" in the teaching of all orthodox Protestant divines Justification is both an act and a

state ale. It is an act of God_whereby men are declared to be just or righteous; and it is a of man into which h introduced as a consequence of this declaration tion But whether as an act or as a state, the word in its true connotation, is never used in the sense of making men righteous, but only in the sense of declaring or pronouncing them free from the guilt and penalty of sin, and therefore righteous. Thus salvation is a broader term than justification, and includes regeneration, adoption and sanctification. The terms used in the Scriptures carry a certain exactness of meaning, indicating an act, an act in process, an act as fully accomplished or perfected, and a state following the accomplishment of the act. (1) &Katow or the simple verb form is expressive of the act of justification. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifleth (Romans 8:33). (2) &KaLcocnc signifies the act in process of completion. Who was delivered for our off ences, and was raised again for our justification (Romans 4:25). The free gift came upon

Mr. Wesley states that "the plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins," "It is that act of God the Father, whereby, for the sake of the propitiation made by the blood of His Son, He 'showeth forth His righteousness (or mercy) by the remission of the sins that are past.' This is the easy, natural account of it given by St. Paul, throughout this whole epistle."-Wesley, Sermon, Justification by Faith,

Knapp takes the position that "one who is guilty is said to be justi. fled when he is declared and treated as exempt from punishment, or innocent, or when the punishment of his sins is remitted to him. This is called 'justificatio externa,' The terms justification, pardon, accounting righteous, occur in the Bible much more frequently in this sense than in any other, and so are synonymous with forgiveness of sin,"- Knapp, Chr. Tb. p. 387 The words forgiveness and remi8sion have, sometimes, each a spe. cific sense. The word pardon is sometimes specifically synonymous with remission, and sometimes equal to both forgiveness and remission. When an aggrieved party forgives the aggressor, there is a change in the feelings of the aggrieved toward the aggressor; he regards him, feels toward him, and treats him the same as though he had never done him an injury. This may occur between private individuals in cases where the offense is not a violation of public law, where the aggrieved has not authority to inflict penalty. Remission has respect not to the feelings of the aggrieved, or to the personal feelings of the magistrate, but to the penalty incurred by the transgression. To remit sin is to release from obligation to punishment; it is to order authoritatively the nonexecution of penalty · Raymond, Syst. Tb, II, p. 323, all men unto justification of life (Romans 5:18, last clause). (3) kaiwua signifies the act as already accomplished. The free gift is of many off ences unto justification (Romans 5:16) ; Even so by the righteousness of one

27. Chapter 28 - CHRISTIAN SONSHIP

Chapter 28 - CHRISTIAN SONSHIP

Christian sonship, mvolving as it does, both regeneration and adoption, is vitally related to Christian righteQusness. There are, however, real points of difference between them. The necessity for justification lies in the fact of guilt and penalty, while that of regeneration is due to the moral depravity of human nature ~after~the fall. The former cancels guilt and removes penalty; the latter renews the moral nature and re-establishes the privileges of sonship. The two, however, are coincident in time, for they are accomplished in answer to the same act of faith. We may say, then, that Christian righteousness and Christian sonship, involving justification, regeneration, adoption and initial sanctification, are concomitant in personal experience, that is, they are offered as inseparable blessings and occur at the same time. The regenerate man is justified, and the justified man is reThe leading blessings concomitant with justification are regeneration and adoption; with respect to which we may observe generally, that although we must distinguish them as being different from each other, and from justification, yet they are not to be separated. They occur at the same time, and they all enter into the experience of the same person; so that no man is justified without being regenerated and adopted, and no man is regenerated and made a son of God, who is not justified. Whenever they are mentioned in Scripture, they, therefore, involve and imply each other.—Watson, Theological Institutes, II, p. 266 No terms are more strictly correlative than regeneration and adoption. They describe the same blessing under two aspects: the former referring to the filial character, the latter to the filial privilege. But they are not thus closely connected as cause and effect: they are co-ordinate, and the link between them is the common sonship. The assurance of filial adoptioa does not produce the regenerate life nor does the infusion of tha perfect life of regeneration of itself invest the children of God with all the prerogatives of heirship. Moreover, they are as distinct from the other leading blessings in the economy of grace as they are themselves united. The justified state does not involve of necessity the special privileges of adoption; nor does regeneration as such imply the specific relation to God which sanctification signifies. The two terms we now consider embrace in their unity an entirely distinct department of the Spirit’s administration of the New Covenant; they lead us into the household of faith and the family of God. Touching at many points those other departments, they are nevertheless perfect and complete in themselves.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 3, 4 generated. The terms are not, however, synonymous, and in the development of theological thought gradually became more sharply defined—justification being limited to a change in relations, and regeneration to a change in the moral state. Regeneration and adoption are more nearly correlative terms than regeneration and justffication. The former describes sonship in reference to its filial character, while the latter presents it from the viewpoint of filial privilege. However, these terms are not related as cause and effect, but find their union in the common fact of sonship. Our study will embrace the following subjects, (1) Regeneration; (2) Adoption; and (3) The Witness of the Spirit

REGENERATION The term regeneration is derived from the Greek word palingenesia (7raXwyEvw-ta or ‘n-aXLyy€vEo-t’a) which is compounded of ~-Aw “again” and ye’veo-Lc “to be,” so that the word means literally “to be again.” It is, therefore, to be understood as a reproduction or a restoration. Theologians and biblical commentators have generally applied the term to the moral change set forth in the Scriptures as “born again” (John 3:3; John 3:5; John 3:7; 1 Peter 1:23); “born of God” (John 1:13; 1 John 3:9; 1 John 4:7;

5: 1, 4, 18); “born of the Spirit” (John 3:5-6); “quickCrowther in his portraiture of the Wesleyan positions says “that all who repent and believe, are, (I) Justified, and have peace with God; that we are accounted righteous, only through the sacrifice and intercession of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. But although faith, receiving and resting upon Christ, is the sole condition and instrument of justification; yet this faith in the justified person, worketh by love,’ and produces inward and outward holiness. They believe (2) That all persons who are thus justified, are adopted into the family of God, have a right to all the privileges of His children, and may come b.ldly to the throne of grace; receiving the spirit of adoption, they are enabled to cry, Abba, Father; and, as His children are loved, pitied, chastened, protected, and provided for; they are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ; and that continuing in this state they shall inherit all the promises, and obtain everlasting life. They believe also,

(3) That those who are thus justified and made children of God, are assured of this; and that this blessed assurance arises from ‘The Spirit of God bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God.’ They believe that no person, under the gospel dispensation is excluded from this privilege, except through unbelief, lukewarmness, the love of the world, or some other sin. . . . But they believe that every person possessed of this justification, adoption, and witness of the Spirit, hungers and thirsts after righteousness.”—Crowther, Portraiture, pp. l 71, I 72 ened” (Ephesians 2:1; Ephesians 2:5; Colossians 2:13); and “passed from death unto life” (John 5:24; 1 John 3:14). In the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus uses the words y€vv’qO~ awvo.OEv which mean literally, “to be born from above.” St. John indicates also, that the change wrought by the Spirit in regeneration is, like that of justification and adoption, conditioned on faith. Thus, to as many as received him, to them gave he power [Eovo-tav or authority] to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name (John 1:12). St. Paul uses more indirect terms than St. John, but his meaning is the same. Thus if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature (2 Corinthians 5:17). And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses (Colossians 2:13). In all his epistles, St. Paul stresses faith as the sole condition of salvation The word regeneration occurs but twice in the New Testament. The first use of the term is in our Lord’s conversation concerning future rewards, where He said to His disciples, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matthew 19:28). Commentators generally admit the correctness of the punctuation as found in the Authorized Version and, therefore, connect the word regeneration with that which immediately follows. They differ, however, as to the application—some referring it to the millennial state, and others to the resurrection or the general judgment. Dr. Ralston refers it to the perfected gospel dispensation. However the passage be interpreted, it cannot be made to refer to the moral and spiritual renovation by which men are constituted the children of God. The second

Regeneration, like justification, is a vital part of Christian soteriology. It must be such, since native depravity is a reality, and regeneration a necessity to a truly spiritual life. It follows that a truthful doctrine of regeneration must be profoundly important. Yet it is one respecting which error has widely prevailed, and greatly to the detriment of the Christian life. However, as between evangelical systems, the doctrine of regeneration has been far less in issue than that of justification. mostly because it is less directly concerned in the doctrinal view of the atonement.—Miley, Syst. Tb., II, p. 327 use of the term is found in the statement of St. Paul to the effect that men are saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Titus 3:5). Here the "washing of regeneration" is an allusion to the rite of baptism, although in a narrower sense, the "washing" may refer to the rite, and the "regeneration" to the spiritual renovation which it symbolizes. The "renewing of the Holy Ghost" must be regarded as a comprehensive term, referring in one sense to the basic work of regeneration, and in another to the subsequent work of entire sanctification. As related to regeneration, this renewing is a restoration to the moral image of God in which man was originally created and, therefore, the re-establishment of the primal pattern. But it is more than this. It is also the renewing of the original purpose of man's life in its full devotement to God. Hence we are exhorted by St. Paul to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness (Ephesians 4:24); and again to put on the new man, which is

Dr. Shedd points out that the term "regeneration" has been used in a wide, and in a restricted sense. "It may signify the whole process of salvation, including the preparatory work of conviction and the concluding work of sanctification. Or it may denote only the imparting of spiritual life in the new birth, excluding the preparatory and concluding processes. The Romish Church regards regeneration as comprehending everything in the transition from a state of condemnation on earth to a state of salvation in heaven, and confounds justification with sanctification. The Lutheran doctrine, stated in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession and in the Formula Concordi~, employs regeneration in the wide meaning, but distinguishes carefully between justification and sanctification. In the Reformed Church, the term regeneration was also employed in the wide signification. Like the Lutheran, while carefully distinguishing between justification and sanctification, the Reformed theologian brought under the term 'regeneration' everything that pertains to the development as well as to the origination of the new spiritual life. Regeneration thus included not only the new birth, but all that issues from it." "The wide use of the term passed into the English theology. The divines of the seventeenth century very generally do not distinguish between regeneration and conversion, but employ the two as synonyms." "But this wide use of the term regeneration led to confusion of ideas and views. Consequently. there arose gradually a stricter use of the term regeneration, and its discrimination from conversion. Turretin defines two kinds of conversion, as the term was employed in his day. The first is 'habitual' or 'passive' conversion, It is the production of a habit or disposition in the soul. The second kind is 'actual' or 'active' conversion. It is the acting out in faith and repentance of this implanted habit or disposition." This shows the manner in which Calvinism was led to adopt such a sharp distinction between regeneration and conversion. (Cf. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 41.494) renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him (Colossians 3:10). Here it is evident that man is "renewed" or created anew in regeneration (r~w Kara O~ov KTto-OEVTa); and that the subsequent knowledge, righteousness and holiness is the end for which he was renewed. He is, therefore, exhorted to "put on the new man" of perfect inward holiness and righteousness. We may

note in this connection also, that the word dva~aZvcxrtc translated “renewing” is found only twice in the New Testament—once the “renewing of the Holy Ghost” as here used (Titus 3:5); and once as the “renewing of your mind” (Romans 12:2). While the former as indicated, bears a relation to regeneration, the latter can refer only to the transformation effected by the Holy Spirit in entire sanctification

Deftnitioiof~Rege~ne.r.atio~ Mr. Wesley defines regeneration as “that great change which God works in the soul when He brings it into life; when He raises it from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. It is the change wrought in the whole soul by the Almighty Spirit of God, when it is created anew in Christ Jesus; when it is renewed after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness” (WESLEY, Sermon on the New Birth). According to Mr. Watson, “Regeneration is that mighty change in man, wrought by the Holy Spirit, by which the dominion which sin had over him in his natural state, and which he deplores and struggles against in his penitent state, is broken and abolished; so that with full choice of will and the energy of right affections, he serves God freely, and runs in the way The change in regeneration consists in the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is to say, so as to love him supremely and serve him ultimately as our highest end, and to delight in him superlatively as our chief good. . . . Regeneration consists in the principle being implanted, obtaining the ascendancy, and habitually prevailing over its opposite. . . . It is all effected by the word of truth, or the gospel of salvation, gaining an entrance into the mind, through divine teaching, so as to possess the understanding, subdue the will, and reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature, the regenerate man. - . . Regeneration is to be distinguished from our justification, although it is connected with it. Everyone who is justified, is also regenerated; but the one places us in a new relation, and the other in a new moral state.”—Watson, Dictionary, Art. Regeneration of His commandments” (WATSON, Th. Inst., II, p. 267). “Regeneration,” says Dr. Pope, “is the final and decisive work wrought in the spirit and moral nature of man when the perfect principle of spiritual life in Christ Jesus is imparted by the Holy Ghost” (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 5). Dr. Ralston says that “Regeneration may be defined to be a radical change in the moral character from the love and practice, and dominion of sin, to the love of God, and to the internal exercise and external practice of holiness” (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, p. 420). Dr. Hannah defines regeneration as “that spiritual change which is wrought in believing man by the Holy Spirit of God, and which, though it may be mysterious and inexplicable in its process, is sufficiently plain and obvious in its effects” (Cf. FIELD, Handbook of Chr. The., p. 217). We prefer the following simple definition, “Regeneration is the communication of life by the Spirit, to a soul dead in trespasses and sms”

Characteristics of Regeneration. What is ~tTi~ nature of the new birth? “We are not,” says Mr. Wesley, “to expect any minute, philosophical account of the manner of this. This our Savior told Nicodemus, when he said, 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 3:8). Thou mayest be as absolutely assured of

Dr. Julius Kafton says, “Regeneration is the entrance of the new life that is connected with the rise of the Christian faith. This is the conception of regeneration in the narrower 8ense; in the wider sense, it includes justification and sanctification.” This definition has in it something of the confusion which attaches to the Roman Catholic position, especially in its wider aspect. Kafton is usually classified as Ritschlian in his Theology The Calvinistic position is shown in the following

definitions: “Regeneration is that act of God by which the governing disposition of the soul is made holy, and by which, through the truth as a means, the first holy exercise of this disposition is secured.”—Dr. A. H. Strong. “Regeneration may be defined as that work of the Holy Spirit in man by which a new life of holy love, like the life of God, is initiated.”— William Newton Clarke,

Dr. A. M. Hills defines regeneration as “the work of God and man co-operating, by which man resolutely turns from a life of self-gratification, and makes the supreme choice to live for the glory of God and the good of being; having been previously incited thereunto by the convicting and enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit who graciously inclined him to the love of God and holiness.”—H,lls, Fund, Chr. Th., II, p. 200 the fact, as of the blowing of the wind: but the precise manner how it is done, how the Holy Spirit works this in the soul, neither thou nor the wisest of the children of men are able to explain” (WESLEY,Sermon on the New Birth). The subject may be approached from a twofold point of view, (1) that of the oper~atiQxLQLQQd; and (2) the nature of the work wrought in t~.gejierate From the viewpoint of the operation of God there are three terms used to denote the work of regeneration

(1) The first and simplest is that of~ a begetting, as in 1 John 5:1—every one that loveth him that begat ~o-avra] loveth him also that is begotten of him y€y€vv~p~vov] .“ St. Peter (1, 1: 3) uses the expression begotten us again ~~racI; while St. James declares that Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth (James 1:18). While it is veiled in the translation, the word used by St. James is expressive of the maternal ~iaiijo-€vJ rather than the paternal function. The word is the same as that translated “bringeth forth” in verse 15. (2) Another term~ ~ in this connection is that of a “quickening” or “making alive.” Thus, the Son quickeneth {~pioirot€Z or makes alive] whom he will (John 5:21); and again, He hath quick-

Professor Burwash says that it is the soul’s entrance on the new life which Mr. Wesley specifically regards as the new birth. In the latter part of the sermon, he allows that the term “new birth” is used in all the standards of the Church of England in a different sense from this, to designate the new relationship in which a man is placed before God and the Church in the ordinance of baptism. But whatever may have been his interpretation of the church formulary, he puts it aside and preaches only the Arminian doctrine of the new birth and this is “an inward change of nature, inseparably associated with a change of relation to God, and a profound crisis of religious experience.” Professor Burwash also maintained that it was to “this view of regeneration, with the corresponding views of justification, justifying faith,” and assurance, that the power of revival preaching was largely due. He says, “This entire system of doctrine of salvation sets before men 8omething so definite as the test of their moral and religious condition that every man’s conscience must respond with a definite ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to the question, ‘Am I saved?’ It is throughout the doctrine of a present and conscious salvation. Any doctrine of an election from all eternity, or of a personal redemption completed unconditionally in Christ, or of a sacramental salvation, the germ of which is implanted in baptism, and which is gradually and unconsciously carried forward to perfection by the means of grace, can never be made the basis of such appeal to the unconverted as is founded upon the doctrine before us” (Cf. Harrison, Weelcyan Standards, I p. 364) ened us together {a-vv€~oo1Tot’qo-€] with Christ (Eph. 2:5). (3) The third term presents.this~ work~as~a-.~ereatmg” or “á ~~tion.” Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature TIO-tc creation 1 (2 Cor. 5: 17); and again, we are his workmanship,2q/.La, creation] created {KTLO-OE’vTec] in Christ Jesus unto good works (Eph. 2: 10). In this connection, Dr. Pope

reminds us that “we must remember the analogy of the genesis of all things at the beginning: there was an absolute creation of matter, or calling that which was not into being; and there was a subsequent fashioning of that matter into forms which constitute the habitable cosmos. The latter is the creation on which the scripture most dwells: whether it regards the physical or spiritual order. Just as the sleeper is dead, and the dead is only asleep—awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead—so creation is only a renewal, while the renewal is no less a creation. The two are sometimes united” (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 6) As viewed from the nature of the work wrquglit in the souls of men, regeneration is described in the Scriptures by a series of terms comparable to those which express the operation of God. Hence instead of the terms begetting, quickening and creating, we have such terms as the new birth, a spiritual resurrection, and a new creature. (1) Thefirst of these, or the p.ewJ~j~” is taken from the conversation of our Lord with Nicodemus. The statement is emphatic, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God (John 3: 3, 6,

7). This is His only formal statement on this subject and must, therefore, be given pre-eminence. As previously indicated in our discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit (Chapter XXV), regeneration must be regarded as that impartation of life to the souls of men, which sets them up as distinct individuals in the spiritual realm. Evidently our Lord intended by His use of the term “born from above,” to make a distinction between the prevenient grace which is given to all men, and the mysterious issue of this grace in individual regeneration. That regeneration is thus a distinct and completed act is shown by St. John’s use of the term. The word for born is ~ y€y€vv~voc, and being used in the perfect form, denotes the completion of a process. Our Lord also emphasizes the distinct moral quality of the new birth. He says, That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit (John 3:6). This “new birth” carries with it, therefore,ilig idea of a bestowment of life, and is the result ~fli~at divine operation by which the souls of men are r~estorej~Lta fellowship with God. (2) The second term used to describe the regenerate life is that of a spirituaL4uiekening~or resurrection While the “newi5iiih” carries with it the idea of the origin and moral quality of the new life, the “resurrection” in a spiritual sense, sets this new life in contrast with the previous state of sin and death. St. Paul emphasizes this contrast in a twofold manner. He

Mr. Wesley points out the analogy between the natural and spiritual birth as follows: “A man’s being spiritually born again, bears a near analogy to the natural birth. Before a child is born, it has eyes, but does not see: and ears, but it does not hear. It has a very imperfect use of any other sense. It has no knowledge of anything, nor any understanding. To that existence we do not even give the name of life. It is only when a child is born that it begins to live. He then begins to see the light, and the various objects which surround him. His ears are opened, and he hears sounds. And all the other senses begin to be exercised upon their proper objects, and he breathes and lives in a manner, very different from what he did before. In like manner, before a man is born of God, he has eyes, but in a spiritual sense, does not see. Hence he has no knowledge of God, or of the things of God, either of spiritual or eternal things, But, when he is born of God, the eyes of his understanding are opened. He sees the light of the knowledge of the glory of God. He is conscious of a peace that passeth all understanding, and feels a joy unspeakable and full of glory. He feels the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost which is given to him. And all his spiritual senses are exercised to discern spiritual good and evil. Now he may be properly said to

live: God having quickened him by his Spirit, he is alive to God through Jesus Christ."—Wesley, Sermon on the New Birth

Regeneration is for the individual man, what the coming of Christ is for the human race: it is the absolute turning point, where the earlier development of character is broken off and terminated, and a new and holy development of life begins; a turning point which has been heralded by a series of external and internal workings of preparatory grace. Regeneration may be described as the breaking out of grace in the man; or, with equal propriety, as the breaking out of freedom in the man, for regeneration denotes precisely that these two factors have henceforward found their living point of union, and that a new personality is established, a copy of the divine and human personality of Christ. "If any man be in Christ, ' says the apostle, "he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new,"

—Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 383 says, You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1); and you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses (Col. 2: 13). In the former, the contrast is between the new life, and death under the condemnation of the law; in the latter, between the new life, and the idea of death as a defilement. Regeneration, then, is a spiritual quickening, by which the souls of men dead in trespasses and sins are raised to walk in newness of life. It is an introduction into a new world, where there are new tastes, new desires and new dispositions. St. Paul exhorts them, therefore, to yield themselves to God, as those that are alive from the dead, and declares that sin shall not have dominion over them (Rom. 6: 13, 14). From this it is evident that while regeneration is the infusion of divine life into the soul, it must not be regarded as the removal of anything infused by sin into the nature of the spirit. (3) T~e third term used in this connection, is that of a "new ~creation" br~a "new creature." If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature (2 Cor. 5: 17). As a "birth from above" regeneration must be understood to be a sharing of the life of Christ. I am come, He said, that they might have life (John 10: 10). As a quickening or spiritual resurrection, regeneration is the communication of the life of Christ glorified. St. Paul declares that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life (Rom. 6: 4). As a new creature, man is restored to the original image in which he was created. Christ is the great pattern or

Dr. Miley lays it down as a principle, that "the offspring is in the likeness of the parentage." "This is the principle," he says, "which opens the clearer view of regeneration. As by natural generation we inherit from the progenitors of the race a corruption of the moral nature, so by the new birth we receive the impress and likeness of the Holy Spirit. This is our interpreting principle, Nor is it fetched from afar, but is right at hand in the classical passage on regeneration: 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' In the first part the truth is deeper than the derivation of a body of flesh in the form and likeness of the parental body: it means the inheritance of a corrupt nature. As the depravity of the original parentage is transmitted through natural generation, so through regeneration we are transformed into the moral likeness of the Holy Spirit."—Miley, Syst. Th., II, pp. 330-331 archetype, and man is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him (Col. 3: 10, 11)

Errors respecting regeneration. Before beginning a systematic discussion of the errors respecting regeneration, it may be well to note briefly, some of the more popular misconceptions of this basic

experience. (1) Regeneration is not a stage in naturalistic evolution. The assertion that regeneration is merely the unfolding of previously existing spiritual elements in a man is false. Man apart from the grace of God, is destitute of spiritual life. A power from above must enter his soul. A wholly new beginning must be made. (2) Regeneration is not the transition from childhoo.d to manhood,~ as..Js..Jrequently advocated by certain psychologists. It is true that the period of adolescence is one of marked changes, but this does not in itself produce spiritual life. The latter is not merely a process of natural development, but a special work of the Spirit in creating the soul anew in Christ. (3) Regeneration is~ not.achange oLthe h~igher in distinction from the lower powers of the soul It is not a partial work but a change in the entire nature of the being. (4) Regeneration is not repentance. The latter is a preparatory process leading to regeneration, but must not be identified with it. Regeneration is such a renewal of the whole heart, as to bring dominion over sin. With penitents, this is still the object of search, and, therefore, confessedly unattained. (5) Regeneration is not water baptism. Baptism is the outward sign of an inward grace, and for this very reason cannot be regeneration. St. Peter tells us that baptism is not the putting

Those who have attempted to explain the work of regeneration on the ground of trichotomy. have fallen into the error of partial regeneration. Trichotomy as an assumption of three distinct and essential elements in the constitution of man, holds that the first is material, the second animal and the third spiritual. As it respects regeneration, one class holds that sin has its seat in the soul, and regards the~rpe~j.~aas uncorrupted by the fall. Another class regards the soul and body as without moral quality, and places sin in the~rpei3~aor spirit. This they regard as paralyzed by the fall. In either case, regeneration consists in restoring the 7rPei~a to its place as the controlling factor. This it is readily seen is only a partial regeneration. In reply to this objection. we say that trichotomy as above held is not accepted in the church. There are not two spiritual essences in man, one sinful and the other holy. Furthermore, it makes the human 7rpeDaa the controlling principle instead of the Holy Spirit away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God (1 Peter 3: 21); and this good conscience cannot be attained apart from an inward spiritual renewal. (5) Regeneration is not to beidentifled with either justificatiöfi öi~inttiaI ~anctiflcation It is true that they are concomitant, but they are not identical. This is the error of the Roman Catholic Church The theological errors respecting regeneration may be systematically treated under the following general heads: (1) Sacramentarianism; (2) Pelagianism; and

(3) Calvinistic monergism. Philosophically considered, these errors arise from an ~ upon one aspect of personality, either that of the mystical, thëT~tional or the volitional

1. Sacramentarianism represents, perhaps, the earliest error respe~tIngregene~ation. Since the inner spiritual transformation and the outward symbolic representation of it were so closely related in thought, early patristic literature came to identify the two. In this, Jewish influence was prominent. During the intertestamental period, the convert to Judaism was said to be “born again.” As such, he became a proselyte, either of the gate, which admitted him to the civil privileges and a place in the court of the Gentiles; or of righteousness, which bound him to the whole law. It is thus seen that regeneration was used in the sense of adoption, or an induction into the outward privileges of the covenant. It was in this sense that the idea of regeneration was introduced into the church. This is shown by our Lord’s use of the term as referring to the future regeneration of all things. In the development of the doctrine, the following stages may be noted: (1) As in the case of Jewish proselytes, the “new birth” came~ ta repr~sj~j.~jpitiation by baptism into the mysteries of

the Christian~ate. While the inner spiritual renewal was faithfully taught, it was not always connected with. the term, and hence regeneration came to be used in the sense of adoption. Baptism, therefore, was looked upon as the completing act in the appropriation of Christianity, and the seal of positive adoption into the family of God. (2) Re- generation being confused with adoption, the latter came to be viewed as the precursor of the new life, instead of being concomitant with it. It was held to be the state out of which the new life should flow if preliminary grace was used aright. Hence regeneration came to be regarded as sacramentally pledged by virtues of the grace preveniently bestowed upon all men. Baptism, then, was the sign of the blessing into which this grace was expected to mature. It was in this sense that infant baptism was generally understood. As such, it was the seal of adoption into the privileges of the covenant by virtue of Christian parentage, and the pledge of divine grace which should later prompt them to personal dedication. They were thus regarded as being made outwardly holy, and given the sign and seal of the impartation of inward blessings in so far as they were capable of receiving them. To adults, baptism was the sign and seal of pardon and renewal. (3) Baptism.being so closely related to adoption and regeneration, came to be further regarded as the instrument by which ~the inner transformation was effected. As early as the middle of the second century, it may be said that baptismal regeneration had become prevalent in the teachings of the church. Furthermore, baptism was regarded as securing the “remission of sins” and, therefore, regeneration was not only confused with adoption, but with justification and sanctification as well. Thus according to the Nicene Creed, there is “one baptism for the remission of sins,” and this was interpreted as being unto pardon, regeneration and sanctification. The confusion of this position was more or less removed by the Reformers, especially as it concerned the distinction between justification and sanctification

Dr. Pope gives the following in defense against the error of baptismal regeneration. (I) It should be remembered that baptism is the seal of all the blessings of the covenant, and not of the new birth apart and alone; the term baptismal may as well be applied to justification and sanctification as to regeneration. (2) Scripture connects the new birth with baptism, which is its ordained seal and pledge; but the covenant seal may assure the believer of a past fact, a present gift, or of a bless. ing yet to come. Union with Christ is 8ymbohzed in this sacrament, which, however, is like circumcision, of no avail apart from faith. in Christianity there is no grace “cx opere operato” or dependent upon official acts.—Pope, Higher Catechism, p. 249

2. Pelagianism represents the rationalistic tendency m the early church Durmg the fifth century, the controversy between Pelagianism and Augustinianism marked the extremes of thought concerning the doctrines of grace. The former was synergistic, but stressed the human element almost to the exclusion of the divine; the latter was monergistic, emphasizing the divine to the exclusion of the human. Between these extremes were various mediating positions, such as Semi-Pelagianism and Semi-Augustinianism. (1) Pelagianism regarded the change effected by regeneration as an act of the human will. Regeneration was not, therefore, a renewal of the will by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but the illumination of the intellect by the truth. God’s grace was designed for all, but man must make himself worthy, by choosing the right and fully fixing his purpose on the good. As we are imitators of Adam in sin, so we must become imitators of Christ in order to salvation. (2) Semi-Pelagianism maintained that fallen man was g~aciously restored by the redemptive work of Christ to that extent, that the will was given its freedom and power. Hence

regeneration was regarded as the divine blessing upon human volition. (3) At a later time, the Latitudinarians held that all men were regenerated in Christ, and, therefore, no subsequent regeneration was necessary. (4) In.~ ode~txL times, this rationalistic tendency is found in those churches which hold that regeneration is effected by the power of truth alone. The error in all these positions is to be found in the dePelagianism which denied original sin, regarded regeneration asmerely the renewal of human nature through Christian discipline. SemiPelagianism taught that man's power was only weakened by the fall, and this finds expression in some modern theories which hold that regeneration is the right exercise of our own faculties under the influence of grace

Lutheran Synergism rightly taught that there is a co-operation of the human will with divine grace, but it did not trace this with sufficient distinctness to the special grace of the Spirit restored in redemption. Wesleyanism, even more than earlier Arminianism developed the doctrine of prevenient grace, asserting that man is not now found in the fallen 8tate of nature simply, but that very nature itself is grace; that the Spirit works through the word with His own preliminary influences, deepening and bringing them to perfection; and that this continuous prevenient grace is in salvation consummated by the gift of regenerate life (Cf. Pope, Higher Catechism, p. 220) thai of the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit, who alone can effect the new birth

3. Calvinistic monergism represents the opposite extreme of thought in relation to the work of regeneration. It holds that regeneration is the first step in the ordo salutis, or order of salvation; that this is effected unconditionally by the Holy Spirit apart from any preparatory steps; and that the mind of man is, therefore, perfectly passive in its reception. Thus the Westminster Confession of Faith declares that "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 Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." So also Witsius, after defining regeneration as "that supernatural act of God whereby a new and divine life is infused into the elect person spiritually dead," states that "there are no preparations antecedent to the first beginning of regeneration; because, previous to that, nothing but mere death, in the highest degree is to be found in the person of the regenerated." "You will say, then, that there are no preparatory dispositions to the first regeneration? I confessedly answer, there are none." It is evident that if regeneration is the first effect of saving grace on the heart, then it precedes both repentance and faith. The Calvinistic order is (1) regeneration; (2) faith; (3) repentance; and (4) ~onyersion

Against this position, Arminianism has always strenuously objected, on both theologic Fàhcj ~piàctical grounds (1) It objectsto making regener~t~n~the~.rst step in the process- of salvation, in-that this is a virtual denial of any gracious influence upon the heart previous In Buck's Theological Dictionary, under the article "Conversion," the position of Calvinism is stated as follows: "In regeneration, man is wholly passive; in conversion, he is active. The first reviving in us is wholly the act of God, without any concurrence of the creature; but after we are revived, we do actively and voluntarily live in His sight. Regeneration is the motion of God in the creature; conversion is the motion of the creature to God, by virtue of that first principle: from this principle all the acts of believing, repenting, mortifying, quickening. do spring. In all these a man is active; in the other he is merely passive to regeneration. Nothing is clearer in the Scriptures than this, that before one can be made the child of God by regenerating grace, he must first make use of preven-. ient grace by repenting, believing and calling upon God. As many as received him, to

them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name (John 1: 12); For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26); and Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord (Acts 3: 19). Since this doctrine, therefore, conflicts with the Bible doctrine of prevenient grace, we cannot admit its truth. (2) Clqsely related to this, is the objection that Calvinism does in. fact, identify regeneration with incipieflt grace instea4 of making it concomitant with justification and adoption It maintains that the first act of grace upon the heart of the sinner regenerates him. Following this are faith, repentance and conversion. Thus we have according to this system, a regenerated person who has not yet repented, who has not been pardoned, and hence is still a sinner. The mere statement of this position is its own refutation. (3) Objection is further made to the Calvinistic idea of passivity. That regeneration is solely the The work of regeneration is synergistic and not monergistic, as is affirmed by the Augustinian anthropology. From the standpoint in which the above discussion places us, the controversy between monergists and synergists is reduced to narrow limits, is confined to a single view. Monergism affirms that the work of regeneration is the sole work of the Spirit. Synergism affirms that the will of man co-operates in this work. Now, of course, to affirm that the Spirit does what He does, is an identical proposition; there can be no controversy so far. Again, that creating anew is a divine work; that the only agency competent to effect the change we call regeneration is the omnipotent will of God is also evident; all evangelical Christians are agreed on this point. The point of controversy is found in the question, “Is the work of regeneration conditioned upon any volition of the human mind, or is it wholly unconditioned?” The work is divine—wholly divine—but whether the doing, the fact of its being done, depends solely upon the sovereign will of God, entirely separate from, and independent of, the human will, or is made dependent upon the co-operating consent of both the human and the divine will, is the question. The human agency is not employed in the work of regenerating—this is God’s work—but in the performance of antecedent conditions; in hearing the word and giving good heed thereto, in repenting of sin and doing works meet for repentance, and in believing and trusting in the grace and mercy of God through Jesus Christ.—Raymond, Syst. Th., II, pp. 356, 357 work of the Spirit is not denied, but that it is absolutely so, apart from all conditions, is not according to the Scriptures. We are commanded to seek, to ask, to repent, to open the heart, and to receive Christ. These are requisites which cannot be met apart from human agency. There can be no regeneration without them, and yet they are not possible to the unaided resources of fallen human nature. While this help is graciously bestowed upon man by the Spirit, yet with every communication of saving grace, there must be the cooperation of the human will. The soul may resist and be lost, or it may accept and be born of the Spirit. This is the uniform testimony of Scripture. (4) To deny all conditions as prerequisites to regeneration, is to link the doctrine with unconditional election. Hence all the five, points of Calvinism follow immediately, predestination1imited atonement, natural inability, irresistible grace ancL6.nal perseverance. These we trust have been sufficiently discussed in connection with the atonement and prevenient grace. (5) There is a final objection drawn -froni~practical considerations. If men are made to feel that there are no conditions to regeneration on their part, they are led into either carelessness or despair. Only as men have been made sensible of the presence of the Holy Spirit, and the necessity of obedience to His awakening and convicting influences, have revivals been promoted, and the work of salvation accomplished. We are, therefore, exhorted to seek the Lord while He may be found, and to call upon Him while He is near

Summary of~.the A .rn~inia~.Doctrine. The doctrine of regeneration as held by Arminian theologians may be summarized under two general heads as follows: (1) It is a work wrought in the souls of rien by. ..the efficient Operation of the Holy Ghost. (2) The Holy Spirit~exThrough the whole process of salvation, man receives grace forgrace; the grace of faith is given when the grace of repentance has been improved; and the power to believe given by grace, being used, the grace of justification, regeneration, and adoption succeeds; each succeeding is conditioned upon the proper improvement of antecedent grace. Man works out what God works in, and on condition of his so working, God works farther, and thus man grows in grace, from the first enlightening of the understanding, to the full completion of the preparation for heaven.—Raymond, Syst. Th., II, p. 358 erts His regenerating power only on certain conditions, that is, on the conditions of repentance and faith. These positions may be amplified to cover the following statements of belief

1. Regeneration is a moral change wrought in the~ hearts of men by the H1y Spirit. This change is neither physical nor intellectual, although both the body and the mind may be affected by it. It is not a change in the substance of the soul, nor is it the addition of any new powers. Regeneration is not a metamorphosis of human nature. Man does not receive a new ego. His personal identity is the same in essence after regeneration as before. He has the same powers of intellect, feeling and will, but these are given a new direction. God does not undo in the new creation what He did in the first creation. The change is, therefore, not in the natural constitution of man, but in his moral and spiritual nature. Furthermore, it is important to believe that the whole man,, and not merely certain powers of his being, is the subject of this spiritual renewal

2. This radical change is wrought by the efficient agency of the Holy Spirit It is an act of God Whatever means may be used to bring the soul to Christ, the work itself is wrought solely by the direct, personal agency of the Spirit. The nature of the work indicates this. It

Dr. Pope in his Higher Catechism, thus sums up some of the less prevalent errors concerning regeneration. (I) The ancient Gnostic heresy, still found in its subtle influence, that the spirit in man was not affected by sin, and that the sensuous soul only is renewed. (2) The modern theory that regeneration is itself the gift of a spirit through the Spirit: here, as the opposite of the former, the loss of the spirit is held to have been the effect of sin, which virtually reduced man to a mere body and soul. These two are together refuted as follows: “Regeneration is the spirit of new life imparted by the Spirit to the entire personality and nature of man.” (3) Another error is that of those who suppose the Holy Spirit to give such an ascendancy to the renewed spirit that no sin remains in the regenerate, supposed to preserve his union with Christ. This is refuted by “the Apostle’s testimony that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit giveness of qur sins and in the changing of the relation wlh~i bear to Him; regeneration is the renewal of our fallen nature through the bestowment of iifeonithe ground of this new relationship; while adqption. i~_the restoration of the privileges of sonship by virtue of the new birth. The necessity for justification is found in the fact of guilt; that of regeneration in the fact of depravity; that of adoption in the loss of privilege. Arminianism holds that all three, while distinct in nature and perfect in their kind, are nevertheless bestowed by the same act of faith and consequently concomitant in personal experience

5. Regeneration is accomplished through the instrumentality of the Word. The Holy Spirit uses means, for St. James declares specifically, that Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures (James 1: 18). We need to guard against an

error which has frequently been current in the church, namely, that it is the power of truth alone which regenerates. We need to grasp and hold

It is true that some theologian8, especially of the strict Calvinistic school, have preferred to under8tand by regeneration the primary act of God in man's spiritual recovery, in which almighty power operates upon a purely passive subject, and creates therein a new spiritual sensibility. But this view, as will be shown a little farther on, is not in harmony with the scriptural representation, which assumes a conditioning agency in man, or a consenting rather than a purely passive subject of regeneration. The office of awakening is to produce the sense of need and the measure of aspiration and desire which are requisite to make one a willing subject in the consummation of his spiritual sonship."—Sheldon, Sys. Chr. Doct., p. 454

Regeneration must not be confounded with awakening, though there is a striking similarity between them, and they are often blended together in real life. Awakening precedes regeneration, but it does not constitute it. Awakening is certainly a work of grace, affecting the en. tire personality of the man, raising his consciousness to a higher religious state, a state to which he could not raise himself by his own natural powers. The awakened man is as yet only aroused by grace, he is not actually endowed with grace: he is still one of the called, not the chosen. There i8 still wanting a decided resolve on his own part. Awakening, as such, is only a state of religious distress, a pathos, in which the man is involuntarily influenced; it must be viewed as analogous to those congenial circumstances in a person's life, which must not be identified with his own free discretion and action. Grace cannot advance toward its goal except through a voluntary act of surrender on the part of the man himself.—Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 384

Mr. Wesley says that "Justification relate8 to that great work which God does for us, in forgiving our sins; and that regeneration relates to the great work which God does in us, in renewing our fallen nature." clearly in mind that it is not the truth apart from the operation of the Spirit which regenerates, nor is it the action of the Spirit apart from and independently of the truth. That the Spirit uses the truth as the instrument in both regeneration and sanctification is clearly set forth in the Scriptures (Cf. Acts 16: 14; Eph. 6: 17; 1 Peter 1: 23). Perhaps one of the best guarded statements concerning the relation of the Spirit and the truth in regeneration is that of Dr. Daniel Fiske, published in the Bibliotheca in 1865. He says, "In regenerating men, God in some respects acts directly and immediately on the soul, and in some respects He acts in connection with and by means of the truth. He does not regenerate them by the truth alone, and He does not regenerate them without the truth. His mediate and immediate influences cannot be distinguished by consciousness, nor can their respective spheres be accurately determined by reason."

6. Regeneration is related to sanctification. The life bestowed in regeneration is a holy life. It is for this reason that Mr. Wesley spoke of it as the gateway to sanctification. In its relation to regeneration, however, a distinction must be made between initial and entire sanctification. Initial sanctification is, in the Wesleyan scheme, concomitant with justification, regeneration and adoption, while entire sanctification is subsequent to it. The distinction arises from the fact that guilt which as condemnation for sin is removed by justification, carries with it also, an aspect of pollution which can be removed only by cleansing. For this reason Wesleyanism has always held that sanctification begins with regeneration, but it limits this "initial sanctification" to the work of cleansing from the pollution of guilt and acquired depravity, or, the depravity which necessarily

attaches to sinful acts. Entire sanctification, then, is subsequent to this, and from the aápect-of~puri1ication~ is. a cleansing of the heart from original sin or inherited depravity. The distinction, therefore, is grounded in the twofold character of sin—sin~ as an act, and sin~ as a state. Those who hold to the doctrine of entire sanctification frequently take a position concerning regenera tion which is logically opposed to it. They regard regeneration as such a “change of heart” as amounts to only a renovation of the old life. This renovation is regarded as complete, and hence no place is found for a further work of grace, But this is a misconception of the work of regeneration. It is not a remaking of the old life, but an impartation of new life. Regeneration, therefore, “breaks the power of cancelled sin and sets the prisoner free,” but it does not destroy the inbeing of original sin. “What has occurred,” says Dr. Raymond, “is not a complete removal of what is called the flesh, or its weakness, not an entire removal of the carnal mind, but a bestowment of power to conquer it, to walk not after it, but to walk after the Spirit, and so to conquer the flesh and live after the Spirit as to maintain a constant freedom from condemnation. The thing done is salvation from the reigning power of inbred or original sin; it is deliverance from captivity; he is free whom the Son maketh free; it is a bestowment, by the grace and power of God by which man is empowered to volitionate obedience” (RAYMOND, Syst. Th., II, p. 358)

Regeneration in Its Larger Relations. The Christian privilege of sonship, whether regarded as regeneration or adoption, connects the Holy Trinity in a particular The relation of regeneration to the order of grace and other privileges, is thus stated by Dr. Pope: (I) As to the Christian life generally, regeneration takes the middle place between the life of release from condemnation and the life everlasting which follows the resurrection. (2) As to preliminary grace, regeneration is not merely its full development, but a new gift of life in Christ, for which that grace only prepares: the preparation may be mistaken for the gift, inasmuch as it shows many signs of a life of its own. (3) As to original sin, regeneration brings entire freedom from its power: “For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death” (Rom. 8:2). (4) To justification and sanctification it is related as the new life is related to the righteousness and holiness of that life. (5) It ii the substratum of all ethics, which are in this relation viewed as the growth of the new man, or fruits of a new nature, or the gradual renewal into the original image of God lost or defaced through sin. As to the conditions and means of regeneration, he gives the following:

(I) The preliminary grace of repentance and faith, used under the influence of the Spirit, is the condition. (2) The efficient cause is the Spirit using the Word of God. (3) The sacraments are the seals and pledges of the new life: baptism of its bestowment, and the Eucharist of its continuance and increase. Channels, strictly speaking, they are not. (4) But the formal cause is the formation of Christ in the soul as the principle and element of its new life.”—Pope, Higher Catechism, pp. 244, 245 manner with the administration of redemption. Each of the Persons is vitally involved. It is said of the Father, that Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth (James 1: 18); of the Son, I am come that they might have life (John 10: 10); and of the Holy Spirit, That which is born of the Spirit is spirit (John 3: 6). The Father is the pattern of all true paternity, and His relation to the eternal Son, becomes in some sense, the type of His relation to His created sons. The Son as the Logos of creation takes on a new aspect in respect to the filial creation, in that we are regenerated by the life of Christ imparted through the Holy Spirit; while the Holy Spirit himself becomes in the truest and deepest sense, “the Lord and Giver of life.” That we may understand how central this doctrine is, it must be considered briefly in relation to the other great doctrines of the gospel

1. Regeneration rnake&~possible to mankindtle~p~rsonal kn~wledg~oLGod. The regenerated soul is àhanged fundamentally in moral and spiritual quality, and this change becomes the ground of a new personal relationship. Tue life communic~1ed~by~.the~Spii4t iw a reproduction~ cf the life of Ch~t in_man. Its quality is of the nature of God. Hence only as man becomes the partaker of the divine nature, does he learn through experience the kind of a being God is. Previous to this he may have had a theoretical knowledge of God; or he may have been given to metaphysical speculation as to the nature of the reality back of all phenomenal experiWe cannot review these various aspects of the new life without being impressed with the feeling that it is in some sense the central blessing of the Christian covenant. Justification is unto life, and this life is devoted to God in sanctification. But the life, as the life is in Jesus, is the unity of all. . . . This specific blessing is in relation to justification and sanctification what the Son is in relation to the Father and the Holy Ghost. . . . He who is the Logos to creation generally is the Son toward the filial creation. But this special relation to the Son extends to both aspects of sonship as adoption and regeneration. We are adopted into the relation which the Son occupies eternally: hence the term which expresses this prerogative isvZoO,oiw,where the pA?,, is preserved as the solitary word that is ever used to signify the Son's relation to the Father. We are regenerated by the life of Christ imparted through the Spirit: hence it is ,raX,-~ yrpkia, and we arer€',cpa,both terms as it were reproducing in time the eternal generation. Our regeneration answers to the eternally Begotten, our adoption to the eternally Beloved.' —Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., Ill, pp. 4, II ence, but only through the character and quality of the life given in regeneration, can man have a positive acquaintance with God. It is through this experience, that we taste and see that the Lord is good (Psalm 34: 8)

2. Regeneration is vitally related to the ~ of God in Christ Jesus Christ is the supreme revelation of God. In Him the truth of God becomes visible, as if projected for us upon the screen of humanity. He may be viewed as a Teacher, a Prophet or a Revealer, but He is more. He is our life (Col. 3: 4). It is for this reason that men miss the true conception of the gospel when they view it merely as a system of ideas instead of a series of spiritual forces. It is indeed, a system of truth, but it is truth vitalized into reality. The doctrinal system is but an attempt to give expression to this reality in a unified and systematic manner. Since Christ is the supreme revelation of God, it is evident that the truth remains outside and apart from man experientially, until Christ is revealed in him as the hope of glory. This explains the fact that unregenerate man frequently fails to accept the revelation of Christ as set forth in the Holy Scriptures. With such it is purely a matter of intellectual investigation, but Christ can be understood only as we are made spiritually like Him. Hence these rationalists have closed the spiritual avenues of approach to the truth, and shut themselves off from that inner affirmation which comes solely through the new birth. It is for this reason that St. Paul declares that if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the eyes 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. 4:3, 4)

3. Regeneration is also related to the enabling power of the Holy Spirit. He not only reproduces the life of Christ in the regenerate as a Revealer, but also as the Agent of enabling grace. The life bestowed in regeneration is not only manifested in new light but in new power. It is a new spiritual beginning for man. It is an ethical change. It is a revitalizing of truth. It lifts the whole process out of the realm of theory into the realm of reality. Not only is a new goal set for man's

Bishop Merrill endeavors to explain the change in the soui made by regeneration, by a distinction between the technical use of the “soul” and the “spirit.” He assumes the unity of our spiritual nature and the oneness of our essential selfhood. The ego in which consciousness inheres is not an aggregation of distinct substances or essences, but is simple and uncompounded. We call this entity the soul, and then it is the soul that remembers, wills and imagines. It is the soul acting in different directions,or exercising its different powers. Thus all the natural faculties, attributes and powers of the soul, have a common nature, essence and being. Now it is possible, he says, to conceive of the soul as existing with all its natural attributes, and yet as destitute of moral character. The soul does not so exist in fact, but when we so conceive by abstracting in the mind, everything from the soul that gives it character, leaving it possessed only of its natural attributes, we leave it in possession of all that the word “soul” expresses, when that word is used in connection with the word “spirit,” so as to require in thought a distinc. tion between soul and spirit, But since the soul does not exist without something to give it character, we must recognize as belonging to it a different set of powers, or attributes, distinct and yet not separate, in quality and manifestation. These additional are moral, and determine character, because they give bent or inclination to all the powers of the soul and determine the life and conduct of the person with reference to goodness or badness. They are qualities in the natural faculties, giving them tone, inclination, impulse and affinity. They are to the soul what temper is to steel, or fragrance to the flower, or heat to the sunlight. We describe them as passions, impulses, desires and affections. They are not the soul but its vesture, its tone, its character. Any change in them is a change in the soul, for they are the soul’s properties. As distinct from the “soul” they are the “spirit.” “Do the Scriptures sustain this distinction?” he inquires. “When the word ‘soul’ occurs in the Bible without the word ‘spirit,’ or any other term conjoined with it requiring a limitation of its meaning, to its exact import, it expresses all that belongs to our spiritual nature, including the natural attributes and moral qualities and dispositions. So also, when the word ‘spirit’ occurs alone, or unconnected with the soul, or any other word that suggests or requires limitation to its more specific meaning, it expresses all that is included in soul and spirit both. It then denotes all our nature that is not material, expressed by the word body. But when the two words are conjoined in the same sentence, each has its own meaning, and must be restricted to its specific import. The word ‘soul’ means the conscious self, the substratum of being, including the natural attributes; and the ‘spirit’ means the tone or disposition of the soul, with its leanings, aversions, and affinities, with reference to the eternal law of righteousness.” He points out also that the words “mind” and “heart” are used in the same manner, either of the terms when used alone referring to the immaterial part of our nature, but when used together, the word “mind” refers more especially to the intellectual powers, and the “heart” to the moral and passional elements within us, Consequently he argues, that the change is in the “spirit” and the “heart,” which are the subjects of cleansing, renewal and change. “The soul with its natural attributes remains the same through all the experiences of sin and pardon, of pollution and washing, or death and life, retaining its identity and its essential aptitudes and powers; but the spirit, the seat and sphere of depravity, and of renewing and sanctifying influences, passes through these changes of character and condition, determining always the moral state of the man. A new soul is impossible, but a new heart and a new spirit are plainly promised, and graciously realized” (Cf. Merrill, Aspects of Chris. tian Experience, pp. II 7ff). - attainment, but power is also given to free him from the bondage of sin, and to cause him to always triumph in Christ. This new life is devoted to God in sanctification, and he needs now to

advance to the goal of entire sanctification, in which the heart is purified from all sin by the baptism with the Holy Spirit

ADOPTION

Adoption is the declaratory act of God, by which upon~being justified by faith m Jesus Christ, we are received into the family of God and reinstated in the privileges of sonship. Adoption as we have previously indicated, is concomitant with justification and regeneration, but in the order of thought, logically follows them. Justffication removes our guilt, regeneration changes our hearts, and adoption actually receives us into the family of God. Like the term regeneration, adoption has a wider application in the Scriptures, than that which is concerned immediately with the restoration of the individual. St. Paul uses the term broadly to express, (1) the special election of Israel from among the nations, to whom pertaineth the adoption (Rom. 9: 4); (2) the purpose of the incarnation, that we might receive the adoption of sons (Gal. 4: 5); and (3) the full assur~ce of a future inheritance, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body (Rom. 8: 23). It will be noticed that this last scripture bears a close relation to

Adoption is an act of God's free grace, whereby, upon the forgiveness of sins, we are received into the number, and have a right to all the privileges, of the sons of God.—Wesleyan Catechism, Adoption is the term occasionally used to signify the divine declaratory act by which those who are accepted in Christ are reinstated in the privileges of forfeited sonship for the sake of the Incarnate Son. It is used also of the state to which these privileges belong.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p, 13. Adoption is "that act of God's free grace by which, upon our being justified by faith in Christ, we are received into the family of God, and entitled to the inheritance of heaven."—Ralston, Elem. of Divinity, p. 435 In civil government sonship by adoption is sonship by provision of law, not on the ground of parentage. In the absence of such ground, adoption is the only mode of sonship. Now there is a sense in which we are alien from God; out of filial relation to Him, Hence, when we are so viewed as the subjects of a gracious affiliation, our sonship may very properly be represented as in the mode of adoption. But it is never really such in fact. The new birth always underlies this sonship.—Miley, Syst. Theology, II, pp. 337, 338

Matt. 19: 28, where our Lord speaks of the final regeneration of all things. Both terms refer to man's restoration to his original estate. The word adoption is characteristic of St. Paul, and is used to express the privileges to which regeneration introduces believers under the terms of the new covenant. He uses both the words v~6c and 'rE'Kvov of the Christian, while St. John, who is concerned with the community of life, uses only 7'€Kvov, reserving the word vi_c for the sonship of Christ. The term v~oO&rt'a or ado ptio meant in ordinary usage, the act of a man in taking into his household as his own, children which were not born to him. Civil adoption, however, always required the consent of the person to be adopted, which was publicly demanded and expressed

&neftts of Adoption. The blessings which flow from adoption into the family of God are many and desirable. These may be summarized as follows: (1) The privilege of sonship. We become the children of God by

Dr. Wakefield includes in his treatment of this subject, the following interesting account of the ceremony of adoption. He says, Among the Romans the ceremony of adoption consisted in buying the child to be adopted from his parents for a sum of money formally given and taken. The parties

appeared before the magistrate in the presence of five Roman citizens: and the adopting father said to the child, ‘Art thou willing to become my son?’ to which the child replied, ‘I am willing.’ Then the adopter, holding the money in his hand, and at the same time taking hold of the child, said, ‘I declare this child to be my son according to Roman law, and he is bought with this money,’ which was given to the father as the price of his son,” “Thus the relation was formed according to law; and the adopted son entered into the family of his new father, assumed his name, became subject to his authority. and was made a legal heir to the whole of the inheritance, or to a share of it if there were other sons.” “Of the same nature is that transaction in the divine economy by which men are acknowledged to be the children of God. We may, therefore, define adoption, according to the scriptural sense of the term, to be that gracious act of God by which we are acknowledged to be of the number and become entitled to all the privileges of His children.”—Wakefleld, Chr. Th., p. 483,

“Betwixt civil and sacred adoption,” says John Flavel, “there is a twofold agreement and disagreement. They agree in this, that both flow from the pleasure and good will of the adoptant; and in this, that both confer a right to the privileges which we have not by nature; but in this they differ; one is an act imitating nature, the other transcends nature; the one was found out for the comfort of them that had no children, the other for the comfort of them that had no Father. Divine adoption is in Scripture either taken properly for that act or sentence of God by which we are made sons, or for the privileges with which the adopted are invested. We lost our inheritance by the fall of Adam; we receive it by the death of Christ, which restores it again to us by a new and better title.” faith in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3: 26); And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ (Rom. 8: 17); And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son; then an heir of God through Christ (Gal. 4: 6, 7). The kingdom of heaven has been described as “a parliament of emperors, a commonwealth of kings; every humble saint in that kingdom is coheir with Christ, and hath a role of honor and a scepter of power and a throne of majesty and a crown of glory.” (2) Filial confidence towariLGod For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father (Born, 8: 15). The Spirit of adoption brings deliverance from the bondage of sin. Condemnation is removed, spiritual darkness dispelled, and God’s approval placed upon the soul. (3) The unity of the soul with Christ. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for the which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren (Heb. 2: 11). This unity is wrought by the Holy Spirit, a gift promised by our Lord to all His disciples. Those who have been born of the Spirit become candidates for the baptism with the Spirit. Through Him as the Comforter or Paraclete, we are to be blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ (Eph. 1: 3)

(4) A proprietary right in all that Christ has and is. All things are yours. . . . And ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s (1 Cor. 3: 21, 23). (5) The right and .title to an eternal inheritance. St. Peter speaks of this inheritance as incorruptible, and unde filed, and that fadeth not away (1 Peter 1: 4). It is called a “kingdom” (Luke 12: 32; Heb. 12: 28); a “better country” (Heb. 11: 16; a “crown of life” (James 1: 12); a “crown of righteousness” (2 Tim. 4: 8); and an “eternal weight of glory” (2 Cor. 4: 17). “Whatever God now is to angels and glorified saints,” says Dr. Dick, “and whatever He will be to them through an endless duration, for all this the adopted sons of God are authorized to hope. Even in this world, how happy does the earnest of the inheritance make them! How divine the

peace which sheds its influence upon their souls! How pure and elevating the joy which in some select hour, springs up in their bosoms! How are they raised above the pains and pleasures of life, while, in the contemplations of faith, they anticipate their future abode in the higher regions of the universe! But these are only an earnest" (Lecture 73) The Evidence of Adoption. The doctrine of assurance is one of the precious doctrines of the gospel. Nor is there any doctrine more clearly taught in the Scriptures than that of experiential religion. As in the case of the new birth, we may not understand the Spirit's operations, yet we may and can know the fact, Theologians sometimes make a distinction between the "witness of the Spirit" and the doctrine of "assurance," yet in the conscious experience of the believer, they are substantially the same. We shall, therefore, follow the practice common to Arminian theologians, and treat this subject under the head of the "Witness of the Spirit." THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT By the Witness of the Spirit, is meant that inward evidence of acceptance with God which the Holy Spirit reveals directly to the consciousness of the believer, This doctrine is held by the great majority of evangelical Christians, but may be said in a peculiar sense to have been revived in modern times by Mr. Wesley and his coadjutors. Mr. Wesley in turn, received it from the Moravians, although it was contained in the doctrinal standards of his own church. When, however, his mind was fully awakened to the truth, he found he could no longer follow the Moravian guides, and so turned to the Scriptures, which he studied with that tireless energy which was so characteristic of his labors. He had proved beyond question that the earlier fathers taught this doctrine, and sustained his position by quotations from Origen, Chrysostom, Athanasius and Augustine; but it was only in the Scriptures that he found the true principles of its defense. "The Methodists, in proof of the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit," wrote Dr. Adam

Clarke, "refer to no man, not to Mr. John Wesley himself '~They appeal to none—they appeal to the Bible, where this doctrine stands as inexpügñable as the p11-lars of heaven." Added to this was the practical and experiential aspects of the doctrine which they so fully developed. "There is nothing more usual," continues Dr. Clarke, "among even the best educated and enlightened of the members of the Methodist society, than a distinct knowledge of the time, place and circumstances, when and where, and in which way, they were deeply convinced of sin, and afterward had a clear sense of God's mercy to their souis, in forgiving their sins, and giving them the witness in themselves that they were born of God" (CLARKE, Chr. Th., p. 169). It is for these reasons that the best in the literature on this subject must be drawn from the writings of the fathers of Methodism The Scripturai. sis~ofJib~,Doctr4ne. The Scriptures afford many illustrations of men who enjoyed the witness of the Spirit. In the Old Testament we have the record of Abel (Heb. 11: 4); Enoch (Heb. 11: 5); Job (19:25); David (Psalm 32:5; 103:1, 3, 12); Isaiah (6: 7); and Daniel (9: 23). The New Testament likewise abounds with references to this doctrine (Cf. Acts 2: 46; 8: 39; 16: 34). As proof texts supporting this position, the following may be mentioned, The Spirit itself ~?. In/EU/La or the same Spirit] beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God (Rom. 8: 16); ye Of this doctrine Mr. Wesley wrote, "It more nearly concerns the Methodists, to call, clearly to understand, explain, and defend the doc. trine; because it is one great part of the testimony which God has given them to bear to all mankind. It is by His peculiar blessing upon them in searching the Scriptures, confirmed by the experience of His children, that this great evangelical truth has been recovered, which had been for many years well-nigh lost and forgotten.—Wesley, Works, Vol. I, p. 93 The direct teaching of Mr. Wesley upon this subject is found in Sermon X on the Witness of the Spirit, written in 1747. Sermon XII on the Witness of Our

Own Spirit, was written in I 767, twenty years later. Sermon XI, likewise on the Witness of the Spirit was written in 1771. and interposed between Sermons X and XII, in order to present the aspect of the continuous state of assurance, arising Out of the initial assurance described in Sermon X. Mr. Watson deals at length with this doctrine in his Institutes, and with “assurance” in his Theological Dictionary. Dr. Adam Clarke emphasizes the witness of the Spirit in his Christian Theology and in his commentaries have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father (Rom. 8: 15); God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father (Gal. 4: 6); He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself (1 John 5: 10); And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth (1 John 5: 6). These passages clearly teach that the Spirit testifies concerning the relation of the believers to God The Twofold Witness of the Spirit. The classical passage on this subject is that found in Romans 8: 16, The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. It is evident that the apostle teaches here, a twofold testimony, th wijncss of the divine Spir~it, and the witness of our own spirit. The first is commonly knöwii ‘as the direct witness, the second as the indirect witness. In addition, the use of the Greek word ~rv,..q.Laprvp€~ seems to imply a conjoint testimony of these two witnesses, the Spirit itself (c~T~ r~ flv€I~a or the same Spirit), being a fellow-witness with our own spirit. The word o-vj.qi.apTvp€2 means literally, “to testify or bear witness together, or at the same time with another, or to add one’s testimony to another” (Cf. WAKEFIELD, Chr. Th., p. 437). The passage is sometimes rendered “bear witness to” instead of “bear witness with” our spirit. This, however, does not change the meaning, but rather strengthens the former position. In maintaining the docI 8hOUld never have looked for the “witness of the Spirit,” had I not found numerous scriptures which most positively assert it, or hold it out by necessary induction; and had I not found that all the truly godly of every sect and party, possessed the blessing, a blessing which is the common birthright of all the sons and daughters of God. Wherever I went among deeply religious people, I found this blessing. All who had turned from unrighteousness to the living God, and sought redemption by faith in the blood of the cross, exulted in this grace. It was never looked on by them as a privilege with which some peculiarly favored souls were blessed: it was known from the scripture and experience to be the common lot of the people of God. It was not persons of a peculiar temperament who possessed it; all the truly religious had it, whether in their natural dispositions sanguine, melancholy or mixed. I met with it everywhere, and met with it among the most simple and illiterate, as well as among those who had every advantage which high cultivation and deep learning could bestow. Perhaps I might with the strictest truth say that, during the forty years I have been in the ministry, I have met with at least forty thousand who have had a clear full evidence that God, for Christ’s sake, had forgiven their sins, the Spirit himself bearing witness with their spirit that they were the sons and daughters of God.—Dr. Adam Clarke, Christian Theology, p. 163 trine of the direct witness of the Spirit, Wesleyanism has had to contend against the mediate or single witness theory. This position is that the Holy Spirit does not bear direct or immediate testimony to the human consciousness, but only mediately through our own spirit. It is argued that the Holy Spirit works certain moral changes in the heart, such as “illuminating our understanding, and assisting our memory in discovering and recollecting those arguments of hope and comfort within ourselves,” and that these are the evidence of our son-ship. But it will be seen that this but reduces the testimony to that of our own spirit; and the Holy Spirit is not brought in at all except to qualify our own testimony. This theory does in fact do away with the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit, and reduces the whole process to mere inference from

subjective changes

1. The Witness of the Divine Spirit. Mr. Wesley held that “the ~té~ith fthSjiiiifl~ an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am the child of God: that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given Himself for me; and that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God” (Sermon X). He points out that the question is not whether there is a testimony of the Spirit, but whether or not this is a direct testimony; “whether there is any other than that which arises from a consciousness of the fruit of the Spirit. We believe there is . . . because, in the nature of the thing, the testimony

It must be evident from what has been already said that to the fact of our adoption two witnesses and a twofold testimony must be allowed. But the main consideration is, whether the Holy Spirit gives His testimony directly to the mind by impression, suggestion, or otherwise, or mediately by our own spirit, in some such way as is described by Bishop Bull in the extract above given; by “illuminating our understanding, and assisting our memory in discovering and recollecting those arguments of hope and comfort within ourselves,” which arise from “the graces which he has produced in us.” But to this statement of the doctrine, we object, that it makes the testimony of the Holy Spirit, in the point of fact, nothing different from the testimony of our own spirit; and that by holding but one witness it contradicts St. Paul, who, as we have seen, holds two. For the testimony is that of our own consciousness of certain moral changes which have taken place no other is admitted; and, therefore, it is but one testimony. Nor is the Holy Spirit brought in at all except to qualify our own spirit to give witness.— Wakefield, Chr. Tb., p. 437 must precede that which springs from it. . . . Does not the Spirit cry, ‘Abba, Father,’ in our hearts the moment it is given, antecedently to any reflection upon our sincerity? Yes, to any reasoning whatsoever! And is not this the plain natural sense of the words which strikes anyone as soon as he hears them? All these texts, then, in their most obvious meaning, describe a direct testimony of the Spirit” (Wesley, Sermons, pp. 94, 99). The value of absolute certainty in matters of such vital importance as the eternal salvation of the soul, cannot be overestimated. Here we must have the highest form of testimony. If there be no direct witness of the Holy Spirit, then the whole matter becomes one of mere inference. But God has not left His people in darkness. He has given us of His Spirit that we may know the things that are freely given to us of God. For this reason Mr. Wesley exhorted his people not to “rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness. There may be foretastes of joy, peace and love, and those not delusive, but really from God, long before we have the witness in ourselves: before the Spirit of God witnesses with our spirits that we have ‘redemption in the blood of Jesus, even the forgiveness of sins.’” “If we are wise,” he continues, “we shall be continually crying to God, until his Spirit cry in our heart, Abba, Father! This is the privilege of all the children of God, and without this we can never be assured that we are His children. Without this we cannot secure a steady peace, nor avoid perplexing doubts and fears, but when we have once received the Spirit of Adoption, this ‘peace

Meantime let it be observed, I do not mean hereby that the Spirit of Cod testifies this by any outward voice; no, nor always by the inward voice, although He may do this sometimes. Neither do I suppose that He always applies to the heart (though He often may) one or more texts of scripture. But He so works upon the soul by His immediate influence, and by a strong though inexplicable operation that the stormy wind and troubled waves subside, and there is a sweet calm, the heart resting as in the arms of Jesus, and the sinner being clearly satisfled that God is

reconciled that all His “iniquities are forgiven, and his sins all covered , . - Now what is the matter of dispute concerning this? Not whether there be a witness or testimony of the Spirit; not whether the Spirit does testify with our spirit, that we are the children of Cod; none can deny this, without flatly contradicting the Scriptures, and charging a lie upon God.”—Wesley, Sermons, 11, p. 94 which passes all understanding,’ will ‘keep our hearts and minds in Christ Jesus.’” (Wesley, Sermons, II, p. 100)

2. The Witness, of QurQi~Spirit. This is the indirect witness of theSpirit, and consists in4heeonseions-ness that individually we possess the character of the children of God. Mr. Wesley held that “it is nearly, if not exactly, the same with the testimony of a good conscience toward God; and is the result of reason and reflection on what we feel in our own souls. Strictly speaking, it is a conclusion drawn partly from the Word of God and partly from our own experience. The Word of God says everyone who has the fruit of the Spirit is a child of God; experience or inward consciousness tells me that I have the fruit of the Spirit; and hence I rationally conclude, therefore I am a child of God

Now, as this witness proceeds from the Spirit of God, and is grounded on what He works in us, it is sometimes called the Spirit’s indirect witness, to distinguish it from the other testimony, which is properly direct” (Sermon XI). Furthermore, this indirect witness is confirmatory, rather than fundamental, “We love him because he first loved us” (1 John 4: 19). “Since, therefore, this testimony of His Spirit must precede the love of God and

Referring to the Spirit’s cry in the soul, Dr. Adam Clarke says that “crying” is not only the participle of the present tense, denoting the continuation of the action; but, being neuter, it agrees with th~ Spirit of his Son; so it is the divine Spirit which continues to cry, ‘Abba, Father!’ in the heart of the true believer. And it is ever worthy to be remarked that when a man has been unfaithful to the grace given, or has fallen into any kind of sin, he has no power to utter this cry. The Spirit is grieved and has departed, and the cry is lost I Were he to utter the words with his lips, his heart would disown them.”—Clarke, Chr. Th.,p. 161 To suppose that through the infinite love of God the eternal Logos became incarnate, suffered and died; that the eternal Spirit visits man with enlightening, sanctifying, guiding, comforting, and saving influences; that holy angels are commissioned to minister unto men; that the Scriptures have been divinely inspired; that the Christian ministry has been divinely appointed; and that the Church, with all its ordi. nances and appliances is divinely employed—all for the accomplishment of man’s personal salvation—and at the same time to suppose that at best the result of all this in the mind of man is but a doubtful impression—a ground for only an uncertain hope—is, to say the least, a great incongruity, and precisely the opposite of all reasonable expectations.—Raymond, Syst. Th., II, p. 362 all holiness, of consequence it must precede our inward consciousness thereof, or the testimony of our spirit concerning them.” Filial love springs from the knowledge of filial relationships, and the direct witness of the Spirit must therefore, precede the indirect, But the indirect is not thereby of less consequence. It is as indispensable as the first, for by it the direct testimony of the Spirit is fully confirmed. “How am I assured,” continues Mr. Wesley, “that I do not mistake the voice of the Spirit? Even by the testimony of my own spirit; by ‘the answer of a good conscience toward God.’ Hereby I shall know that I am in no delusion, that I have not deceived my own soul. The immediate fruits of the Spirit, ruling in the heart, are ‘love, joy, peace, bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering.’ And the outward fruits are the doing of good to all men, and

a uniform obedience to all the commandments of God" (Wesley, Works, I, p. 92). We may

"These fruits (love, joy, and peace) cannot result from anything but manifested pardon; they cannot themselves manifest our pardon, for they cannot exist till it is manifested, God, conceived of as angry, cannot be the object of filial love; pardon unfelt supposes guilt and fear still to burden the mind; and guilt, and 'joy,' and 'peace' cannot coexist.' "—Watson, Institutes, II, Chapt. XXIV

"Again, it is asked if a man be conscious of love, joy and peace, may he not infer therefrom that he is a child of God? We answer, a consciousness of the fruits of the Spirit is the testimony of our own spirit and not of the divine Spirit. It is confirmatory, but it is not primary—not first in order—not basal or fundamental, The love which evidences adoption is filial love; but filial love is conditioned upon a knowledge of filial relations; one does not love God as his father, until he knows God as his father; when the Spirit is given, and the recipient in heart says Abba, Father, then, and not until then, he loves as a child, The witness of the Spirit, then must be antecedent to filial affec. tions. The same may be said of joy and peace. These spring from a sense of salvation; they do not arise till the assurance of adoption has been given; they are evidences of adoption, but evidently do not render the divine testimony useless; so far from rendering a divine testimony unnecessary, they are founded upon and flow from it."—Raymond, Syst. Tb., 2: p. 370 Our own spirit can take no cognizance of the mind of God as to our actual pardon, and can bear no witness to that fact. The Holy Spirit only, who knows the mind of God, can be this witness; and if the fact that God is reconciled to us can be known only to him, by him only can it be attested to us. But we are competent witnesses, from our own consciousness, that such moral effects have been produced within us as it is the office of the Holy Spirit alone to produce; and thus we have the testimony of our own spirit that the Holy Spirit is with us and in us, and that he who bears witness to our adoption is, in truth, the Spirit of God.—Wakefield, Chr. Tb., p. 441 say, then, that these two witnesses taken together, establish the assurance of salvation. The one cannot exist without the other, and taken together, no higher evidences can exist The Common Privileg~e of Believers. We have gone carefully over the scriptural grounds for belief in the witness of the Spirit; have shown that this testimony is inseparably connected with the Spirit of Adoption; that it is indeed essential to filial love; and therefore, that it is as much a part of the common salvation as adoption itself. For this reason, we may safely affirm. that the witness of the Spirit is the common privil~ge of all believers. It is in some peculiar sense, their divine birthright, Closely related to this is the question as to whether or not, the witness of the Spirit can be held in uninterrupted enjoyment. As a matter of observation, it is well known that there are wide differences in the spiritual experiences of believers. Consequently, we should expect the assurance of sonship to vary accordingly. This whole subject, Mr. Wesley reviews with his usual spiritual insight, in his sermon on "The Wilderness State." Finally, the Scriptures speak of the "full assurance of understanding" (Col. 2: 2); the "full assurance of hope" This doctrine has been generally termed the doctrine of assurance; and perhaps the expressions of St. Paul, "the full assurance of faith," and "the full assurance of hope" may warrant the use of the word. But as there is a current and generally understood sense of this term among persons of the Calvinistic persuasion, implying that the assurance of our present acceptance and sonship is an assurance of our final perseverance, and of our indefeasible title to heaven, the phrase, a comfortable persuasion or conviction of our justification and adoption, arising out of the Spirit's inward and direct testimony, is to be preferred; for this has been held as an indubitable doctrine of holy writ by Christians who by no means receive the

doctrine of assurance in the sense held by the followers of Calvin. There is also another reason for sparing the cautious use of the term assurance, which is that it seems to imply, though not necessarily, the absence of all doubt, and shuts out all those lower degrees of persuasion which may exist in the experience of Christians. For, as our faith may not at first, or at all times, be equally strong, the testimony of the Spirit may have its degrees of strength, and our persuasion or conviction be proportionally regulated. Yet if faith be genuine, God respects its weaker exercises, and encourages its growth, by affording measures of comfort, and degrees of this testimony. Never. theless, while this is allowed, the fullness of this attainment is to be pressed upon everyone that believes, according to the Word of God:

“Let us draw near,” says St. Paul to all Christians, “with full assurance of faith.”—Watson, Institutes, II, pp. 407, 408

(Heb. 6: 11); and the “full assurance of faith” (Heb. 10: 22). These refer to a perfect persuasion of the truth as it is in Christ, the fulfillment of the promise of a heavenly inheritance, and entire trust in the blood of Christ. From these Scriptures we must conclude, therefore, that the full assurance of understanding, faith and hope is the privilege of every Christian, and that none ought to rest short of his high calling in Christ Jesus

28. Chapter 29 - CHRISTIAN PERFECTION OR ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Chapter 29 - CHRISTIAN PERFECTION OR ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Christian perfection, or entire sanctification are terms used to express the fullness of salvation from sin, or the completeness of the Christian life. Entire sanctification has been defined as a comprehensive word which bridges the chasm between hell and heaven, sin and holiness, guilt and glorification. To understand the spiritual significance of this work of grace it must be experienced, for spiritual things can be known only by experience. Holiness has been called "the central idea of the Christian system, and the crowning accomplishment of human character." To convey to the mind of man the riches of this grace, the entire Levitical system of the Old Testament is laid under tribute. The terms used embrace the altar and its sacrifice, the priesthood, the ritual with its

Bishop Foster says of holiness that "it breathes in the prophecy, thunders in the law, murmurs in the narrative, whispers in the promises, supplicates in the prayers, sparkles in the poetry, resounds in the songs, speaks in the types, glows in the imagery, voices in the language, and burns in the spirit of the whole scheme, from alpha to omega, from its beginning to its end. Holiness! holiness needed! holiness required! holiness offered! holiness attainable! holiness a present duty, a present privilege, a present enjoyment, is the progress and completeness of its wondrous theme! It is the truth glowing all over, webbing all through revelation; the glorious truth which sparkles and whispers, and sings and shouts in all its history, and biography, and poetry, and prophecy, and precept, and promise, and prayer; the great central truth of the system. The wonder is that all do not see, that any rise up to question, a truth so conspicuous, so glorious, so full of comfort." - FOSTER,Christian Purity, p. 80

Dr. Phineas F. Bresee regarded holiness as the goal of the redemptive process. He says, "Now this baptism with the Holy Ghost is `the blessing of Christ' spoken of in this text. . . . . It is the crowning glory of the work of the soul's salvation. All that ever went before it was preparatory for it. Did prophets speak and write; did sacrifices burn; were offerings made; did martyrs die; did Jesus lay aside the glory; did He teach and pray and stretch out His hands on the cross; did He rise from the dead and ascend into heaven; is He at the right hand of God: It was all preparatory to this baptism. Men are convinced of sin, born again and made new creatures that they may be baptized with the Holy Ghost. This work completes the soul's salvation." - P. F. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 100.

sprinklings and washings, the ceremonies of presentation and dedication, the hallowing and consecration, the sealing and the anointing, the fasts and the feasts - all these point to this New Testament standard of piety. While this subject is a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and of vast importance to the church, there are few subjects in theology concerning which there is a greater variety of opinion. All evangelical Christians hold that it is a Bible doctrine, that it includes freedom from sin, that it is accomplished through the merits of Christ's death, and that it is the

heritage of those who are already believers. They differ widely, however, as to its nature, and the time of its attainment. There are four general positions concerning the subject: (1) that holiness is concomitant with regeneration and completed at that time. This is frequently known as the Zinzendorfian theory. (2) Another class regards it as a growth extending from the time of regeneration until the death of the body. (3) Others hold that man is made holy only in the hour and article of death; while (4) another class believes that holiness begins in regeneration, but is completed as an instantaneous work of the Holy Spirit subsequent to regeneration. It is this view, commonly known as the Wesleyan position, which we shall endeavor to set forth in the following pages. A subject so sacred, however, and an experience so high and holy, forbids in any degree the spirit of controversy. We tread here upon sacred ground; we are through the blood of Jesus to enter into the holiestby a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh(Heb. 10:19). This truth has a large place in the confessions and the theologies, the catechisms and

The doctrine of a purgatorial cleansing from sin, as held by the Roman Catholic Church is sometimes included in the theories of deliverance from sin. The doctrine of purgatory, however, is so far from Protestant thought, that no account need to be taken of it here That this is an experience here and now I need not wait to argue. The New Testament dispensation rests upon it. This is the keystone to the arch of redemption. Take it away and the arch crumbles into decay and ruin. Build the arch and crown it with this all embracing fact and it shines in this world in glorious reflection of the rainbow about the throne, full of the unbraided colors of divine glory. - DR. P. F. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 164.

hymnologies of the church, whether eastern or western, Catholic or Protestant. Needless to say, the whole tenor of the inspired Scriptures isholiness unto the Lord

We shall discuss this subject under the following divisions: (I) The Scriptural Basis for the Doctrine; (II) The Historical Approach to the Subject; (III) The Meaning and Scope of Sanctification; and (IV) Progressive Sanctification. Following this we shall discuss the finished work under two aspects, (V) Entire Sanctification; and (VI) Christian Perfection THE SCRIPTURAL BASIS FOR THE DOCTRINE A careful study of the Holy Scriptures is the best apologetic for the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification. Here, however, we must limit this study to the more prominent proof texts, which we shall arrange according to the following classification: (1) those which speak of Holiness as the New Testament Standard of Christian Experience; (2) those which specifically teach that Entire Sanctification Is a Second Work of Grace; (3) the Tense Readings of the Greek Testament; and (4) Scripture Texts used in Opposition to the Doctrine. For the sake of brevity, texts properly belonging to more than one division, will not generally be duplicated

Holiness as the New Testament Standard of Christian Experience. Here we shall notice those scriptures which refer to the will of God, His promises and His commands 1. It is the will of God that His people shall be holy. (1)Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding

A very extensive class of terms - perhaps the most extensive - exhibits the Christian estate as one of consecration to God. The entire range of phraseology has been transferred from the ancient temple service to the use of the new temple or church. It embraces all aspects of the Christian privilege as one of dedication to God, whether the dedication be external or internal, effected by the Spirit or presented by the believer. But sanctification is here viewed as a blessing bestowed

freely under the covenant of grace; and we must therefore to some extent, though not altogether, omit its ethical relations. As a privilege of the covenant, its principle is twofold: purification from sin, consecration to God; holiness being the state resulting from these. As a gift of grace, it is declared to be perfect in the design of the Spirit; and full provision is made for the entire sanctification of the believer in the present life, even as full provision is made for His finished righteousness and perfect Sonship. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 28.

what the will of the Lord is. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit(Eph. 5:17, 18). This refers to the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, which the disciples received at Pentecost, and of whom it was said,they were all filled with the Spirit. It implies (a) that the disciples had some measure of the Spirit previous to Pentecost; (b) that to be filled with the Spirit necessitates a cleansing from sin; (c) that it is mandatory; (d) that it not only means to be filled to the exclusion of all sin, but to be continuously filled in an ever-enlarging capacity. This is possible because of the property of the Spirit as procession. (e) Lastly, it implies a passive submission to the Spirit in all His offices. (2)For this is the will of God, even your sanctification(I Thess. 4:3). Here holiness or "the sanctification" is set in contrast to the misuse of the body. God’s will is that His people shall be cleansed from all uncleanness, whether of the soul or the body. The text implies that the grace of God can deliver from those fleshly appetites which bind the world in sin. (3) By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all(Heb. 10:10). The one great act of atonement finds its supreme purpose in the sanctification of His people. The blood of Jesus Christ not only furnishes the ground of our justification, but is the medium of our sanctification also

2. God has promised to sanctify His people. (1)Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool(Isa. 1:18). Scarlet is known as one of the most indelible of the dyes, and is here used to designate the stain of sin in the soul. The guilt of actual sin, and the pollution of inbred sin, can be cleansed only by the blood of Jesus Christ. (2)Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you(Ezek. 36:25). The work of the Holy Spirit is here represented by the symbol of water as a cleansing agent. It is to this scripture doubtless that St. Paul refers in II Cor. 7:1. (3)For he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fuller’s soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness(Mal. 3:2, 3). Christ is portrayed by the prophet as the Great Refiner of His people. It should be noted (a) that it is the sons of Levi who are to be purged; and (b) the purpose of this purging is to enable them to make an offering in righteousness. This is a reference doubtless to the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire. (Matt. 3:11, 12). (4)I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me . . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire(Matt. 3:11, 12). Nothing can be more evident than that (a) the baptism with the Holy Ghost effects an internal and spiritual cleansing which goes far deeper than John’s baptism. One was for the remission of sins, the other for the removal of the sin principle. (b) This baptism is applicable to Christians only, not to sinners. (c) The separation is not between the tares and the wheat, but between the wheat and the chaff, or that which clings to it by nature. Sinners are never regarded as wheat, but always as tares. (d)

The wheat thus separated, will be gathered into the garner and preserved; the chaff will be burned, or destroyed with unquenchable fire. The chaff referred to here is not the wicked, but the principle of sin which cleaves to the souls of the regenerate, and which is removed by Christ's purifying baptism

3. God commands His people to be holy. These commands embrace the three terms commonly applied to entire sanctification - holiness, perfection, and perfect love. (1) Be ye holy; for I am holy(I Peter 1:16). This text is a reference to Lev. 19:2. God requires His people to be holy and enjoins it by precept and example. Evangelical holiness is positive and real, not merely typical or ceremonial. There is a relative aspect of holiness as we shall show later, but it is never separated from thatwhich is inwrought by the Spirit. Holiness in God is absolute, and in man is derived, but the quality is the same in God and man. (2)The Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect(Gen. 17:1);Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect(Matt. 5:48). This is the perfection of love, which comes from the purging of all the antagonisms of the soul, which war against it. (3)And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment(Mark 12:30). And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live(Deut. 30:6). Dr. Adam Clarke says that "the circumcision of the heart implies the purification of the soul from all unrighteousness." The love mentioned here is not merely natural human love or friendship (filia), but holy love (agape), or the love created and shed abroad in the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5)

Entire Sanctification as a Second Work of Grace.Of the numerous texts which could be cited in this connection, we limit ourselves to three only. (1)I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God

The love of God is the secret presence of God himself in our souls whilst in eternal blessedness He gives Himself to His saints as the Manifested one. Accordingly, the love of God is not the inward life of man in a state of exaltation, the life of feeling heightened in intensity, but it is a higher principle which has been grafted into man - the Holy Spirit. These words express the substantial cause, love the actual effect: but essentially they are the same, for the love of God cannot be regarded as separate from the essential being of God in its highest manifestation, that is, the Holy Ghost - God's love is there only where God himself is, for He is love, and does not have love as something in or beside Himself. - OLSHAUSEN.

Christians; (b) that an appeal to the mercies of God would mean nothing to those who had not already experienced His pardoning grace; (c) that the sacrifice was to be presented holy, as initially sanctified by the cleansing from guilt and acquired depravity; (d) that it was to be acceptable, that is, those who presented it must have been justified; all of which the apostle deems a reasonable service. In the second verse it is admitted, (e) that there remained in the hearts of the believers, a bent toward worldliness, or a bias toward sin; (f) that this tendency to conform to the world was to be removed by a further transformation, or a renewal of their minds;

and (g) that they were thereby to prove, or experience, the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. (2) Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves(kaqariswmen)from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness(epiterlounteV [present] agiwsunhn [or a personal purification]in the fear of God(II Cor. 7:1). Regeneration as we have seen, is the impartation of a life that is holy in its nature; and concomitant with it, is an initial holiness or cleansing from guilt and acquired depravity. Now this holiness already begun is to be perfected by the cleansing at a single stroke from inbred sin, and brings the soul to a constantly existing state of perfected holiness. This cleansing applies to the body as well as to the soul. (3)Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection(Heb. 6:1). The word for perfection isteleioteta(teleiothta) from the adjectiveteleios(teleioV). Dr. Clarke says, "The verb teaches the idea of our being borne on immediately into the experience." Dr. Whedon makes a similar statement as follows: "When Hebrews 6:1 is adduced as an exhortation to advance to a perfected Christian character, it is no misquotation."

Tense Readings of the Greek Testament.Dr. Daniel Steele in hisMilestone Papershas an excellent chapter on this important subject (cf. STEELE,Milestone Papers, Chapter V). He points out the contrast between the use of the present tense, asI am writing, or the imperfectas denoting the same continuity in the past, asI was writing, with the aorist tense, which in the indicative expresses simple momentary occurrence of an action in past time, asI wrote. In all other moods, the aorist is timeless, or what is styled "singleness of act." When, therefore, the present tense is used, it denotes continuous action; but when the aorist is used, it denotes a momentary, completed act without reference to time. There is in the English no tense like it, and hence the translators found it difficult to translate it without circumlocution. . . . . A proper understanding of this will greatly aid in the interpretation of important texts. We shall mention but a few of these. (1)Sanctify[aorist imperative]them(once for all)through thy truth: [that is, through faith in the distinctive office and work of the Comforter] . . . .And for their sakes I sanctify[present tense - am sanctifying or consecrating]myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth(or truly sanctified) (John 17:17, 19). Dr. C. J. Fowler points out, that in the Greek text, verse 17 readsen taaletheia(en th alhqeia), through the truth, or in the use of the truth; but verse 19 omits thetei(th) and readsen aletheia(en alhqeia) which meansin truth, since omitting the article makes it equivalent to an adverb. (2)Purifying[aorist - instantaneously]their hearts by faith(Acts 15:9). "This verse," says Dr. Steele, "is a key to the instantaneous sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit wrought in the hearts of believers on the day of Pentecost, since the words,even as he did unto us, refer to that occasion." (3)I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present[aorist - a single act not needing to be repeated]your bodies a living sacrifice(Rom. 12:1). (4) Put ye on[aorist - a single definite act]the Lord Jesus Christ, and make[present tense] not provision[that is, quit making provision]for the flesh(Rom. 13:14). (5)Now he which stablisheth[present - who is continually establishing]us with you in Christ, and hath[aorist, as a single definite act]anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us[aorist],and given[aorist - gave as a single definite act]theearnest of the Spirit in our hearts(II Cor. 1:21, 22). Here the establishing is constant, or continuous, while the anointing, the sealing and the earnest of the Spirit are momentary and completed acts of the one experience of entire sanctification. (6) And they that are Christ’s have crucified[aorist - a single definite and completed act]the flesh[sarx not swma or body]with the affections and lusts(Gal. 5:24). A distinction is made here between the carnal mind as the principle of sin, and the works of the flesh which flow from it. These works of the flesh are put off in conversion. But now the carnal mind

itself, as the underlying principle of sin (the flesh or sarx with its inordinate affections and outreachings, which though existing are not allowed to express themselves in works, or actual sinning) is to be crucified (from staurow implying destruction accompanied with intense pain). (7)In whom also after that ye believed,[aorist]ye were sealed[aorist]with that holy Spirit of promise(Eph. 1:13). Here both the believing and the sealing are definite, completed acts. (8)Mortify(aorist - kill outright)therefore your members which are upon the earth(Col. 3:5). "Let nothing live inimical to your true life, hidden in Christ. Kill at once (aorist) the organs and media of a merely earthly life." - Bishop Ellicott (cf. STEELE, Milestone Papers, p. 80). (9)Put on[aorist]the new man(Col. 3:10).Put on, ... [aorist]as the elect of God. . . . . bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering(Col. 3:12). Dr. Steele says that all these excellencies of character are assumed at once, through the incoming of the Comforter. This represents the positive side of entire sanctification, as mortification represents the negative. (10)And the very God of peace sanctify[aorist]you wholly; and. . . . your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved(initial aorist, to mark the beginning of the power which is to preserve the believer) (I Thess. 5:23). (11)That he might sanctify[aorist] the people with his own blood, suffered[aorist]without the gate(Heb. 13:12). (12)If we confess[present tense] our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive[aorist]us our sins, andto cleanse[aorist]us from all unrighteousness(I John 1:9). Here both the forgiveness and the cleansing are spoken of as completed acts, and there is no more reason grammatically for believing in a gradual sanctification than in a gradual justification HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE SUBJECT The doctrine of Christian perfection has come down to us from apostolic days as a sacred and uninterrupted tradition through all the Christian centuries. The different ages have been frequently characterized by a difference in terminology, which the student of history must be quick to discern, but in no age has this glorious truth suffered eclipse. "The essentials of the doctrine have been preserved, though with many minor differences, from the beginning, clearly discernible through all the ascetic, fanatical, ultra-mystical, semi-Pelagian veils which have obscured them" (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 61). We shall trace the subject briefly through the following periods, in order to furnish a historical basis for further discussion

1. The Apostolic Fathers are definite in their teaching upon this important subject. The last words of Ignatius before his martyrdom were "I thank Thee, Lord, that Thou hast vouchsafed to honor me with a perfect love toward Thee." Polycarp, speaking of faith, hope and charity, says, "If any man be in these, he has fulfilled the law of righteousness, for he that has love is far from every sin." Clement of Rome states that "those who have been perfected in love, through the grace of God, attain to the place of the godly in the fellowship of those who in all ages have served the glory of God in perfectness."

2. The Later Fathers bore the same testimony. We note first the words of Augustine, who at times rose to sublime heights in his conception of grace, and at others, seemed to shrink from the full truth of his positions. He declares that "no one should dare to say that God cannot destroy the original sin in the members, and make Himself so present to the soul, that the old nature beingentirely abolished, a life should be lived below as life will be lived in the eternal contemplation of Him above." Yet he believed that evil concupiscence remains throughout the natural life. Apart from this, however, he taught a full deliverance from all sin in this life. We have also the word of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (d. 386) who says, " "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be invested with power from on high. Receive it in part now; then shall ye bear it in its fullness. For he

who receives often possesses the gift but in part; but he who is invested is completely enfolded by His robe." Macarius the Egyptian (100: 300-391) wrote a series of homilies on Christian experience in which the idea of perfect love is given a prominent place. He says, "In like manner Christians, though outwardly they are tempted, yet inwardly they are filled with the divine nature, and so nothing injured. These degrees, if any man attain unto, he is come to the perfect love of Christ and to the fullness of the Godhead" (Homily 5). "By reason of the superabundant love and sweetness of hidden mysteries, the person arrives to such degrees of perfection as to become pure and free from sin. And one that is rich in grace at all times, by night and by day, continues in a perfect state, free and pure" (Homily 14)

3. The Mystics, notwithstanding their numerous errors and extravagances, served to preserve evangelical religion during the Middle Ages. Their contribution to this department of theology has been peculiarly rich, in that the central idea of all mysticism is entire consecration to God. It demands a separation from the creature, and perfect union with the Creator in love. Mosheim the historian, says, "If any sparks of real piety subsisted under this despotic empire of superstition they were to be found only among the mystics; for this sect, renouncing the subtlety of the schools, the vain contentions of the learned, and all the sects and ceremonies of external worship, exhorted their followers to aim at nothing but internal sanctity of heart and communion with God, the center and source of holiness and perfection (MOSHEIM,History, p. 390). Those forms of mysticisminfluenced by Neo-Platonism took on pantheistic tendencies, and must be classed as more pagan than Christian

4. The Roman Catholic doctrine was eclectic, and existed in a variety of forms, such as that of the Jansenists, the Mystics, the Ascetics and the Scholastic Fathers of the Middle Ages. It took the form of German semi-pantheism, French Quietism, and Spanish Illuminism. The Church laid a good foundation for this doctrine in its creed, but it erred greatly in building upon it a false superstructure. Thus the Tridentine Decrees in referring to the perfection of obedience, maintain that negatively there is no bar to an entire conformity to law; and that positively, a complete satisfaction of its requirements is necessary to salvation. Mohler asks the question, `"How shall man be finally delivered from sin, and how shall holiness in him be restored to perfect life?" In his reply, he attacks the idea of a deliverance from sin through the death of the body, as held by some of the Protestant formularies. He attributes this error to the reformed doctrine of complete passivity in regeneration. "But the Catholic," he says, "who cannot regard man other than as a free, independent agent, must also recognize this free agency in his final purification, and repudiate such a mechanical process as inconsistent with the whole &nb

In its purest form, mysticism proper has in every age molded an interior circle of earnest souls, seeking the innermost mysteries of the kingdom of grace by the most strenuous ethical discipline. Its methods have been from time immemorial described as, first, the way of PURIFICATION; second, the way of ILLUMINATION; third, the way of UNION. These may be considered as answering respectively to the evangelical doctrines of purification from sin, the consecration of the Spirit, and the estate of holiness in abstraction from self and earthly things in fellowship with God. A careful study of St. John’s First Epistle will find in it laid the sure and deep foundations of this better mysticism. It gives the three principles in their order. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1:7); this is the mystical purgation. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things" (2:20); this is the mystical illumination. "He that dwelleth in love

dwelleth in God, and God in him" (4:16); this is the perfect union. A true mysticism may be traced in almost every community; and, wherever found, has taught directly or indirectly the perfection to which the Spirit of God raises the spirit of man, blending in its pursuit, contemplation and action; contemplation which is faith waiting passively for the highest energy of the Holy Ghost; and action, which works out His holy will. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 75.

moral government of the world. If God were to employ an economy of this nature, then Christ came in vain." He sums up his position by saying that "the Redeemer will at the day of judgment have fulfilled the claims of the law outwardly for us, but on that very account inwardly in us. The consolation, therefore, is to be found in the power of the Redeemer which effaces as well as forgives sin." But it is at this point that the doctrine of purgatory is injected. This purification is to be accomplished in a twofold way. "With some it consummates purification in this life; with others it perfects it only in the life to come. The latter are they who by faith, love, and a sincere penitence, have knit the bond of communion with the Lord, but only in a partial degree, and at the moment of their quitting life were not entirely pervaded by His Spirit; to them will be communicated the saving power, that at the day of judgment they also may be found pure in Christ." The first error in the Roman Catholic Church, as it touches this doctrine of purity, is the failure to recognize the present power of the atoning blood of Christ, for full and complete cleansing. Thus while rejecting the mechanical idea of purification by death, they very inconsistently substitute a mechanical process of cleansing after death. The second error in the doctrine of holiness is concerned with the positive aspect of divine love as the consecrating power of entire sanctification. It is held that love not only fulfills the law, but that it may more than fulfill it by keeping those counsels of perfection which are recommended though not imposed by our Lord. This position leads directly to the belief that love may achieve works of supererogation, and consequently to an undue emphasis upon good works, through an obedience which is above law

5. The Reformers in their reaction against the erroneous position of the Roman Catholic Church concerning justification, adopted a theory of the atonement, which through a misplaced emphasis upon its substitutionary aspect, gave rise to the various theories of imputation. These have been previously discussed in thechapters on the Atonement and Christian Righteousness, and it is sufficient here, to mention them briefly in their relation to the doctrine of Christian perfection. As there are erroneous theories of imputation concerning justification, so also the same theories are erroneously applied to sanctification. Since Christ is our substitute, the Reformers held that not only a complete justification, but also an entire sanctification was thus provided for the believer, and applied to him as a gift of covenant grace. But there is here an emphasis upon objective soteriology, or what Christ has done for us, to the minifying of the importance of subjective soteriology, or what He has wrought in us by the Spirit. Thus with their peculiar form of a substitutionary atonement, they held to a belief in the imputation to Him of our sins, and to us of His righteousness for our justification, and for our sanctification also, in so far as it applied to the cleansing from guilt. But sin itself cannot be done away by imputation; hence in the Calvinistic system it is necessary to deny that it is actually done away. It is not imputed and, therefore, not reckoned to the believer. Thus he is sanctified by imputation, that is by his "standing" in Christ, although as to his actual "state," he still has the carnal mind or inbred sin, which imputation cannot take away. This will be clearer when it is recalled that the extreme substitutionary theory of the atonement not only held, (1) that Christ’s death, or passive righteousness was imputed for the

remission of sins; but that (2) His active righteousness, or His life in holiness was also imputed as a substitute for the believer's imperfect obedience. Hence sin is not abolished as a principle or power, but instead, Christ's righteousness is imputed as a substitute, and inbred sin is thereby hidden under the robe of an imputed righteousness. Here is the basis of the "standing and state" theory which forms such a prominent part in some of the modern theories of sanctification. The standing of the believer is in Christ, that is by imputation; the actual state is one in which sin is repressed, and, therefore, does not reign; while sanctification is the process of bringing the principle of sininto subjection to the life of righteousness. Sanctification, therefore, according to this theory is merely progressive while the soul dwells in the body, and is completed only at death. The subtlety of a doctrine which holds that man can be instantaneously sanctified by an imputed standing, but not actually sanctified by an impartation of righteousness and true holiness, makes the error more dangerous. Anything which falls short of an actual cleansing from all sin or the death of the "old man" is anti-Wesleyan and anti-scriptural. The Reformation, however, led to other movements of a spiritual nature, which served to further the work of true holiness. Spener founded the Pietists who emphasized holiness, and organized societies in Frankfort for its promotion, much as Mr. Wesley did in London. Wesley was in some measure indebted to the Moravians for the beginning of his spiritual life, although he disagreed with Count Zinzendorf on his doctrine of imputation, and also rejected his idea that purification or sanctification took place at conversion

6. The earlier Arminians wrote much on Christian perfection also, and their statements contain the germ of that which was later developed in Wesleyanism. Arminius defined holiness as follows: "Sanctification is a gracious act of God by which He purifies man, who is a sinner, and yet a believer, from ignorance, from indwelling sin, with its lusts and desires, and imbues him with the spirit of knowledge, righteousness and holiness. . . . . It consists of the death of the old man, and the quickening of the new man." Episcopius says, "The commandment may be kept with what he regards as a perfect fulfillment in the supreme love which the gospel requires according to the covenant of grace, and in the utmost exertion of human strength, assisted by divine help." Limborch states that there is a "perfection in being correspondent to the provisions and terms of the divine covenant. It is not sinless or an absolutely perfect obedience, but such as consists in a sincere love of piety, absolutely excluding every habit of sin." The doctrine,however, was more fully developed by John and Charles Wesley and their coadjutors

7. The Wesleyan movement which resulted in the organization of the Methodist Church, marks a revival of the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification in the eighteenth century. To the question, "What was the rise of Methodism?" Mr. Wesley replied, "In 1729 my brother Charles and I, reading the Bible, seeing we could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others to do so. In 1737 we saw that holiness comes by faith. In 1738 we saw that men are justified before they are sanctified, but still holiness was our pursuit - inward and outward holiness. God then thrust us out to raise up a holy people." Two years before his death, Mr. Wesley wrote, "This doctrine is the grand depositum which God has lodged with the people called Methodists; and for the sake of propagating this chiefly He seems to have raised us up." John Wesley was the founder of Methodism, and his Sermons and Notes, together with the Twenty-five Articles, form the standards of doctrine. Charles Wesley was the hymn writer of the movement, and John Fletcher, a member of the Anglican Church, its saint and chief apologist. The names of Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury are prominent in the organization of American Methodism. During the

nineteenth century, a fresh impetus was given to the doctrine and experience of holiness by the great national campmeetings. The Wesleyan Methodist Connection was organized in 1843, the Free Methodist Church in 1860, and the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness in 1866. In order to both promote and conserve the truth of holiness, the latter part of the century witnessed &nb

Dr. Stevens says that "The Holy Club was formed at Oxford in 1729 for the sanctification of its members. The Wesleys there sought purification, and Whitefield joined them for that purpose" (History of Methodism). Doubtless the ritual of the English Church assisted the Wesleys in their search after the doctrine and experience. In the ritual of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the statement is as follows: "Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord." . . . . "vouchsafe to keep us this day without sin, and grant Thy people grace to withstand the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and with pure hearts and minds to follow Thee."

the organization of the Church of the Nazarene by Dr. Phineas F. Bresee, the Pentecostal Association of Churches in the East, and a number of holiness movements in the South. These were later combined into one body, known as the Church of the Nazarene. This period witnessed also the combining of a number of other groups into the Pilgrim Holiness Church. These churches have sought to conserve the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification; and have persistently opposed the various fanatical groups that have obscured the pure truth, and brought into ill-repute the glorious doctrine and experience of full salvation

8. Among the more modern developments, aside from Wesleyanism, may be mentioned the following: (1) The Oberlin Position; (2) The Theory of the Plymouth Brethren; and (3) The Keswick Theory

(1) The Oberlin position is represented by President Asa Mahan, Charles G. Finney, and President Fairchild. According to this theory, there is a simplicity of moral action which makes sin to consist solely in an act of the will, and consequently maintains that it is impossible for sin and virtue to exist in the same heart at the same time. It accepted but one definition of sin, namely, "Sin is the transgression of the law." Several erroneous positions followed immediately - (1) It denied inbred sin as a state or condition of the soul, and held instead, to an "intermittent," "vibratory," or "alternating" theory of moral character. Of this position, Dr. A. M. Hills, himself a student at Oberlin, says, "To hold that a Christian believer in every moral act is as good or bad as he can be, and that the least sudden sin of a warm-hearted Christian plunges him to the level of the worst sinner, is too great a tax on credulity to be accepted" (HILLS,Fundamental Chr. Th., II, p. 253). (2) It confused consecration with sanctification. Sanctification was made to consist in such an "establishment in consecration" as to prevent further "alternation of the will." (3) It made sanctification a matter of growth and development. Thus President Fairchild begins his chapter on sanctification with these words, "The growth andestablishment of the believer, the development in him of the graces of the gospel, is called sanctification." (FAIRCHILD,Elements of Theology,p. 280). President Mahan later came into the clear experience of entire sanctification, and advocated practically the Wesleyan position

(2) The Plymouth Brethren originated in Dublin, Ireland, and almost simultaneously in Plymouth, England. In England their growth was very rapid, and hence they soon came to be known as the

Plymouth Brethren. Their leading mind, if not their founder, was &nb

Mr. Finney denies that there is any sin or moral depravity remaining in the soul after regeneration, but this he does by denying that the states of sensibility, in which they war against the right determinations of the will, and clamor for indulgences which the will cannot allow without sin, involves sin or moral depravity. This makes the discussion turn upon the mere name by which a mental state is called, and not upon the fact of the existence of the state. That such states of sensibility exist after regeneration all must admit, but while old school men call it depravity remaining after regeneration, Mr. Finney denies that it is sin, or moral depravity, and affirms that it is physical depravity, referring to the same mental state which others call remaining sin after regeneration, allowing regeneration to take place instantaneously with justification. . . . He denies that any moral quality pertains to the sensibilities of the soul, and hence does not include the subjugation of the passions to the sanctified will in his idea of entire sanctification, beyond the mere fact that the will is not governed by them, and does not endorse or execute any of their irregular motions. His words are, "It is evident that sanctification in the scripture, and proper sense of the term, is not a mere feeling of any kind. It is not a desire, an appetite, a passion, a propensity, an emotion, nor indeed any kind or degree of feeling. It is not a state or phenomenon of the sensibility. The states of the sensibility are, like those of the intelligence, purely passive states of the mind, as has been repeatedly shown. They of course can have no moral character in themselves. The inspired writers evidently use the terms which are translated by the English word sanctify, to designate a phenomenon of the will, or a voluntary state of mind." (cf. FINNEY,Syst. Th., II, p. 200). Luther Lee in commenting upon the above statements says, "If the above be all true, the conclusion appears undeniable that every man is entirely sanctified the moment he wills right, and as Mr. Finney contends for the freedom of the will, that man has natural power to will right, all can sanctify themselves by an act of will in a moment. . . . Mr. Finney’s view of sanctification, as above given, appears to be defective . . . . . Mr. Finney’s view of sanctification differs very materially from that commonly held by other schools of theology. It differs by being grounded upon a denial that moral depravity extends to the state of the intelligence and sensibility of the soul, depravity being confined wholly to the state of the will. It does differ by being made to include, according to the above view, only a right state of the will, while others hold that it includes a right state of all the powers and susceptibilities of the soul." - LUTHER LEE,Elements of Theology, pp. 212, 213.

John Darby, a clergyman of the Church of England, who not only withdrew from the established church, but took the position that all organization of a churchly nature was a detriment to Christianity. Their theological positions were in general, based upon the extreme imputation theories of hyper-Calvinism, which we have already treated in our discussion of the Atonement. The movement was antinomian in the extreme, and was but a revival of the principles of Moravianism against which Mr. Wesley had to contend, and those of the Anabaptists who preceded them. They said little, however, of the decrees, or of unconditional election - these being implied, rather than directly stated. Dr. Daniel Steele in hisAntinomianism Revived, points out, that by omitting those doctrines which are peculiarly obnoxious to the Arminians,

Signally useful as that beloved man of God, President Finney, was, I can but believe that he would have led many more into the experience of sanctification, had he held a different philosophy. He himself had experienced a marvelous baptism with the Holy Spirit, which made him an example to

the world of "holiness and power." But when he tried to lead others into an experience similar to his own, something stood in his way. President Mahan says of him, "No one ever disciplined believers so severely, and with such intense and tireless patience as Brother Finney. Appalled at the backsliding which followed his revival, he put forth the most earnest efforts to induce among believers permanence in the divine life. He gathered his theological students together and instructed them in renunciation of sin, consecration to Christ, and purpose of obedience. They would renew their renunciations, consecrations and purpose, with all the intensity with which their natures were capable. But they were not told to exercise faith for the blessing; and all their human efforts and consecrations, ended in dismal failure, and left them in groaning bondage, under the law of sin and death." - HILLS,Fund. Chr. Th., p. 253 When alone with God, one day, in a deep forest, I said distinctly and definitely to my heavenly Father, that there was one thing that I desired above all else - the consciousness that my heart was pure in His sight; . . . . In this state I came to Oberlin, as the president of that college. I had been there but a short time, when a general inquiry arose in the church after the divine secret of holy living, and a direct appeal was made to Brother Finney and myself for specific instruction upon the subject, which induced in me an intensity of desire, indescribable, after that secret. Just as my whole being became centered in that one desire, the cloud lifted, and I stood in the clear sunlight of the face of God. The secret was all plain to me now, and I know also, how to lead inquirers into the King’s highway (Baptism of the Holy Ghost, p. 108). His error previous to this, he states as follows, "When I thought of my guilt and need of justification, I had looked to Christ exclusively, as I ought to have done." "For sanctification, on the other hand, to overcome (the world, the flesh, and the devil!) I had depended mainly upon my own resolutions. I ought to have looked to Christ for sanctification as much as for justification, and for the same reason. - ASA MAHAN.

and stressing those which appeal to the Calvinists, the errors of this movement are adapted to become widespread in both of these great branches of so-called orthodoxy. The principal error of this system, and that upon which most if not all the others depend, is a false view of the Atonement, or the mediatorial work of Christ. The Plymouth conception of the Atonement, is that of the old commercial theory, or so much suffering as an atonement for so much sin. They regard sin as having been condemned on the cross of Christ; and consequently hold that all sin - past, present and future, has by this act been done away - not provisionally, nor actually, but by imputation of men’s sins to Christ. Having been done away by imputation to Christ, men are no longer responsible either for their sinful state or sinful acts. A distinction is made between the believer’s "standing" and his actual "state" or condition. Believers are accounted righteous or holy by their "standing" in Christ. God does not take account of their actual "state" for He sees them only through Christ. Sin is not actually removed from the heart and life, but only covered over with the robe of Christ’s imputed righteousness. Holiness and righteousness are only imputed, never imparted. In this system, faith becomes, not the condition of personal salvation, but simply a recognition of what was done by Christ on the cross. Justification likewise is not an act in the mind of God by which the sinner is forgiven, but &nb

An Antinomian is a professor of Christianity, who isantinomos, against the law of Christ, as well as against the law of Moses. He allows Christ’s law to be the rule of life, but not a rule of judgment for believers, and thus he destroys that law at a stroke, as a law; it being evident that a rule by the personal observance or nonobservance of which Christ’s subjects can never be acquitted or

condemned, it is not a law for them. Hence he asserts that Christians shall no more be justified before God by their personal obedience to the law of Christ than by their personal obedience to the ceremonial law of Moses. Nay, he believes that the best of Christians perpetually break Christ's law that nobody ever kept it but Christ himself; and that we shall be justified or condemned before God, in the great day, not as we shall personally be found to have kept or broken Christ's law, but as God shall be found to have, before the foundation of the world, arbitrarily laid, or not laid, to our account, the merit of Christ's keeping of His own law. Thus he hopes to stand in the great day, merely by what he calls "Christ's imputed righteousness." - John Fletcher,Checks to Antinomianism.

a wholesale transaction on Calvary, centuries ago, only just now recognized and accepted. Regeneration is regarded, not as an impartation of life to the soul, but as in some sense the creation of a new personality which existed alongside the old, both natures remaining unchanged &nb

The principles which underlie the antinomianism of the Plymouth Brethren are essentially those which characterized the Moravianism of Wesley's day, and of the Anabaptists which gave Luther so much concern. Mr. Wesley sums up the differences between the Moravians and the Methodists in the following statement. He says, "The difference between the Moravian doctrine and ours lies here; they believe and teach, (1) That Christ has done all which was necessary for the salvation of all mankind. (2) That, consequently, we are to do nothing, as necessary to salvation, but simply to believe in Him. (3) That there is but one duty now, but one command, namely, to believe in Christ. (4) That Christ has taken away all other commands and duties, having wholly abolished the law'; that a believer is therefore `free from the law,' is not obliged to do or omit anything; it being inconsistent with his liberty to do anything as commanded. (5) That we are sanctified wholly the moment we are justified, and are neither more nor less holy to the day of our death; entire sanctification, and entire justification, being in one and the same instant. (6) That the believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only; he has no holiness in himself at all, all his holiness being imputed, not inherent. (7) That if a man regards prayer, or searching the Scriptures, or communicating as a matter of duty; if he judges himself obliged to do these things, or is troubled when he does them not; he is in bondage; he has no faith at all, but is seeking salvation by the works of the law." In reply to the above, Mr. Wesley gives the following of these errors in refutation. "We believe the first of these propositions is ambiguous, and all the rest utterly false. (1) `Christ has done all which was necessary for the salvation of all mankind.' This is ambiguous. Christ has not done all which was necessary for the absolute salvation of all mankind. For, notwithstanding all that Christ has done, he that believeth not shall be damned. But He has done all which was necessary for the conditional salvation of all mankind; that is, if they believe; for through His merits all that believe to the end, with the faith that worketh by love, shall be saved.' (2-3) `There is but one duty now, but one command, namely, to believe in Christ.' Almost every page in the New Testament proves the falsehood of this assertion. (4) `Christ has taken away all other commands and duties, having wholly abolished the law.' How absolutely contrary is this to His own solemn declaration! "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." (5) `We are sanctified wholly the moment we are justified, and are neither more nor less holy to the day of our death; entire sanctification and entire justification being in one and the same instant.' Just the contrary appears from both the tenor of God's Word, and the

experience of His children. (6) `A believer is never sanctified or holy in himself, but in Christ only. He has no holiness in himself at all; all his holiness being imputed, not inherent.' Scriptural holiness is the image of God; the mind which was in Christ; the love of God and man; lowliness, gentleness, temperance, patience, chastity. And do you coolly affirm that this is only imputed to a believer, and that he has none at all of this holiness in him? Is temperance imputed only to him that is a drunkard still; or chastity to her that goes on in whoredom? Nay, but a believer is really chaste and temperate. And if so, he is thus far holy in himself." - WESLEY,Works, Vol. VII, p. 22.

until death. The person, or that which in man says "I," may put itself under the direction of either the "new man" or the "old man" without any detriment to his standing in Christ, except that in the latter case, communion will be interrupted. The "standing" is eternal, and remains unchanged, regardless of the actual "state" of the professed believer. Furthermore, the doctrine of the two natures is not fully understood until it is seen, that neither of these natures is responsible for the other. Whatever may be the deeds of the "old man," the believer is not held to be accountable for them - they were condemned on the cross. The Plymouth idea of sanctification, like that of justification, is purely Antinomian. The believer is not only made righteous in Christ, he is made holy also. The one act, viewed as righteousness, is justification; viewed as holiness, it is sanctification. One of their own writers states this position as follows: "He who is our Great High Priest before God is pure and without stain. God sees Him as such, and He stands for us who are His people, and we are accepted in Him. His holiness is ours by imputation. Standing in Him, we are in the sight of God, holy as Christ is holy, and pure as Christ is pure. God looks at our representative, and He sees us in Him. We are complete in Him who is our spotless and glorious &nb

Mr. Wesley made an epitome of Baxter's Aphorisms on Justification, which sets forth in an admirable manner, the whole question of a believer's relation to law. "As there are two covenants, with their distinct conditions, so there is a twofold righteousness, and both of them necessary for salvation. Our righteousness of the first covenant (under the remediless, Christless, Adamic law) is not personal, or consisteth not in any actions preferred by us; for we never personally satisfied the law (of innocence), but it is wholly without us, in Christ. In this sense every Christian disclaimeth his own righteousness, or his own works. Those only shall be in Christ legally righteous who believe and obey the gospel, and so are in themselves evangelically righteous. Though Christ performed the conditions of the law (of paradisaical innocence), and made satisfaction for our nonperformance, yet we ourselves must perform the conditions of the gospel. These (last) two propositions seem to me so clear, that I wonder that able divines should deny them. Methinks they should be articles of our creed, and a part of children's catechisms. To affirm that evangelical or new- covenant righteousness is in Christ, and not in ourselves, or performed by Christ, and not by ourselves, is such a monstrous piece of Antinomian doctrine as no man, who knows the nature and difference of the covenants, can possibly entertain." - BAXTER,Aphorisms, Pro. 14, 15.

Head." His holiness, is purely in the "standing" which man has in Christ, that is, it is imputed only. As to the "state" or actual condition of his heart, there is no personal holiness inwrought by the Spirit. Sin continues until death, but this in nowise affects the "standing" of the believer. "We must never measure the standing by the state," says Mr. McIntosh, "but always the state by the standing. To lower the standing because of the state, is to give the death-blow to all progress in practical Christianity." Commenting upon this, Dr. Daniel Steele says, "that is to say, the fruit must

always be judged by the tree; to judge the tree by the fruit, is to give the death blow to pomology."

It can easily be seen why the teachers of this doctrine have a special hostility to the Wesleyan and scriptural teaching concerning Christian perfection. The former holds to an imputed holiness; the latter to an imparted holiness. The former holds that we are merely reckoned holy; the latter that we are actually made holy. The former base everything on a logical syllogism - Christ is holy; we are in Christ; therefore we are holy. Christ is indeed holy, but the fact is overlooked, that no man is in Christ in the fullest sense of new covenant privilege, until he is cleansed from all sin by the baptism with the Holy Ghost. The intellectual assertion that a man is in Christ, does not make it so in fact; this is accomplished by an inner work of the Spirit of God. Ethically, this Antinomian doctrine breaks down all the restraints that would hinder men from sin, as set up in Arminianism and the older Calvinism. Logically, it has its issue in the doctrine of final perseverance, or what in more modern times is wrongly known as eternal security

(3) The Keswick Movement was founded for "the promotion of scriptural holiness" as stated in the invitation to the original meeting, held in Oxford in 1874. The following year, a second convention was held at Keswick, from which the movement took its name. Here the invitation stated that the convention was forthe "promotion of practical holiness." It has been popularized by a number of nationally known evangelists and has in it many sincere and earnest Christians. They believe in the lost condition of the race, and are zealous in their efforts for the salvation of men. They insist upon the abandonment of all known sin, and a definite and complete consecration to Christ. They emphasize the necessity of an appropriation by faith, of the power of God through Christ, for both holy living and Christian service. This enduement for service is known among them as the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and is generally regarded as being subsequent to conversion. It is not, however, in the strict sense, a work of grace, for there is no cleansing from inbred sin. Their position in regard to inbred sin is essentially that of the Plymouth Brethren. It is regarded as a part of the believer’s humiliation, and in a sense defiling his best deeds. It involves continuous suppression, and will continue to exist until death delivers from its defilement. The enduement of the Spirit counteracts in some measure, the carnal mind, and assists the believer in repressing its manifestations. It will be seen from these statements, that apart from other differences in theology, the power of sin is merely broken, which Wesleyanism maintains takes place in conversion. It is in no sense entire sanctification as Wesleyanism defines this term. It is rather, more closely related to the idea of positional holiness as taught by the Plymouth Brethren. The believer is holy in his "standing" but not in his "state." Holiness is thus a matter of imputation instead of impartation. Actual cleansing from all sin is rejected as being out of harmony with their general principles. The "standing" is eternal, and hence, like the former theory, logically issues in the so-called doctrine of "eternal security."

The Salvation Army, and especially its earlier leaders, have been able representatives of the doctrine of entire sanctification. General William Booth and his wife, were particularly definite in their teaching. The works of Commissioner Brengle are recognized as standard holiness literature.

THE MEANING AND SCOPE OF SANCTIFICATION

We have in the two previous divisions indicated in a general way the meaning and scope of sanctification, but the subject demands a more thorough study. The termholiness, as it is used in this connection, refers to man’s moral or religious state, andsanctification, to the act by which he is

made holy. The idea of the divine holiness necessarily underlies our conception of human holiness - the former being absolute, the latter, relative or derived. The concept of the divine holiness was given careful attention in our study of the Moral Attributes of God (Chapter XIV); we must now study the question of human holiness in relation to our former positions. The terminology of the Greek New Testament will furnish the best approach to this subject, but must be limited solely to those words and their derivatives, which in the English translation are rendered holiness or sanctification. Other words referring to this experience will be given consideration later. In the study of these Greek words, however, we must bear in mind that the Greeks had no clear idea of holiness, such as the Christian religion demanded, and hence St. Paul was under the necessity of reading into these words, a deeper meaning, than that which they ordinarily conveyed to the Greek mind

We shall notice, at this time, the following Greek terms. (1)Hagios(agioV), holy. This word occurs frequently in the Scriptures, but is rarely used outside of Holy Writ. It means (a) reverent, or worthy of veneration, and is applied to God (Luke 1:49); to things on account of their connection with God (Acts 6:13; 7:33); and to persons whose services God employs

Entire sanctification is not the destruction of any faculty, affection, or passion, but the purification, sanctification, and preservation of all that is essentially human unto eternal life (I Thess. 5:23)

Dr. C. J. Fowler says that sanctification is used in the Scriptures interchangeably with justification, regeneration, adoption, conversion and the like, but not in that sense alone. The Corinthians are addressed as "sanctified in Christ Jesus," and at the same time their entire sanctification is denied, for they are addressed as "yet carnal" and exhorted to perfect "holiness in the fear of God." In Paul’s epistle to the Thessalonians, prayer is offered that they may be sanctified "wholly" (cf. FOWLER,Sermon on Double Cure, p. 103).

(Eph. 3:5). (b) To set apart to God, to be exclusively His (Mark 1:24; Luke 2:23). (c) It is used of sacrifices and offerings prepared for God with solemn rite (Rom. 11:16; 12:1; I Cor. 7:14; Eph. 1:4; 5:27; Col. 1:22). (d) In a moral sense, pure, sinless, upright and holy (Rom. 7:12; 16:16; I Cor. 7:14; 16:20; I Peter 1:16; II Peter 3:11). (2)Hagion(agion), neuter gender of agioV and used generally to designate a holy place (Heb. 9:24, 25; 10:19). (3)Hagiadzo(agiazw) a verb meaning to separate, to set apart, to render or to declare holy. It means (a) to hallow (Matt. 6:9); (b) to separate from the profane and dedicate to God - things (Matt. 23:17; II Tim. 2:21); persons (John 10:36; 17:19); (c) to purify - externally (Heb. 9:13; I Tim. 4:5), by expiation (I Cor. 6:11; Eph. 5:26; Heb. 10:10, 14, 29; 13:12), internally (John 17:17, 19; Rom. 15:16; I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 5:23; Jude 1; Rev. 22:11). (4)Hagiasmos(agiasmoV) is a word used only by biblical and ecclesiastical writers. It is derived from the perfect passive (hgiasmai) of agiazw, and is translated sanctification or holiness. It is found in I Thess. 4:3 this is the will of God, even your sanctification: Heb. 12:14 Follow peace with all men, and holiness, (agiasmon) (or the sanctification wrought by the Holy Spirit, agiasmw PneumatoV); and again, ye have your fruit unto holiness (agiasmon) (Rom. 6:19, 22). (5)Hagiotes(agiothV), sanctity, or in the moral sense, holiness. It refers especially to the property of moral natures, and is applicable to both God and sanctified men (Heb. 12:10). (6)Hagiosune(agiwsunh), sanctity, sanctification, holiness. The word is generally regarded as synonymous with the preceding term, but restricted more especially in its application to men. As such it signifies emphatically, a personal purification. It is used but three times in the New

Testament, (a) Rom. 1:4, where the contrast is made between Christaccording to the flesh(kata sarka), andaccording to the spirit of holiness(kata pneuma agiwsunhV); (b) II Cor. 7:1,perfecting holiness(agiwsunhn); and (c) I Thess. 3:13, stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness (agiwsunh) From this brief study ofHagios(agioV) and its derivatives, it will be clearly seen, that while the primary meaning is a setting apart, or a separation, this in the New Testament takes on the deeper significance of a cleansing from all sin. This is the dominant meaning of the terms used in the Scriptures, and from this authority there can be no appeal. The wordhagnos(agnoV) and its derivatives, on the other hand, while implying inward purity (cf. I John 3:3), refer primarily to external or ceremonial purity, the sanctification of the body, and the general qualities of purity and chastity (John 11:55; Acts 21:24, 26; II Cor. 11:2; Phil. 4:8; Titus 2:5; James 3:17) Definitions of Entire Sanctification.

We cannot pass without a definition of this word "purify." It is the very word from which we get our English derivative - cathartic. It literally means to purge, to purify, to remove dross and eliminate that which is foreign. It is identically the same word as is used in I John 1:7. It means nothing more or less than the actual cleansing of the nature of man from the virus of a sinful disposition. Let men decry the truth and resolutely clamor heresy, but the clear and unmistakable statement of Peter, whom the Holy Spirit himself directed to speak, was that the heart meaning of Pentecost then - and now - was and is the cleansing of the heart from inborn sin. To this clear witness of Peter scripture boldly attests and the lives of multitudes happily declare. This then is the privilege of every Christian. - DR. H. V. MILLER,When He Is Come

Sanctified souls are inclined to name the blessing after their principal sensations, harmonizing with their emotional experiences. (1) One person realizes principally a marked increase of faith, and he calls it "the rest of faith." (2) Another is conscious of a deep, sweet resting in Christ, and calls it "resting in God." (3) Another is permeated with a sense of the divine presence, and filled with ecstatic raptures, and calls it "the fullness of God." (4) Another feels his heart subdued, melted, refined and filled with God, and calls it "holiness." (5) Another realizes principally a river of sweet, holy love flowing through the soul, and he calls it "perfect love." (6) Another is prostrated under the power of the refining and sin-killing Spirit, and calls it "the baptism with the Holy Ghost." (7) And another realizes principally a heaven of sweetness in complete submission to God, and he calls it "entire sanctification." (8) While another may feel clearly and strongly conscious of complete conformity to all the will of God, and calls it "Christian perfection." If genuine, the work wrought in each case is essentially the same. - WOOD,Perfect Love, p. 125.

entire devotement to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect. It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service. Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness. This experience is also known by various terms representing its different phases, such as " "Christian Perfection," "Perfect Love," "Heart Purity," "The Baptism with the Holy Spirit," "The Fullness of the Blessing," and "Christian Holiness" (Creed, Art. X). Mr. Wesley says that "Sanctification in the proper sense

The literature of early Methodism on the subject of entire sanctification is peculiarly rich and prolific. We give a few of the more outstanding utterances on this subject. "From the very first years of my ministry I have held with Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, John Fletcher and John Wesley, that regeneration and sanctification are separated and distinct one from the other and therefore received at different times. They are both received by faith, and the last one is the privilege of every believer as the first is of every penitent." - BISHOP MALLALIEU. Regeneration "is a mixed moral state. Sanctification is like weeding the soil, or gathering the tares and burning them, so that nothing remains to grow there but the good seed. . . . . Entire sanctification removes them - roots them out of the heart, and leaves it a pure soil." - BISHOP HAMLINE,Beauty of Holiness, p. 264. "In the merely justified state we are not entirely pure. . . . . But in the work of entire sanctification, these impurities are all washed away so that we are wholly saved from sin, from its inward pollution." - BISHOP JESSE T. PECK,Central Idea of Christianity, p. 52. "Regeneration removes some sin or pollution, and entire sanctification removes the corruption which re mains after regeneration. This will be seen from the authorities given to be the Wesleyan idea of sanctification." - BISHOP FOSTER,Christian Purity, p. 122. "The degree of original sin which remains in some believers, though not a transgression of a known law is nevertheless sin, and must be removed before one goes to heaven, and the removal of this evil is what we mean by full sanctification." - BISHOP HEDDING,Sermons. "By holiness I mean that state of the soul in which all its alienation from God, and all its aversion to a holy life are removed BISHOP MCCABE From the commentators we have the following definitions: "This term (sanctify) has the Old Testament sense of setting apart to a sacred service, and the New Testament sense of spiritual purification." - JACOBUS, Notes on John 17:17. "Sanctification is to have soul, body and spirit every sense, member, organ, and faculty, completely purified and devoted to the service of God." - SCOTT,Commentary. "True religion consists in heart purity. Those who are inwardly pure, show themselves to be under the power of pure and undefiled religion. True Christianity lies in the heart, in the purity of the heart, in the washing of that from wickedness." - MATTHEW HENRY,Notes on Matt. 5:8.

is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin, and includes an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God." Mr. Watson defines entire sanctification as a complete deliverance from all spiritual pollution, all inward depravation of heart, as well as that, which, expressing itself outwardly by the indulgence of the senses, is called filthiness of the flesh and spirit" (WATSON,Institutes, II, p. 450). Adam Clarke defines it as "the cleansing of the blood, that has not been cleansed; it is the washing of the soul of a true believer from the remains of sin" (CLARKE,Christian Theology, p. 206). Dr. Pope’s definition is as follows: "Sanctification in its beginnings, process and final issues is the full eradication of the sin itself, which reigning in the unregenerate, coexists with the new life in the regenerate, is abolished in the wholly sanctified." Dr. Phineas F. Bresee in his sermon on Divine Power says, "It is evident that the baptism with the Holy Ghost is the conveyance into men and through men, of the ’all-power’ of Jesus Christ - the revelation of Him in the soul"; and again, "The baptism with the Holy Ghost is the baptism with God. It is the burning up of the chaff, but is also the revelation in us and the manifestation to us of divine personality, filling our being" (DR. P. F. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 193). It will be noticed, that while Dr. Bresee never undervalued the cleansing aspect of entire sanctification, his chief emphasis was always upon the divine infilling - the unfolding of the entire being in "loyal relation to the divine." Dr. Edward F. Walker defined sanctification as a "personal cleansing from sin, in order

to a holy life. Made pure in order to sustain devotion to God. A pure heart, full of holy love. Beyond this we cannot go in this world; but short of this we ought never to rest. . . . . Perfect purity plus perfect love in the heart by the efficiency of Christ and the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit equal personal sanctification" (WALKER,Sanctify Them, pp. 42, 49). Dr. John W. Goodwin gives us this definition: "Sanctification is a divine work of grace, purifying the believer's heart from indwelling sin. It is subsequentto regeneration, is secured in the atoning blood of Christ, is effected by the baptism with the Holy Ghost, is conditioned on full consecration to God, is received by faith, and includes instantaneous empowerment for service."

Primarily sanctification has to do with man's inner nature or condition, as justification does with his outer conduct. In a word, when a man is converted he is forgiven and restored to favor with God. The power of sin is broken, "the old man" of sin is conquered, the power of the new life within him is greater than the power of a fallen nature. This inherited bias, or "prone to wander," this inner opposition to the law of God is not destroyed, it is conquered in regeneration. It is destroyed, absolutely annihilated, in sanctification. - DR. R. T. WILLIAMS,Sanctification, p. 17 A glorious fact, however, remains for us to consider. . . . . The coming of the Holy Ghost into the heart and life in His exquisite fullness does so cleanse and empower, protect and guard that liability of spiritual failure is brought to its earthly minimum. . . . . To every soul who will yield to the Holy Ghost, He will come with loving and holy dominion driving from the heart every antagonism to all the will of God. He will then secure the entrance to the soul with His own untiring presence. Whenever the enemy attempts to come in like a flood, He himself will lift up a standard against him. He will culture the soul with skill. He will guide the life with agility. He will build fixed principles of moral living deep within the being so that the slightest insinuation of Satan will be readily recognized and repulsed. He will train the weakened propensities and appetites of a broken race till scriptural culture becomes the instinct of the soul. Thus empowered and equipped the liability of failure is brought to a conspicuous minimum. - DR. H. V. MILLER,When He Is Come, p. 28 To be sanctified is nothing more or less than this one thing, the complete removal from the heart of that which is enmity to God, not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; and this enables the life to be fully devoted to God. Regardless of how perfect may be the consecration, no Christian is truly sanctified by Christ until the heart is made pure by His blood. This is a definite experience, a mighty work of grace, wrought by God in response to the faith of the consecrated Christian in Christ the Sanctifier. This experience marks a definite second crisis in spiritual life, it is the perfection of a spiritual relationship with God, the cleansing from all sin, when God works within us the devotedness He desires. . . . . Devotedness to God - sanctification - includes also a conscious fullness of the Holy Spirit dwelling within as the power of our love, enabling us to live in fellowship with Christ and in full obedience to Him, giving us glorious victory in the many conflicts of life. . . . . Holiness as devotedness to God involves the subordination of all other purposes to the one great purpose - the joyous acceptance and the happy doing of the will of God. - D. SHELBY CORLETT,Holiness - The Central Purpose of Redemption, pp. 22, 23

I have called holiness the heart of Christian experience because it is by way of the full realization of what God has promised to us in the way of crises. Regeneration and entire sanctification are the two crises in which God deals with the sin problem in us and by which He takes us out of sin and then takes sin out of us. After that the Christian life is a way of process and progress, but there are no more crises until glorification comes at the return of Jesus to this world. There is all room for

growth after sanctification, but there is no more place for

Justification and Sanctification. Our previous study of Christian righteousness has given us the general characteristics of justification; it remains for us now to contrast these briefly with sanctification, in order to set forth more clearly the distinctions between them. (1) Justification in a broad sense has reference to the whole work of Christ wroughtforus; sanctification, the whole work wroughtin

crises. There is no state of grace beyond a pure heart filled with the Holy Spirit. But from such a heart flows forth the passive and active phases of Christian life as water flows forth from a spring. Holiness is purity - not maturity. Holiness is the goal only in that it prepares one for whatever there is of Christian life - It is the "enabling blessing" which every Christian needs. - DR. J. B. CHAPMAN,Holiness the Heart of Christian Experience, p. 10 The Holy Spirit is vitally related to all the work of salvation. The Bible clearly presents two distinct operations or works of the Holy Spirit that are crisis works of salvation. The first of these is to be born of the Spirit (John 3:6). Birth is an act, and a crisis act. To be born is to be brought into life. In this case it is to be "born again" (verse 7), to restore a life that has been lost; it is a new spiritual birth - regeneration; it is coming to life as a babe in Christ; it is a new life forgiven and freed from the guilt of sin. The second of these is to be baptized with the Holy Ghost (Luke 3:16). Baptism is an act, and a crisis act. Baptism is something quite different from birth and cannot possibly be until after birth; one must be born before he can be baptized. These two figures that are here applied to the spiritual life necessitate two crisis experiences, the one following the other. With this baptism we have entire sanctification, cleansing from the inner state of sin. - DR. E. P. ELLYSON,Bible Holiness, pp. 89, 90.

is concomitant with it. (10) Justification is an instantaneous and completed act, and therefore does not take placead seriatim, or by degrees; sanctification is marked by progressiveness, that is, it has stages and degrees. There is a partial sanctification which is concomitant with justification, and there is an entire sanctification which is subsequent to it. But both initial and entire sanctification are instantaneous acts, wrought in the hearts of men by the Holy Spirit

Regeneration and Sanctification.The relation existing between regeneration and sanctification is set forth in an able and unique manner by Bishop Jesse T. Peck inhis Central Idea of Christianity

Justification has reference to the disposition and mercy of God toward the repentant sinner; regeneration has respect to the offices of the Holy Spirit pursuant to the dispensation of pardon. Justification absolves from condemnation; regeneration takes away death and inspires life. Justification brings liberty; regeneration supplies power. - LOWREY,Possibilities of Grace, p. 185.

to the laws of language, perform the office of the other. We humbly submit, therefore, that they ought not to be used interchangeably, and that attempts to so use them have caused nearly all the confusion which has embarrassed these great points in theology" (PECK, Central Idea of Christianity, pp. 15, 16)

Generation denotes the production of natural life, regeneration the production of spiritual life. Now the force of the illustration Is seen In the following particulars: (1) The soul in its natural state is "dead" - "dead" In trespasses and sins. It is so, because "to be carnally minded is death." (2) Natural life is the product of divine power alone, and spiritual life must be also. Generation expresses the operation of this power in the one instance, and regeneration in the other. A similar

relation exists between the ideas represented by the words "creature" and "new creature," "horn" and "born again." (3) Generation and birth produce new natural powers and functions, which demonstrate the omnipotence of their Creator; regeneration and the new birth produce spiritual powers and functions, entirely new, which demonstrate equally the divinity of their origin. (4) The result of generation is natural life with its accidents, the result of regeneration is spiritual life with its accidents; the degree of health may be mentioned as an accident of the former, the degree of sanctification or holiness as an accident of the latter. - PECK,Central Idea of Christianity, p. 15

Hence the new birth, or regeneration, is the divine life of Infancy. It is holiness of heart, but holiness lacking the great and chief measure consisting of salvation from all sin and the perfection of love. Regeneration bears the same relation to full redemption that infancy does to manhood, discipline to culture, feebleness to might, tuition to knowledge, and imperfection, maturity and completeness. Such being the relation of the two states, holiness can no more be separated from regeneration than the full currents of vitality In robust manhood can declare themselves unrelated to the feeble flow of Hood in infant veins. - LOWREY,Possibilities of Grace, pp. 185, 186

Dr. E. P. Ellyson treats the state of holiness under four different aspects, with four distinct results. (1) It is a state of moral purity. One may be far from maturity, there may be much of weakness and ignorance, the judgment may be far from perfect, but the heart may be clean; there may be nothing of moral defilement or pollution. (2) This is an experience of separation, and of being set apart. There is such devotement to God as to set one apart from the secular to the sacred. One In his consecration must thus set himself apart. In response to this consecration Christ sets him apart. (3) This is an experience of divine indwelling, of continued divine presence. With this experience, one is never alone, there are always two together; he is "filled with the Holy Ghost." (4) This is an enduement of power. The apostles were to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were "endued with power from on high." They had been converted and called to service as the first leaders of the church, they had been In training under the teaching of Jesus for some time; but there was a heavenly enduement with power that they needed to fit them for this place to which they were called. - DR. E. P. ELLYSON,Bible Holiness, pp. 104ff The difference between a justified soul who is not fully sanctified, and one fully sanctified, I understand to be this: The first is kept from voluntarily committing known sin, which is what is commonly meant in the New Testament by committing sin. But he yet finds in himself the

Concerning Sin in the Regenerate. It has been the uniform belief of the church, that original sin "continues to exist with the new life of the regenerate, until eradicated by the baptism with the Holy Spirit" (Creed, Art. V). As stated in the Thirty-nine Articles, "this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek fronhma sarkoV, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe, yet this lust hath of itself the nature of sin" (Art. IX). "By sin," says Mr. Wesley, "I here understand inward sin; any sinful temper, passion, or affection; such as pride, self-will, love of the world, in any kind or degree; such as lust, anger, peevishness; any disposition contrary to the mind which was in Christ" (Sermon: Sin in Believers

remains of inbred corruption or original sin; such as pride, anger, envy, a feeling of hatred to an enemy, a rejoicing at a calamity which has fallen upon an enemy. Now in all this the regenerate soul does not act voluntarily; his choice is against these evils, and resists and overcomes them as

soon as the mind perceives them. Though the Christian does not feel guilty for this depravity as he would do if he had voluntarily broken the law of God, yet he is often grieved and afflicted, and reproved at a sight of this sinfulness of his nature. Though the soul in this state enjoys a degree of religion, yet it is conscious it is not what it ought to be, nor what it must be to be fit for heaven. The second, or person fully sanctified, is cleansed from all these involuntary sins. He may be tempted by Satan, by men, and by his own bodily appetites to commit sin, but his heart is free from these inward fires, which before his full sanctification, were ready to fall in with the temptation and lead him into transgression. He may be tempted to be proud, to love the world, to be revengeful or angry, to hate an enemy, to wish him evil, or to rejoice at his calamity, but he feels none of these passions In his heart; the Holy Ghost has cleansed him from all these pollutions of his nature. Thus it is that, being emptied of sin, the perfect Christian is filled with the love of God, even with that perfect love which casteth out fear. - BISHOP HEADING. "This," says Dr. McDonald, "is so plain that the child may understand it, and so much in harmony with Christian experience that comment is unnecessary." - (Cf. McDONALD,Scriptural Way of Holiness, p. 122)

Regeneration is like breaking up the fallow ground and sowing it with wheat, In the growth of which there spring up tares. It is a mixed moral state. Sanctification is like weeding the soil, or gathering the tares and burning them, so that nothing remains to grow there but good seed. In regeneration a spiritual growth is like the slow progress of the wheat, choked and made sickly by the intermingling weeds. Entire sanctification removes them, roots them out of the heart, and leaves it a pure moral soil. - BISHOP HAMLINE.

within the heart of the believer, both grace and inbred sin, but there is not, nor can there be any commingling or blending of these antagonistic elements. They exist in the heart without admixture or composition. Otherwise we should have an adulterated holiness. Those who hold to the erroneous idea of regeneration as a making over of the old life, instead of an impartation of the new, find difficulty in accounting for a second work of grace

Entire Sanctification as Subsequent to Regeneration.Theologians of the Wesleyan type frequently speak of the incompleteness of regeneration, and of the necessity of entire sanctification in order to complete or perfect the redemptive process. Thus Dr. Miley states that "the doctrine of an incompleteness of the work of regeneration underlies entire sanctification, particularly in its Wesleyan form" (MILEY,Syst. Th

The Scriptures affirm that there remains in man, after conversion, what is called "the flesh," the "old man," "carnality," "wrath," - inherited predisposition - some call this predisposition, "tendency to evil," but it is evidently more; the apostle calls it "the body of sin." - DR. P. F. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 46 The question is not concerning outward sin; whether a child of God commits sin or no. We all agree and earnestly maintain, "He that committeth sin is of the devil." We agree, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Neither do we inquire whether sin will always remain in the children of God; whether sin will continue in the soul as long as it continues in the body: nor yet do we inquire whether a justified person may relapse either into inward or outward sin; but simply this, "Is a justified or regenerated man freed from all sin as soon as he is justified? . . . . But was he not then freed from all sin, so that there is no sin in his heart?" I cannot say this; I cannot believe it; because St. Paul says the contrary. He is speaking to believers in general, when he says, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to

the other" (Gal. 5:17). Nothing can be more expressive. The apostle here directly affirms that the flesh, evil nature, opposes the Spirit, even in believers; that even in the regenerate there are two principles, "contrary the one to the other." - WESLEY,Sin in Believers

Again, in his sermon on "Patience," Mr. Wesley says, "Till this universal change (purification) was wrought in his soul (the regenerate), all his holiness was mixed." In commenting on this, Rev. J. A. Wood says, "mixed, necessarily in a restricted sense. Both grace and inbred sin have existence in the same soul, though antagonistic and at war with each other. Though existing for the time in the same person in admixture, they are distinct in nature and tendency; they are `contrary the one to the other,' and are irreconcilable enemies. Partly holy, and partly unholy, as in a sense is the case with the merely regenerate, does by no means imply a homogenous character, combining and assimilating into a common nature the elements of both holiness and sin." - J. A. WOOD,Purity and Maturity, p. 111.

is a sense in which this is true, but the form of the statement is unfortunate. Regeneration considered in itself is not an imperfect work. It is the bestowal of divine life, and as an operation of the Spirit, is complete in itself. But regeneration is only a part of the grace embraced in the New Covenant, and in this sense only may be said to be incomplete - incomplete as not in itself representing the totality of New Covenant blessings. Again, regeneration is frequently represented in Wesleyan theology, as the beginning of sanctification - a work which comes to its perfection in entire sanctification. Here, also, discriminating thought is necessary. Regeneration is the beginning of sanctification in this &nb

Regeneration and sanctification both deal primarily with the sin question. That is why they are called the first and second blessings or works of grace. There are many blessings in Christian experience and Christian life, but there are two blessings that are called the first and second blessings. This is due to the fact that these two specific blessings deal with the question of sin. The one deals primarily with what we do, the other primarily with what we are. It would not be altogether correct to say that regeneration deals with the act alone. We have already stated that regeneration deals with sins committed, with spiritual death, and with acquired pollution. Neither would it be quite correct to assert that sanctification deals only with our inner state. This is true primarily, but indirectly it deals with our ethics because of the fact that our inner state makes it easier or harder for us to live right externally. . . . . Here is the great battle ground concerning holiness. The question is simply this, Is sin destroyed in the act of sanctification or not? This is the question on which turns all belief in sanctification. It is folly to try to pass as a believer in holiness and at the same time question its doctrine of eradication. There cannot be such a thing as holiness in its final analysis without the eradication of sin. Holiness and suppression are incompatible terms. "The old man" and counteraction make a pale and sickly kind of holiness doctrine. It is holiness and eradication or holiness not at all. - DR. R. T. WILLIAMS,Sanctification, pp. 16, 17 When does inward sanctification begin? In the moment a man is justified. Yet sin remains in him, yea the seed of all sin, till he is sanctified throughout. - WESLEY,Plain Account, p. 48

Regeneration, also, being the same as the new birth, is the beginning of sanctification, though not the completion of it, or not entire sanctification. Regeneration is the beginning of purification; entire sanctification is the finishing of that work. - BISHOP HEDDING,Conference Address The implantation of spiritual life does not destroy the carnal mind; though its power is broken, it does

not cease to exist. While the new birth is the beginning of purification, it is, perhaps, more the process of imparting or begetting spiritual life, than the process of refining or purification; which in entire sanctification is the extraction of remaining impurity from regenerated human nature. - J. A. WOOD,Purity and Maturity, p. 112 That a distinction exists between a regenerate state, and a state of entire and perfect holiness, will be generally allowed. - WATSON,Institutes, II, chap 29.

sense only, that the life bestowed in the new birth is a holy life. This new life, being one of "holy love" may be said to be the beginning of holiness. But we are not to infer from this that the expanding of this new life by growth, or the increase and development of this love, will bring the soul to entire sanctification. Failure to discriminate here, leads inevitably to the "growth theory" of sanctification. Sanctification is an act of cleansing, and unless inbred sin be removed, there can be no fullness of life, no perfection in love. In a strict sense, regeneration is not purification. Initial sanctification accompanies regeneration, as does also justification and adoption, but regeneration is the impartation of life, and initial sanctification is the cleansing from guilt and acquired depravity. Closely related to both of the foregoing is another statement that needs to be qualified also. We refer to the expression that sanctification is not something new, but a perfecting of that which we already possess. It is indeed true that there is asubstratumwhich is common to both regeneration and entire sanctification, that is, a life of moral love. But regeneration is the impartation of this life of love, and entire sanctification is such a purification of the heart as makes love sole and supreme in experience. The two works are separate and distinct, and consequently the latter is something more than the mere finishing touches of the former

There are two questions which immediately arise in this connection, (1) Why is redemption not comprehended in a single work of grace: and (2) What length of time must elapse between regeneration and entire sanctification? &nb

The substratum of all experimental grace, subsequent to justification is the same. It is love, perfect or imperfect. From the horizon to the zenith, from the twilight to the effulgence of day, the substance is love, love to God and to our neighbor. - LOWREY, Possibilities of Grace, p. 225 That this perfect love, or entire sanctification, is specifically a new state, and not the improvement of a former state, or of regeneration, is plainly inferred from the Bible. - BISHOP HAMLINE,Beauty of Holiness, p. 264.

1. Concerning the first question, it is impossible to say what God may or may not do; we can form our deductions only from what He has revealed to us in His Word. We may say then that God does not justify and entirely sanctify His people by a single work of grace, (1) Because it is not so revealed in His Word. God has system and method in His works, and the work of grace is always bestowed in the same manner, although the manifestations may vary. (2) The sinner does not realize his need of sanctification. His guilt and condemnation at first occupy his attention, and only later does he come to see the need of further cleansing. (3) Life must be given in regeneration before that life can be consciously treated in entire sanctification. (4) Justification and sanctification deal with different phases of sin; the former with sins committed, or sin as an act; the latter with sin inherited, or sin as a principle or nature. It appears to be impossible to discover the latter condition without having experienced the former. Then, too, these works of the Spirit are in some sense antipodal, or directly opposite - the one being an impartation of life, the other a crucifixion or death (cf. C. W. RUTH,Entire Sanctification, p. 48; also LOWREY,Possibilities of

Grace, p. 205)

2. As to the time which must elapse between the two works of grace, this depends wholly upon the experience of the individual. "This progressive work," says Luther Lee, "may be cut short and finished at any &nb

We remark, first, entire sanctification is not usually, if ever, contemporary with regeneration. Regeneration is, in most cases of Christian experience, if not in all, initial sanctification - not completed, perfect renewal. The regenerated person is not, at the moment of his regeneration, "wholly sanctified"; he is not born into the kingdom of God a full-grown man; his new creation is not in the stature of the fullness of Christ; nor is he a child born into perfect spiritual life and health. In a good sense it may be figuratively said, as it is often said, he is a perfect child; but pleasant as the figure may be, it must not be pressed beyond the truth; though a perfect child, evincing good health, there are still in his moral nature, susceptibilities, liabilities, perhaps actualities, of disease, which may develop into speedy death, and, unless counteracted by additional grace, will certainly do so. Does anyone argumentatively ask, Does God bring into His kingdom sickly children? we must answer, He certainly does. Many such are born naturally, and there are many such among God’s spiritual children - children requiring much nursing to keep them in the breath of life. - RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, II, p. 375.

moment. When the intelligence clearly comprehends the defects of the present state, and faith, comprehending the power and willingness of God to sanctify us wholly, and do it now, is exercised" (LEE,Elements of Theology, p. 214). Any delay beyond the period necessary to learn the nature and conditions of its attainment, must be charged to human weakness. God’s time is the present moment. Frequently, also, there are those who enter this experience through spiritual obedience only, without any clear understanding of the theological, or even the scriptural terms in which it is expressed The Divinely Appointed Means and Agencies.We find it impossible to properly appreciate the nature of entire sanctification, without taking into account the means and agencies which God employs to stamp His image anew upon the hearts of men. Sanctification is said to be by blood, by the Spirit, by faith, and through the truth. (1) The originating cause is the love of God.Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins(I John 4:10). (2) The meritorious or procuring cause is the blood of Jesus Christ.If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin(I John 1:7). (3) The efficient cause or agency is the Holy Spirit.We are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost(Titus 3:5); we are said to be electedthrough sanctification of the Spirit(I Peter 1:2); and again, that we are chosen to salvationthrough sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth

I have been lately thinking a good deal on one point wherein, perhaps, we have all been wanting. We have not made it a rule, as soon as ever persons are justified, to remind them of "going on unto perfection." Whereas this is the very time preferable to all others. - WESLEY, (Letter to Thomas Rankin).

prayer, used the wordsSanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth(John 17:17). The Holy Spirit is the spirit of truth and acts through its instrumentality. Hence St. Peter says,Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth(I Peter 1:22); and St. John declares thatwhoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him(I John 2:5). (5)

The conditional cause is faith. And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith(Acts 15:9);that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me(Acts 26:18). When, therefore, we speak of sanctification as being wrought by the Father, or by the Son, or by the Holy Spirit; whether we speak of it as by the blood, or through the truth, or by faith, we are referring merely to the different causes which enter in to this great experience PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION The term progressive as used in connection with sanctification must be clearly defined. As used in the Wesleyan sense, it means simply the temporal aspect of the work of grace in the heart, as it takes place in successive stages. Each of these stages is marked by a gradual approach and an instantaneous consummation in experience, and the stages together mark the full scope of sanctifying grace. Thus "in His administration of sanctifying grace the Holy Spirit proceeds by degrees. Terms of progress are applied to each department of that work in the saint; or, in other words, the goal of entire sanctification is represented as the end of a process in which the Spirit requires the co-operation of the believer. This co-operation, however, is only the condition on which is suspended what is the work of divine

Dr. Edward F. Walker reduces the essentials of salvation to seven causes, as follows: (1) The first cause is the holy Father (Jude 1); (2) the procuring cause is the holy Son (Eph. 5:26); (3) the efficient cause is the Holy Spirit (I Peter 1:2); (4) the determining cause is the divine will (Heb. 10:10); (5) the meritorious cause is the sacrifice of Jesus (Heb. 13:12); (6) the instrumental cause is the truth of God (John 17:17); and (7) the conditional cause is faith in Christ.

grace alone" (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 36). There is here a great truth which no student of theology can afford to overlook, and failure to emphasize this point, leads to confusion concerning the experience itself. But this point was not sufficiently guarded by Methodist theologians, and as a consequence, the emphasis came gradually to be placed upon the aspect of growth and development, rather than upon the crises which marked the different stages in personal experience. Later writers on this subject have more carefully guarded this point. They have emphasized the instantaneousness of sanctification as an act, and thereby preserved the truth of progressive sanctification without falling into the error of the growth theory. Three subjects must be considered in this division, as follows: (1) Sanctification as partial and entire; (2) sanctification as gradual and instantaneous; and (3) sanctification as instantaneous and continuous

Sanctification as Partial and Entire.The concomitant blessings which make up conversion as a first work of grace, are (1) Justification as an act of forgiveness in the mind of God; (2) regeneration as the impartation of a new nature; and (3) adoption as an assurance of the privileges of heirship. To these there must be added another concomitant known as (4) "initial" sanctification. Defilement attaches to sinful acts, and so also does guilt, which is the consciousness of sin as our own. There must be, therefore, this initial cleansing, concomitant with the other blessings of the first work of grace, if this guilt and acquired depravity are to be removed from the sinner. Since that which removes pollution and makes holy is properly called "sanctification," this first or initial cleansing is "partial" sanctification. But the term is not an indefinite one, referring to the cleansing away of more or less of the sinner’s defilement. It is a definite term, and is limited strictly to that guilt and acquired depravity attaching to actual sins, for which the sinner is himself responsible. It does not refer to the cleansing from original sin or inherited depravity, for which the sinner is not responsible

We may say then that initial or partial sanctification includes in its scope all that acquired pollution which attaches to the sinner’s own acts; while entire sanctification includes the cleansing from original sin or inherited depravity. Since sin is twofold - an act, and a state or condition, sanctification must be twofold. There is and can be but two stages in the process of sanctification - initial and entire - the full consummation of the process being rightly known as glorification Sanctification as Gradual and Instantaneous.

Dr. C. J. Fowler points out that sanctification is a double term - used for the partial work of salvation, and for the complete work of salvation. This is a distinction that needs to be kept in mind in order to avoid confusion in thought. For this reason, he suggests that the qualifying word "entire" should always he used when one means complete sanctification, although it is not necessary to do so in the interest of exact statement (cf.Double Cure, p. 103)

Regeneration has been defined by one as an ingeneration of divine life; a sudden process by which man passes from spiritual death to a spiritual life through the quickening power of God’s Holy Spirit. As has been stated, in regeneration one passes from a state of death to a state of spiritual life; from a state of guilt to a state of "forgiveness"; from a state of pollution - that is the pollution acquired by his own acts of disobedience against the laws of God - to a state of conscious cleansing; that is, a cleansing from acquired pollution. Thus regeneration has cleansing, not from the moral corruption inherited through the fall, but cleansing from that moral pollution acquired by his own acts of disobedience. - Dr. R. T. WILLIAMS,Sanctification, pp. 13, 14.

preparatory work may be cut short in righteousness. When the sinner perfectly submits to the righteousness of Christ, and believes the promises of God, that moment he is justified and the Spirit imparts new life to his soul. When, also, the child of God through the Spirit, fully renounces inbred sin and trusts the blood of cleansing, that moment he may, by simple faith in Christ, be sanctified wholly The classic passage in support of this position is found inThe Plain Account of Christian Perfection(p. 51). The question is asked, "Is this death to sin and renewal in love gradual or instantaneous?" The answer is, "A man may be dying for some time; yet he does not, properly speaking, die until the instant the soul is separated from the body; and in that instant he lives the life of eternity. In like manner he may be dying to sin for some time; yet he is not dead to sin until sin is separated from his soul; and in that instant he lives the full life of love." The Scriptures bear out the thought of the gradual preparation and instantaneous completion of entire sanctification so clearly stated by Mr. Wesley. Perhaps the most familiar passage is that which represents inbred sin as under the doom of death.Our old man, says St. Paul, is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin

The truth seems to be this, that the conditional, preparatory work done in the soul under the guidance of the Spirit may be a process more or less lengthy, according as the seeker after sanctification is more or less receptive and yielding to the Spirit’s influence. But when that preparatory work is all completed, and the soul is submissive and open to God, "suddenly the Lord whom ye seek will come to his temple" your heart, your whole being, and fill you with Himself and reign there without a rival. - DR. A. M. HILLS,Holiness and Power, p. 215

Sanctification is "distinct in opposition to the idea that it is a mere regeneration; holding it to be something more and additional; instantaneous, in opposition to the idea of growth gradually to maturity or ripeness ensuing gradual growth, but is by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost, and

instantaneously wrought, however long the soul may have been progressing toward it." - FOSTER,Christian Purity, p. 46

Those who teach that we are gradually to grow into a state of sanctification, without ever experiencing an instantaneous change from inbred sin to holiness, are to be repudiated as unsound - antiscriptural and anti-Wesleyan. - NATHAN BANGS, inGuide to Holiness Though purity is gradually approached, it is instantaneously bestowed. - BISHOP HAMLINE.

manner of death, is a gradual process, disqualifying the body from serving any master, but certainly tending to death, and having its final issue in death. The same writer in another epistle, exhorts us tomake not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof(Rom. 13:14). Here, again, the apostle speaks of the renunciation of the carnal mind, which he portrays under the strong figure of a crucifixion, or a nailing to the cross; and he commands that no provision be made for the fulfilling of the inordinate desires of the flesh. The "old man" must be kept on the cross until he dies; and when sin expires, in that moment the soul is entirely sanctified and lives the full life of perfect love

Entire Sanctification as Instantaneous and Continuous.While there is a gradual approach to sanctification, and a gradual growth in grace following it, the sanctifying act by which we are made holy, must of necessity be instantaneous. In the words of Bishop Hamline, "It is gradually approached, but instantaneously bestowed." Dr. Adam Clarke states that "in no part of the Scriptures are we directed to seek holiness by gradation. We are to come to God for an instantaneous and complete purification from all sin, as for instantaneous pardon. Neither the seriatim pardon, nor the gradation purification, exists in the Bible" (CLARKE,Chr. Th

From this we may deduce two principles. First, the general bias, or character of the soul, becomes positively more and more alienated from sin and set upon good; and, proportionately, the susceptibility to temptation or the affinity with sin becomes negatively less and less evident in its consciousness. There is in the healthy progress of the Christian a constant confirmation of the will in its ultimate choice, and a constant increase of its power to do what it wills: the vanishing point of perfection in the will is to be entirely merged in the will of God. . . . . The positive side - that of consecration by the Spirit of love - is also a process, a gradual process. . . . . Hence the shedding abroad of the love of God by the Holy Ghost admits of increase. It is enough to cite the apostle’s prayer: "that your love may abound yet more and more" (Phil. 1:9). This, in harmony with the uniform tenor of scripture, refers to the growth of love toward God and man. . . . . Is then the process of sanctification ended by am attainment which rewards human endeavor simply? Assuredly not; the Holy Spirit finishes the work in His own time, and in His own way, as His own act. and in the absolute Supremacy if not in the absolute sovereignty of His own gracious character. POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., pp. 37, 38, 42.

act. We mean by this that we are cleansed from all sin, only as through faith, we are brought into a right relation to the atoning blood of Jesus Christ; and only as there is a continuous relation to atoning blood by faith, will there be a continuous cleansing, in the sense of a preservation in purity and holiness. In this connection we refer again to Dr. Adam Clarke, who says, "The meritorious efficacy of His passion and death has purged our conscience from dead works; and cleanseth us kaqarizei hmaV continues to cleanse us; that is, to keep clean what He has made clean; for it requires the same merit and energy to preserve holiness in the soul of man, as to produce it"

(CLARKE,Com. I John 1:7). Both the instantaneous and continuous aspects of sanctification are set forth by the Apostle John as follows:But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin

There is a consummation of the Christian experience which may be said to introduce perfection, when the Spirit cries, "It is finished," in the believer. The moment when sin expires, known only to God, is the divine victory over sin in the soul: this is the office of the Spirit alone. The moment when love becomes supreme in its ascendancy, a moment known only to God, is the Spirit's triumph in the soul's consecration: this also is entirely His work, and whenever that maturity of Christian experience and life is reached which the apostle prays for so often, it L solely through the operation of the same spirit. It is being filled with all the fullness of God, and that through being strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man (Eph. 3:16-19). - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th.,III, p. 43 The fact that inborn sin is a unit, an evil principle or taint infecting our nature, and cannot he removed by parts, and more than its antagonism, the principle of life in Christ, can be imparted gradually in our regeneration is evidence that sanctification is instantaneous. - J. A. WOOD,Perfect Love

Salvation in all its stages is by faith and by faith alone. And this makes sanctification not only instantaneous, hut creates a necessity that we should receive it as a gracious gift, bestowed in opposition to a product worked out, or resulting from development and growth. - Dr. Asbury Lowrey.

indwelling of the Spirit made the recipients of His continuously sanctifying grace. There is a remarkable degree of harmony between this text, and that found in I Peter 1:2. Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ

Observe here, (1) Sin exists in the soul after two modes or forms: in guilt, which requires forgiveness or pardon; In pollution, which requires cleansing. (2) Guilt, to be forgiven, must be confessed; and pollution, to be cleansed, must be also confessed. In order to find mercy, a man must know and feel himself to he a sinner, that he may fervently apply to God for pardon. In order to get a clean heart, a man must know and feel its depravity, acknowledge and deplore It before God, in order to be fully sanctified. . (3) Few are pardoned, because they do not feel and confess their sins; and few are sanctified or cleansed from all sin, because they do not feel and confess their own sore, and the plague of their hearts. (4) As the blood of Jesus Christ, the merit of His passion and death, applied by faith, purges the conscience from all dead works; so the same cleanses the heart from all unrighteousness. (5) As all unrighteousness is sin, so he that is cleansed from all unrighteousness is cleansed from all sin. To attempt to evade this, and plead for the continuance of sin in the heart, through life, is ungrateful, wicked and even blasphemous: for as he who "says he has not sinned, makes God a liar," who has declared the contrary through every part of His revelation; so he that says the blood of Christ either cannot or will not cleanse us from all sin in this life, gives also the lie to his Maker, who has declared the contrary; and thus shows that the Word, the doctrine of God, is not in him. - DR. ADAM CLARKE,Com. I John 1:7-10.

by Christ, not separate from, but in and with Himself; not only by the blood of cleansing, but under the sprinkling of that blood. Faith is the vital bond of union with Christ, and the pure in heart abide in Him only by a continuous faith. If this connection be severed, spiritual life ceases immediately. If

now, we analyze this position carefully, we shall see that as in justification there was a judicial or declarative act which set the soul in right relation to God, and concomitant with it in experience, though logically following it, an inward cleansing by the Spirit from guilt and acquired depravity; so also in entire sanctification there is a judicial sanctification, or a declarative act which pronounces the soul holy, attended by the concomitant grace of the spirit which cleanses from all sin. This act is sometimes known as positional, or imputed holiness. in the same sense that justification is regarded as imputed righteousness. But to maintain that it is possible for a soul to be positionally holy, apart from the inner work of the Spirit which makes it actually holy is one of the errors of imputationism. All the damaging errors which underlie imputation as dissevered from impartation in regard to justification or Christian righteousness, attach likewise to entire sanctification or Christian holiness. &nb

Dr. George Peck in his "Christian Perfection" states that sanctification implies both the death of sin, and the life of righteousness. When, therefore, we speak of sanctification, as to the former part of it, we say it may be attained at once - it is an instantaneous work. . . . . But in relation to the latter part, that is the life of righteousness, it is regarded as entirely progressive. The destruction of sin in the soul, and the growth of holiness are two distinct things. . . . . The one is instantaneous, the other gradual, hence it is that we sometimes say with propriety, that the work of entire sanctification is both gradual and instantaneous. - DR. GEORGE PECK,Christian Perfection

What is it that cleanseth the soul and destroys sin? Is it not the mighty power of the grace of God? What is it that keeps the soul clean? Is it not the same power dwelling in us? No more can an effect subsist without its cause, than a sanctified soul can abide in holiness without the indwelling Sanctifier. - CLARKE,Christian Theology, p. 187 To say that the doctrine of Christian perfection supersedes the need of Christ’s blood is not less absurd than to assert that the perfection of navigation renders the great deep a useless reservoir of water. - FLETCHER.Last Check, p. 574.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

Entire sanctification is a term applied to the fullness of redemption, or the cleansing of the heart from all sin. "We may open our definition of this great gift by asserting that the work of grace, of which the heart is the subject, has its inception, progress, and consummation in this life. The consummation is entire holiness" (LOWREY,Possibilities of Grace, p. 209). It is this consummation of the experience with which we are now concerned, "an entire conformity of heart and life to the will of God, as made known in His Word" (WAKEFIELD,Chr. Th., p. 446). We shall consider three phases of the subject as follows: (1) Entire Sanctification as a Purification from Sin; (2) Entire Sanctification as a Positive Devotement to God; and (3) The Divine and Human Elements in Entire Sanctification

Entire Sanctification as a Purification from Sin.We have indicated that the verb to sanctify is from the Latin sanctus (holy) and facere (to make) and, therefore, when used in the imperative mood, signifies literally to make holy. In the Greek we have the same meaning from the verbhagiadzo(agiazw), which is derived fromhagios(agioV) holy and, therefore, signifies

"But if there be no such second change; if there be no instantaneous change after justification; if there be none but a gradual work of God as well as we can, to remain full of sin till death." "As to the manner, (that there is a gradual work none denies), then we must be content, I believe this

perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith: consequently in an instant." "Certainly sanctification (in the proper sense) is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin." - WESLEY,Sermons The veil over the eyes of a man surrendered to God, is sin - not committed sins hut the sin conditions which are his as a child of Adam. It blurs the vision, it hides God from the soul. - Dr. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 135 The attainment of perfect freedom from sin is one to which believers are called during the present life; and it is necessary to completeness of holiness and of those active and passive graces of Christianity by which they are called to glorify God in this world and to edify mankind. . . . . All the promises of God which are not expressly, or from their order, referred to future time, are objects of present trust; and their fulfillment now is made conditionally only by our faith. They cannot. therefore, be pleaded in our prayers, with an entire reliance upon the truth of God, in vain. To this faith shall the promises of entire sanctification be given, which in the nature of the case supposes an instantaneous work immediately following upon entire and unwavering faith. - WATSON,Institutes, II, p. 455.

alsoto make holy. We may say, then, that the first essential element in entire sanctification is the purifying of the believer’s heart from inbred sin or inherited depravity. In our discussion of this subject we shall note (1) the Twofold Aspect of Original Sin; and (2) the Extent of the Cleansing as set forth in the Scriptures.

1. Original sin must be viewed under a twofold aspect. (1) It is the common sin that infects the race regarded in a general manner; and (2) it is a portion of this general heritage individualized in the separate persons composing the race. As to the former, or sin in the generic sense, original sin will not be abolished until the time of the restoration of all things. Until that time, something of the penalty remains untaken away; and likewise something of the liability to temptation, or the susceptibility to sin, essential to a probationary state. But in the second sense, the carnal mind, or the sin that dwelleth in the me of the soul - the principle in man which has actual affinity with transgression, this is abolished by the purifying work of the Spirit of holiness, and the soul kept pure by His indwelling Presence

2. The extent of cleansing according to the Scriptures, includes the complete removal of all sin. Sin is to be cleansed thoroughly, purged, extirpated, eradicated &nb

Original sin, or sin as generic and belonging to the race in its federal constitution. on earth is not abolished till the time of which it is said, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5); as something of the penalty remains untaken away, so also something of the peculiar concupiscence or liability to temptation or affinity with evil that besets the man in this world remains. The saint delivered from personal sin is still connected with sin by his own past: the one forgiveness is regarded as perpetually renewed until the final act of mercy. . . . . Hence it is not usual to speak of original sin absolutely as done away in Christ. The race hath its sin that doth so easily beset (Heb. 12:1), its euperistaton amartian; and we must cease to belong to the lineage of Adam before our unsinning state become sinlessness. But original sin in its quality as the sin that dwelleth in the me of the soul, as the principle in man that has actual affinity with transgression, as the source and law of sin which is in my members, as the animating soul of the body of this death (Rom. 7:20, 23, 24), and finally, as the flesh with its affections and lusts, is abolished by the Spirit of holiness indwelling the Christian, when His purifying grace has had its perfect work. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 47.

cated and crucified; not repressed, suppressed, counteracted or made void, as these terms are commonly used. It is to be destroyed; and any theory which makes a place for the existence of inbred sin, whatever the provisions made for its regulation, is unscriptural. The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be (Rom. 8:7). A study of the Greek terms used in this connection, will make this clear. (1) One of the most common terms iskatharidzo(kaqarizw), which means to make clean, or to cleanse in general, both inwardly and outwardly; to consecrate by cleansing or purifying; or to free from the defilement of sin. Some of the more prominent texts in which this word is used are the following:And put no difference between us and them, purifying[kaqarisaV]their hearts by faith(Acts 15:9);Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse[kaqariswmen]ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit perfecting holiness in the fear of God(II Cor. 7:1); Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify[kaqarish]unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works(Titus 2:14);But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth[kaqarizei]us from all sin(I John 1:7). Cf. also Matt. 23:25, 26; Luke 11:39; Mark 7:19; Matt. 8:2ff; Eph. 5:26; Heb. 10:14; James 4:8. (2) Closely related to this is the wordkatargeo(kat-argew) which signifies to annul, to abolish, to put an end to, to cause to cease. That the body of sin might be destroyed[kat-arghqh],that henceforth we should not serve sin(Rom. 6:6). Cf. also Luke 13:7; I Cor. 1:28; II Thess. 2:8; II Tim. 1:10; Heb. 2:14; Gal. 5:11; I Cor. 13:8; II Cor. 3:7, 11. (3) The wordekkathairo(ek-kaqairw) means to cleanse out thoroughly, or to purge. Purge [ekkaqarate] out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened (I Corinthians 5:7 cf. II Timothy 2:21). (4) Another strong term isekrizoo(ek-rizow) which means to root out, to pluck upby the roots, and, therefore, toeradicate. Thus the word eradicate appears in the original text but is veiled in the English translation. It is found in the word of our Lord to His disciples, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up[ekrizwqhsetai] (Matt. 15:13). This is explained by St. John to mean that our Lord came to destroy the works of the devil (I John 3:8) (cf. Matt. 13:29; Luke 17:6; Jude 12). (5) Perhaps the strongest term used in this connection isstauroo(staurow), sometimesana-stauroo(anastaurow) orsu-stauroo(sustaurow), which according to Thayer means "to crucify the flesh, destroy its power utterly (the nature of the figure implying that the destruction is attended with intense pain)." It is used in Galatians 5:24, And they that are Christ’s have crucified [estaurwsan] the flesh with the affections and lusts. The words estaurwmai tini and estaurwtai moi ti [sic] as used by St. Paul, carry with them the force of "I have been crucified to something and it has been crucified to me, so that we are dead to each other, all fellowship and intercourse between us has ceased" (cf. THAYER,Lexicon, Gal. 6:14; 5:24; 2:19). (6) Closely related to the previous term is the wordthanatoo(qanatow) signifying to subdue, mortify or kill. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead [eqanatwqhte] to the law by the body of Christ (Rom. 7:4 first clause); for if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die [apoqnhskein]: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify [qanatoute] the deeds of the body, ye shall live (Rom. 8:13). Here as Thayer indicates, the word means "to make to die, that is, destroy, render extinct" (something vigorous). The Vulgate hasmortifico, and the Authorized Version, mortify. (7) The wordluo

Sanctification goes even deeper than contradiction of wrong habit or evil conduct. It strikes not only at our customs and our ideals, but it goes to the seat of wrong affections. It demands death to every wrong affection and to every wrong inner feeling and calls for the absorption of the will in the divine will. This is a glorious demand, but a costly one and, therefore, it is unpopular. Sanctification

calls for the death not only of sinful acts, but sinful desires, sinful appetites and sinful affections. It goes to the center of the human character to destroy the works of the devil. Here is the great battleground of human hearts and human lives. - GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT R. T. WILLIAMS,Sanctification, pp. 30, 31.

(luw) is sometimes used in this connection also. As so used it means primarily to loose or free from; but also to break up, to demolish or to destroy.For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy[lush]the works of the devil(I John 3:8). A careful study of these terms should convince every earnest inquirer that the Scriptures teach the complete cleansing of the heart from inbred sin - the utter destruction of the carnal mind.

Entire Sanctification as a Positive Devotement to God.The work of sanctification involves not only a Separation from sin, but a separation to God. This positive devotement, however, is something more than the human consecration of the soul to God. It represents, also, the Holy Spirit's acceptance of the offering, and, therefore, a divine empowering or enduement. It is a divine possession, and the spring and energy of this spiritual devotement is holy love. The Spirit of God, as the spirit of perfect consecration is able as the Sanctifier, not only to fill the soul with love, but to awaken love in return. Hence St. Paul declares thatthe love of God is shed abroad[ekkecutai, poured out]in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us(Rom. 5:5); while St. Peter approaching the subject from the opposite viewpoint says, Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently (I Peter 1:22). The former is a positive bestowal of divine love - bestowed by the Holy Spirit, and, therefore, holy love; the latter is such a purification as removes from the heart everything that is contrary to the outflow of perfect love. We may say, then, that while entire sanctification considered from the negative point of view is a cleansing from all sin, from the positive standpoint it is the infilling of divine love. This is the first contrast. But we have not yet reached the root of this matter. While the first contrast is between purity on the one hand, and perfect love on the other, there is a narrower contrast within the nature of holiness itself. Entire sanctificationis something more than either purity or perfect love. Neither of these in the strictest sense of the term is holiness. Holiness consists in the unity of these two aspects of experience. Hence those who have been cleansed from sin, or "the veil of sin conditions" which separates between man and God; and who have been consecrated to God, thereby becoming His possession through the bestowal of the Spirit - these are the saints (agioi) or holy ones; and the state in which they live is agiwsunh or holiness. Holiness in man is the same as holiness in God as to quality, but with this difference, the former is derived, while the latter is absolute. In our discussion of the "Biblical Concepts of Holiness and Love," and the relation existing between them, (chapter 14, pp. 373ff) we indicated that the nature of God was holy love - love and holiness being equally of the nature or essence of God. But conceived in the philosophical terms of personality, holiness represents the self-grasp, and love the self-communication; hence holiness logically precedes and must be regarded as the peculiar quality of that nature out of which love flows. Now it will be seen that there is here a narrower contrast existing in holiness itself; and this is best expressed in words applied to Jesus,Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity(Heb. 1:9). Purity and love are thus combined in a deeper, underlying nature, which does not so much appear to indicate any particular virtue, nor all of the virtues combined, as it does the recoil of a pure soul from sin, and a love of righteousness, indicative of a nature in perfect

harmony with itself The distinctions in holiness are ably set forth by Bishop John P. Newman in an article entitled "Scriptural Holiness" published in theTreasury(November, 1888). He says, "What is scriptural holiness? Can we reach its germinal idea? May we rely upon divine aid to ascertain the mind of the Spirit? . . . . In its radical sense it seems to be a peculiar affection wherewith a being of perfect virtue regards moral evil. In a word it is evidently the abhorrence of whatever a holy God has forbidden.Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil.Noseverer test than this can be applied to our spiritual condition. . . . . The Father's eulogy of His Son, and the reason He assigns for the Son's eternal kingship is, Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows(Heb. 1:9). In this hatred of sin and love of holiness, is the deep significance of the command,Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy. If from the old dispensation we pass to the new, we find that holiness therein also implies a state of purity and an act of obedience. Christ is the only religious teacher known to man who demands of His people a moral condition antecedent to the act. He goes behind the act, behind the motive, behind the thought, and takes cognizance of that moral state out of which these spring as the effects of a persistent cause. His doctrine is, that what we think and feel and do are expressions of character which lie deeper than the will, deeper than the affections, deeper than the conscience; that this character is the sum of what a man is, in all his appetites, passions, tendencies; and that out of this character issue man's totality and finality. If God is not a respecter of persons, He is of moral character, and that He has foreordained unto eternal life. Christ's demand for a moral condition antecedent to all mental and physical action is in harmony with the order of nature. There is a passive state of our muscular force and intellectual powers upon which the active depends, and of which the active is the living expression. If the arm is strong to defend, there must be healthfulness in the muscles thereof. If the faculties of the mind respond to the will, there must be latent vigor in the intellect. Man's moral nature is both passive and active. If the affections respond only to objects of purity, if the conscience only to the voice of right, if the will only to the call of duty, there must be inherent purity and strength in all our moral powers, when quiescent; this is the glorious significance of our Lord's words,The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me- nothing in my nature or spirit, nothing in my thoughts or motives, nothing in my words or deeds,for underlying all these is my state of purity. . . . . In this evangelical sense, and as lying hack of this hatred of sin and this state of purity, holiness is the readjustment of our whole nature, whereby the inferior appetites and propensities are subordinated, and the superior intellectual and moral powers restored to their supremacy; and Christ reigns in a completely renewed soul." Not only, therefore, in a broad sense does entire sanctification include purity and perfect love, but holiness is such that it includes both in a deeper nature - so completely renovated and adjusted by the work of the Spirit that its very expression is a love for righteousness and hatred of iniquity The Divine and Human Elements in Entire Sanctification.We have characterized entire sanctification in a broad sense as negatively, a purification from sin, and positively, a full devotement to God. We have seen, also, that holiness embraces both of these aspects in itself, yet nevertheless expresses in a deeper and more fundamental contrast, a nature which at once manifests itself in a love for righteousness and a hatred of iniquity. These must be regarded as fundamental aspects of the human experience, or the divine work wrought in the human heart. But now we must put this total human experience over against the divine element by which it is wrought, and set these in their proper relation to each other. The human transformation is wrought solely that the hearts of men may be prepared for the divine indwelling. There is both a saving

relation from sin and the establishment of a new and holy fellowship. The efficacy of the atonement is both direct and indirect. It is direct in that it does away, not only with the veil of actual sins, which hides the face of God, but makes a new and living way through the second veil of sin conditions, purging the soul from the carnal mind, and thus bringing it into the presence of God. It is indirect in that it secures the power of the Holy Spirit which carries its virtue or efficacy into the inner man. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit. "This gift purifies the heart. That means the destruction of the body of sin,the removal of the carnal mind. It means also something far other; it is more than house-cleaning. This gift is the gift of Himself. The house is cleaned, purified, in order to receive the Guest. He makes it ready for His abode. . . . . Neither does heavenly enduement - aside from the indwelling personality - confer upon men power, either for Christian living or service. To make a man guiltless and pure - which God has provided for - is not sufficient. If left thus he would be an easy prey for the devil and the world, and utterly unable to do the work of bringing men and women to God. We stand by faith, which is heart loyalty to God, an intense longing, trustful gazing into His face; but this would not be sufficient, only that God provides that, into such a heart, that the divine presence comes, filling it with Himself. He keeps it. He acts in and through it. It becomes His temple and His basis of operations. The Bible insists upon, and we must have holiness of heart, but we cannot trust in a holy heart; we can trust only in Him who dwells within it" (DR. BRESEE,Sermons, pp. 7, 8, 27). Entire sanctification as effected by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, must, therefore, be regarded as a comprehensive experience, embracing in one, both "the cleansing of the heart from sin, and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service." Here the experience of entire sanctification is set off distinctly from that of justification and regeneration which precedes

The original teaching of Methodism was peculiar also in its remarkable blending of the divine and human elements in the process of sanctification. It invariably did justice to both the supreme divine efficiency and to the co-operation of man. The charge brought against it, sometimes malevolently, sometimes thoughtlessly, that it stimulates believers to expect this supreme and most sacred blessing at any time, irrespective of their preparatory discipline, is contradicted by the whole tenor of the authoritative standards of this doctrine. Wesley’s sermon on "The Scripture Way of Salvation," contains an elaborate discussion of this point; and it must be taken as a whole by those who would understand the subject. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 97

Human nature at its best, under the blessed remedial power of the blood of Jesus, is but a dwelling place from which, or an avenue through which God acts. Of course the dwelling place or avenue is glorified by His presence, as the water in the river-bed makes its banks fresh with life and beauty. There must be conditions of power, but the conditions are utterly useless without the added power. - DR. PHINEAS F. BRESEE,Sermons, p. 8.

it; and it is equally guarded from the erroneous third blessing theory, which regards entire sanctification solely as a work of cleansing, to be followed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit as an added gift of power. The baptism with the Holy Spirit is, therefore, "the baptism with God. It is the burning up of the chaff, but it is also the revelation in us and the manifestation to us of divine personality, filling our being."

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

Christian perfection in the critical sense, represents the more positive aspect of the one experience, known theologically either as entire sanctification or Christian perfection. Entire sanctification, however, is a term which applies more to the aspect of a cleansing from sin, or the making holy; while Christian perfection emphasizes especially the standard of privilege secured to the believer by the atoning work of Jesus Christ. "We give the name of Christian perfection," says Mr. Fletcher, "to that maturity of grace and holiness which established adult believers attain to under the Christian dispensation; and thus we distinguish that maturity of grace, from both the ripeness of grace which belongs to the dispensation of the Jews below us, and from the ripeness of glory which belongs to departed saints above us. Hence it appears that by Christian perfection, we mean nothing but the cluster and maturity of graces which compose the Christian character in the Church militant. In other words, Christian perfection is a spiritual

In a sermon preached in Berkeley, California, May 20, 1909, from John 17, Dr. Bresee took the following positions. (1) The believer is transferred by the Father into the hands of Jesus. (2) Jesus is seeking a place for Himself - a resting place for His personality in the hearts of His people, and thus illumined by His presence, we become messengers of divine glory. (3) Entire sanctification is not the settling of the sin question only, but the incoming of the divine Personality. (4) The world is opposed to spirituality. People may live moral lives - may even become reformers without meeting much opposition, but when the Spirit of God comes, the carnal mind is stirred. It was only after the anointing of Jesus with the Spirit that His opposition began. (5) Backsliding is the open door to souls for all false teachings, but a lack of sense marvelously helps it along. (6) Unworldliness is the key to successful Christian living and Christian service. we need in spirit, a new order of Franciscans who will dare to be poor for the cause of God. (7) Pentecostal conditions, bring pentecostal results.

constellation, made up of these gracious stars: perfect repentance, perfect faith, perfect humility, perfect meekness, perfect self-denial, perfect resignation, perfect hope, perfect charity for our visible enemies, as well as our earthly relations; and, above all, perfect love for our invisible God, through the explicit knowledge of our Mediator, Jesus Christ. And as this last star is always accompanied by all the others, as Jupiter is by his satellites, we frequently use, as St. John, the phrase `perfect love' instead of the word `perfection'; understanding by it the pure love of God shed abroad in the hearts of established believers by the Holy Ghost, which is abundantly given them under the fullness of the Christian dispensation." Here the word perfection, used in connection with the graces of the Spirit, must be understood to refer solely to their quality, as being pure and unmixed, not to their quantity, as precluding further growth and development

Misconceptions of Christian Perfection.There are numerous misconceptions concerning Christian perfection which must be cleared away before there can be a right understanding or a proper appreciation of this work of the Holy Spirit. The term seems to connote a standard of excellence which those who are rightly informed never claim for it. It is well, therefore, when using the word in this connection, to always accompany it with its guardian adjectives, such as Christian or evangelical perfection. Rightly understood, there can be no objection, either to the doctrine or the experience. (1) Christian perfection is notabsoluteperfection. This belongs to God only. In this sense,there is none good but one, that is, God(Matt. 19:17). All other goodness is derived. So, also, God alone is perfect; but His creatures are also perfect in a relative sense, according to their nature and kind. (2) It is notangelicperfection. The holy angels are unfallen beings, and, therefore,

retain their native faculties unimpaired. They are not liable to mistake, as is man in his present state of weakness and infirmity, and, therefore, have a perfection impossible to mankind. (3) It is notAdamicperfection. Man was made a little lower than the angels, and doubtless in his pristine state, possessed a perfection unknown to man in his present state of existence. (4) It is not a perfection in knowledge. Not only was man’s will perverted, and his affections alienated by the fall, but his intellect was darkened. Hence from this defective understanding may flow erroneous opinions concerning many matters, and these may in turn lead to false judgments and a wrong bias in the affections. (5) It is not immunity from temptation or the susceptibility to sin. These are essential to a probationary state. Our Lord was tempted in all points as we are, and yet He was without sin

Perfection! why should the harmless phrase offend us? why should that lovely word frighten us? We can speak of perfection in reference to mathematics, and all is right; we are readily understood. we speak of a right line, or a line perfectly straight; of a perfect triangle; a perfect square; a perfect circle; and in all this we offend no one - all comprehend our meaning perfectly. We speak of a perfect seed; a perfect bud; a perfect plant; a perfect tree; a perfect apple; a perfect egg; and in all such cases the meaning is clear and definite. Because a seed is perfect, no one expects it to exhibit the qualities of the plant or tree; because the plant or tree is perfect, no one looks to find in it the characteristics of the bud; nor in the bud, the beauties or fragrance of the bloom; nor in the bloom, the excellent qualities of the ripe fruit. - FLETCHER OF MADELEY

Mr. Wesley says, "In the year 1764, upon a review of the whole subject, I wrote down the sum of what I had observed in the following short propositions: 1. There is such a thing as perfection; for it is again and again mentioned in Scripture. 2. It is not so early as justification; for justified persons are to "go on unto perfection" (Heb. 6:1). 3. It is not so late as death; for St. Paul speaks of living men that were perfect (Phil. 3:15). 4. It is not absolute. Absolute perfection belongs not to man, nor to angels, but to God alone. 5. It does not make a man infallible; none is infallible, while he remains in the body. 6. It is sinless? It is not worth while to contend for a term. It is "salvation from sin." 7. It is "perfect love," (I John 4:18). This is the essence of it; its properties, or inseparable fruits, are rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing and in every thing give thanks (I Thess. 5:16ff). 8. It is improvable. It is so far from lying in an indivisible point, from being incapable of increase, that one perfected in love may grow in grace far swifter than he did before. 9. It is amissible, capable of being lost; of which we have numerous instances. But we were not thoroughly convinced of this, till five or six years ago. 10. It is constantly both preceded and followed by a gradual work. 11. But is it in itself instantaneous or not? In examining this, let us go step by step. An instantaneous change has been wrought in some

Implications of the Doctrine.Before considering the scriptural meaning of Christian perfection, it will be well also to give attention to some of the implications of the doctrine. (1) This perfection is evangelical as opposed to a legal perfection.The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did(Heb. 7:19). Christian perfection, therefore, is of grace, in that Jesus Christ brings His people to completion or perfection under the present economy. The term "sinless perfection" was one which Wesley never used because of its ambiguity. Those who are justified are saved from their sins; those who are sanctified wholly are cleansed from all sin; but those who are thus justified and sanctified still belong to a race under the doom of original sin, and will bear the consequences of this sin to the end of the age. The term perfection, however, is a proper one, in

thatthe righteousness of God without the law is manifested. . . . . Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe(Rom. 3:21, 22). This righteousness is forensic, but correlative with it, sin is purged from the soul, and the perfect love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit. This, too, is a completed or perfected act, although the love thus imparted is capable of eternal increase. Again, perfection is a proper term, because we are conformed to the image of His Son, that is, we are made sons by a completed act, and as sons may be purged from all spiritual disease. The consequence of this is a state of gracious or evangelical perfection. (2) Christian perfection is arelativeterm. Those who use the term are frequently charged with

believers. None can deny this. Since that change, they enjoy perfect love; they feel this, and this alone; they rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks." Now this is all that I mean by perfection; therefore, these are witnesses of the perfection which I preach. "But in some this change was not instantaneous. They did not perceive the instant when it was wrought. It is often difficult to perceive the instant when a man dies; yet there is an instant when life ceases. And if even sin ceases, there must be a last moment of its existence, and a first moment of our deliverance from it." . . . . Therefore, all our preachers should make a point of preaching perfection to believers, constantly, strongly and explicitly; and all believers should mind this one thing, and continually agonize for it." - WESLEY,Christian Perfection, pp. 283-285.

lowering the meaning of the word in order to make it conform to the experience of those who profess the blessing. That it is a lowering of the standard we deny, although we freely admit that it is an "accommodation' , to use Dr. Pope's term, an accommodation which bears the impress of the condescension and lovingkindness of God. It is a perfection, which when viewed in relation to the absolute perfection of God, may never be reached, either in this life, or that to come; but when viewed in relation to the present economy, marks a finality, in that it is the deliverance of the spiritual nature from the defilement of sin. It is true that this redeemed and perfected spirit, dwells in a body which is a member of a sinful race, but his spirit may be lifted from darkness to light, while his body remains the same "muddy vesture of decay" that it was before his spirit was redeemed. Consequently it is still beclouded with weakness, in that the soul is under the influence of material things, and will be until the creature itself shall have put on incorruption and immortality. (3) Christian perfection isprobationary. It is a state which is always under ethical law, and hence must be guarded by constant watchfulness, and maintained by divine grace. While we remain in this life, however deep our devotion, or fervent our religious life, there are sources of danger within us. In our nature, and as essential elements of it, there are appetites, affections and passions, without which we should be unfitted for this present state of existence. These are innocent in themselves, but must ever be kept under control by reason, conscience and divine grace. The original temptation was a skilful appeal to human elements which were not depraved, but fresh from the hand of God. The desire for pleasant food is not sinful in itself, nor is the artistic taste, which delights in beautiful form and color. Neither can we condemn the desire for intellectual development or the acquisition of knowledge. These are original and essential elements of human nature, and had they not existed before the fall, there could have been no temptation. The evil lay in the perversion ofGod-given faculties to wrong ends. To argue, therefore, that Christian perfection will destroy or eradicate essential elements of human nature; or that a man or woman may not enjoy perfection of spirit while these elements remain, is to misapprehend entirely the

nature of this experience. What Christian perfection does is to give grace to regulate these tendencies, affections and passions, and bring them into subjection to the higher laws of human nature. (4) One thing further remains - this perfection is mediated. It is not a triumph of human effort, but a work wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit, in answer to simple faith in the blood of Jesus. We are kept by His abiding intercession.I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil(John 17:15) The Fundamental Concept of Christian Perfection. The aspect of the Christian's full privilege in Christ is estimated according to the New Testament standard of love as fulfilling the law (Matt. 22:40; Gal. 5:14). This can be understood only in relation to the New Covenant. Viewed from the human standpoint, wherein Christ is regarded as the "surety of the covenant," it is said, This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people(Heb. 8:10). Viewed from the divine standpoint in which Christ is regarded as the " "minister of the sanctuary" it is said,This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is there is no more offering for sin

Experience shows that, together with this conviction of sin remaining in our hearts, and cleaving to all our words and actions as well as the guilt on account thereof we should incur were we not continually sprinkled with the atoning blood, one thing more is implied in this repentance, namely, the conviction of our helplessness. - WESLEY,Sermon: Scripture Way of Salvation.

of the Covenant. The two immutable things mentioned here, in which it is impossible for God to lie, signify the minister of the sanctuary on the one hand, and the surety of the covenant on the other; and hence both the divine and human aspects center in the one theanthropic being. This gives security to the New Covenant. (2) The Nature of the Covenant. This is the full life of love, made perfect in the heart by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Pure love reigns supreme without the antagonisms of sin. Love is the spring of every activity. The believer having entered into the fullness of the New Covenant, does by nature, the things contained in the law, and hence, the law is said to be written upon his heart.Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love

The phrase afesin amartiwn, or remission of sins, means simply the taking away of sins: and this does not refer to the guilt of sin, merely; but also to its power, nature and consequences. All that is implied in pardon of sin, destruction of its tyranny, and purification from its pollution is here intended; it is wrong to restrict such operations of mercy, to pardon alone. - DR. ADAM CLARKE,Com. Acts 10:43 Queries, humbly proposed to those who deny perfection to be attainable in this life

1. Has there not been a larger measure of the Holy Spirit given under the gospel, than under the Jewish dispensation? If not, in what sense was the Spirit not given before Christ was glorified? (John 7:39)

2. Was that "glory which followed the sufferings of Christ," (I Peter 1:11), an external glory, or an internal, namely, the glory of holiness?

3. Has God anywhere in Scripture commanded us more than He has promised to us?

4. Are the promises of God respecting holiness to be fulfilled in this life, or only in the next?

5. Is a Christian under any other laws than those which God promises to "write in our hearts"? (Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:10)

6. In what sense is "the righteousness of the law fulfilled in those who walk: not after the flesh, but after the Spirit?" (Rom. 8:4)

7. Is it impossible for anyone in this life to "love God with all his heart, and mind, and soul, and strength"? And is the Christian under any law which is not fulfilled in this love?

8. Does the soul's going out of the body effect its purification from indwelling sin?

9. If so, is it not something else, not "the blood of Christ, which cleanseth it from all sin"?

St. Paul uses an illustration which bears directly upon this subject.Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the father(Gal. 4:1, 2). We must distinguish here, between two things, (1) the growth and development of the child, by which he is brought to a relative degree of maturity; and (2) a legal enactment, declaring him to have officially entered into his inheritance. To have made this declaration without a proper period of preparation would have been to dissipate the inheritance; to have omitted the declaration would have left the legal status indefinite and uncertain. It is not the mere fact of growth that gives a youth the full rights of citizenship. A relative degree of maturity, which in the natural realm can come only through physical and mental growth, may underlie the judicial act, but he becomes of age, or ceases to be a minor and attains his majority, only at an appointed time in conformity

10. If His blood cleanseth us from all sin, while the soul and body are united, is it not in this life?

11. If when that union ceases, is it not in the next? And is this not too late?

12. If in the article of death; what situation is the soul in, when it is neither in the body nor out of it?

13. Has Christ anywhere taught us to pray for what He never designs to give?

14. Has He not taught us to pray, "Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven"? And is it not done perfectly in heaven?

15. If so, has He not taught us to pray for perfection on earth? Does He not then design to give it?

16. Did not St. Paul pray according to the will of God, when he prayed that the Thessalonians might be "sanctified wholly, and preserved" (in this world, not in the next, unless he was praying for the dead) "blameless in body soul, and spirit, unto the coming of Jesus Christ"?

17. Do you sincerely desire to be freed from indwelling sin in this life?

18. If you do, did not God give you that desire?

19. If so, did He not give it to mock you, since it is impossible it should ever be fulfilled?

20. If you have not sincerity enough even to desire it, are you not disputing about matters too high for you?

21. Do you ever pray God to "cleanse the thoughts of your heart" that you "may perfectly love Him"?

22. If you neither desire what you ask, nor believe it attainable, pray you not as a fool prayeth?

God help thee to consider these questions calmly and impartially. - WESLEY,Christian Perfection, pp. 239-241.

to law. At that time he comes legally to manhood, with all the rights and privileges of full citizenship in the commonwealth. So also in the spiritual realm, there is a period of growth following regeneration, which precedes his coming to full age; and there will be even more rapid growth following it, but growth does not lead to Christian perfection. This is accomplished by a judicial pronouncement. It is a declarative act, wrought by the Spirit through faith. As in justification there is a judicial act in the mind of God accompanied by the work of the Spirit imparting life to the soul; so in Christian perfection there is likewise a declarative act accompanied by the purifying work of the Holy Spirit. What, then, is the appointed time of the Father - the time when the son becomes of age, when he ceases to be a minor and attains his majority? It is the hour of submission to the baptism with the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:11, 12; Acts 1:5), which purifies the heart from sin (Acts 15:9) and fills it with divine love (Rom. 5:5). There is no need here for an extended lapse of time. It is sufficient only that the believer come to feel his need and see his privileges in Christ Jesus. Through the exercise of his senses, we

In our discussion of prevenient grace (Chapter XXVI) we pointed out the necessity of a preparatory period, wrought in the heart preceding the full state of salvation. To deny this Is to deny co-operative grace, and make salvation to depend solely upon predestination and irresistible grace. This is the monergism of the Calvinistic position, against which Arminianism has always contended. To deny the preparatory period in the believer, wherein he is made conscious of the heinousness of inbred sin, and his desire for its removal stimulated, is to surrender to the idea of a mere "positional holiness" and deny the subjective work of the Spirit. Bishop Hedding says, "That faith which is the condition of this entire sanctification is exercised only by a penitent heart - a heart willing to part with all sin forever, and determined to do the will of God in all things." The normal regenerate heart is one where the self is restricted by divine law, but yet existent. In this heart are two centers of gravity - self and Christ. Two laws are there in conflict, a horizontal earthly law and a perpendicular godly law. In such a heart the "new man created in Christ Jesus" reigns, but not without a rival - self. Thus it is that the regenerate man has a dual nature: the divine nature implanted in regeneration and the self-nature, the former being active and dominant, the latter being restricted and suppressed. Here the will must be constantly exercised and the most careful attention be given lest "a root of bitterness [self] springing up" give trouble, and the sinful nature come again into ascendancy. - DR. FLOYD W. NEASE,Symphonies of Praise, p. 143.

are told (Heb. 5:12-14), he comes to discern both good and evil, and thereby finds within himself the carnal mind warring against the new life in his soul. He finds, also, that God has promised a cleansing from all sin through the blood of Jesus. He lays hold of the promises of God, and in a moment, the Holy Spirit purifies his heart by faith. In that instant he lives the full life of love. In him

love is made perfect, and the conditions of the New Covenant are, therefore, perfectly fulfilled in him. The law of God is written upon his heart. No longer is his spiritual status that of a child but of an adult; no longer a minor but of full age - ateleion(teleiwn) or one of the "perfect ones." Here perfection "refers especially to the fullness of spiritual knowledge manifesting itself in the Christian profession as the antithesis of babyhood." The Greek adjective used here signifies adulthood. Hence the writer follows immediately with an exhortation:Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection(Heb. 6:1). Here the word teleiothta is the noun of the word used in Hebrews 5:14, and is "represented not as something realized by the lapse of time, or by unconscious growth, and least of all, attainable only at death. . . . . For the Greek preposition `unto' here embraces both motion to a place and rest in it, and cannot mean an unattainable ideal"

"What is Christian perfection? The loving God with all our 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 pure love." "The perfection I teach is perfect love; loving God with all the heart, receiving Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, to reign alone over all our thoughts, words and actions." - MR. WESLEY

Whatever may be the time, whether long or short; whatever may be the manifestations of sorrow, whether groaning or tears - these things may vary; but until by an instantaneous act of the Spirit in answer to simple faith in the cleansing of Jesus sin is purged from the soul, that person does not have what we call entire sanctification. On the other hand, to expect a crucifixion of sin in the soul, without first having that sin nailed to the cross in deep and pungent conviction and self-renunciation is to develop a superficial type of experience

Faith, in order to its exercise, presupposes a certain state of the mind and affections, and without these it cannot exist - its very existence includes them; namely in the briefest terms, it supposes the knowledge of sin, and sorrow for it; the knowledge that there is a Saviour, and a readiness to embrace Him. - BISHOP FOSTER,Christian Purity, p. 121.

(STEELE,Half Hours with St. Paul,p. 113). The verbpherometha(feromeqa) meaning to press on is used withepi(epi), unto, as the goal to be attained; and as Delitzsch indicates, "combines the notion of an impulse from without with that of an eager and onward pressing haste." We may conclude, then, that nothing is clearer from the Scripture than that there is a perfection which may be attained in this life; that this perfection consists solely in a life of perfect love, or the loving God with all the heart, soul, mind and strength; that this perfection of love has no reference to the degree or quantity of love, but to its purity or quality; that this state of perfect love is a consequence of the purification of the heart from all sin, so that love remains in soleness and supremacy; that this purification is accomplished instantaneously by the baptism with the Holy Spirit; that the resultant state of perfect love is regarded as adulthood in grace, in that the believer enters into the fullness of privilege under the New Covenant; and last, in that love is the fulfilling of the law, this state of pure or perfect love, is known as Christian perfection.

Important Distinctions.It is necessary in this connection to emphasize a few important distinctions in order to preserve the doctrine of Christian perfection from some of the popular errors which are urged against it

1. Purity and maturity must be carefully distinguished from each other. Failure to do this lies at the base of practically every objection to entire sanctification. Purity is the result of a cleansing from the pollution of sin; maturity is due to growth in grace. Purity is accomplished by an instantaneous act; maturity is gradual and progressive, and is always indefinite and relative. when, therefore, we speak of perfect love, we have reference solely to its quality as being unmixed with sin, never to its degree or quantity. As to the latter, the Scriptures teach that love, and all the graces of the Spirit are to increase and abound more and more. We have previously indicated that Christian perfectionis to be regarded as adulthood, in contrast with spiritual childhood; but this is true only in the sense of having been cleansed from all sin, and thereby brought into the fullness of the new covenant of love. From the standpoint of growth in grace and spiritual understanding there are "babes" and "young men" in the state of entire sanctification, as well as those of more mature experience. A clear comprehension of the difference between purity and maturity will prevent confusion, both as to the doctrine and experience of Christian perfection

2. Infirmities must be distinguished from sins. Sin in the sense used here is a voluntary transgression of a known law. Infirmities on the other hand, are involuntary transgressions of the divine law, known or unknown, which are consequent on the ignorance and weakness of fallen men. These are inseparable from mortality. Perfect love does not bring perfection in knowledge, and hence is compatible with mistakes in both judgment and practice. There seems to be no remedy for this until the body is redeemed from the consequences of sin, and glorified. Infirmities bring humiliation and regret, but not guilt and condemnation. These latter attach to sin only. Both, however, need the blood of sprinkling. The careful student of the Levitical rites of purification will have noticed that the errors and infirmities &nb

Purity and maturity! The words are similar in sound, but they are very distinct in meaning. Purity may be found in the earliest moments after the soul finds pardon and peace with God. But maturity involves time and growth and trial and development. The pure Christian may even be a weak Christian. For it is not size or strength that is emphasized, but only the absence of evil and the presence of elementary good. Purity is obtained as a crisis, maturity comes as a process. One can be made pure in the twinkling of an eye; it is doubtful that anyone in this world should be listed as really mature. Growth continues while life lasts, and for aught we know, it may continue throughout eternity More faith, more love, more hope, and more patience incline one to think that at some undefined time we will have none of the opposites of these. But growth is not a process for purifying. Growth is addition, purifying is subtraction. And even though one may approach holiness by ever so gradual a process, there must be a last moment when sin exists and a first moment when it is all gone, and that means that in reality sanctification must be instantaneous. At this or any given moment every Christian is either free from sin or he is not free from sin. There can be no sense in which he is actually holy and at the same time still somewhat defiled. - DR. J. B. CHAPMAN, Holiness: The Heart of Christian Experience, pp. 23, 24.

of the individual Hebrew were put away solely by the sprinkling of blood (Heb. 9:7); while sin always demanded a special offering. It is for this reason we maintain that there is not only a definite act of cleansing from sin, but that there is also a continuous blood of sprinkling for our involuntary transgressions. The Scriptures as well as the testimony of human experience, takes into account this distinction between sins and infirmities. St. Jude says, Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling[apaistouV or exempt from falling. The Vulgate reads,sine peccato, without

sin]and

A failure to distinguish between sin and infirmity, puts an undue emphasis upon sin, and has a tendency to discourage earnest seekers from pressing on to a full deliverance from the carnal mind. Calling that sin which is not sin, opens the door also to actual sinning. Another distinction to be kept in mind is that between humanity as such, and carnality. The latter is a perversion of the former. Entire sanctification does not remove any natural, normal, human trait, but it does purify these and bring them under subjection to the law of reason and the higher influences of divine grace Not only sin, properly so-called, that is, a voluntary transgression of a divine law; but sin, improperly so-called, that is, involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown, needs the atoning blood. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. Therefore, sinless perfection is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to involuntary transgressions. - WESLEY,Plain Account, p. 43 To us the clear teaching of the Bible is, that man quits sinning when he begins to repent . . . . but he does need a further salvation from many other things; his ignorance - lack of skilled conformity to heavenly patterns - and from his shortcomings or limitations because of the results of old conditions. He is like a king’s son who was captured and carried away to live among wild and uncivilized races, but who was at last recaptured and brought home; he is full of gladness and love, yet, in his ignorance, liable to offend in many ways against the new conditions into which he has come. Thus every Christian will always have need to say, "Forgive me my trespasses." He needs a salvation of abounding grace that will keep every element of mind and body in its normal condition as the agent and instrument of Jesus Christ. The appetites of the body are God created - right and good - and are to be held in proper poise and condition by the gracious anointings with the Holy Ghost. The attributes of the mind are, likewise, God created and must be held in balance by the same divine Spirit. Some of them will need great, direct help from the Holy Ghost, and it is necessary for our good that we realize this help and receive it in answer to prayer. . . . . A sanctified man is at the bottom of the ladder. He is but a child - a clean child. He is now to learn; to grow; to rise; to be divinely enlarged and transformed. The Christ in him is to make new and complete channels in and through every part of his being - pouring the stream of heaven through his thinking, living, devotement and faith. - DR. PHINEAS F. BRESEE,Sermon: Death and Life.

to present [sthsai to place in the presence of His glory] you faultless [amwmouV, without blemish, faultless, unblameable] before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy(Jude 24). We may be kept from sin in this life, we shall be presented faultless only in our glorified state

3. Temptation is reconcilable with the highest degree of evangelical perfection. Jesus was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, but was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin. Temptation seems to be necessarily involved in the idea of probation. No temptation or evil suggestion becomes sin, however, until it is tolerated or cherished by the mind. As long as the soul maintains its integrity, it remains unharmed, however protracted or severe the temptation may be. Several questions arise in this connection. (1) When does temptation become sin? To this most difficult question Bishop Foster replies, "Sin begins whenever the temptation begins to find inward sympathy, if known to be a solicitation to sin. So long as it is promptly, and with full and hearty concurrence of the soul, repelled, there is no indication of inward sympathy, there is no sin"

(FOSTER, Christian Purity, p. 55). (2) What is the difference between the temptations of those who are entirely sanctified, and those who are &nb

Those entirely sanctified need the atonement. "In every state we need Christ in the following respects: (1) Whatever grace we receive, it is a free gift from Him. (2) We receive it as His purchase, merely in consideration of the price He paid. (3) We have this grace, not only from Christ, but in Him. For our perfection is not like that of a tree which flourishes by the sap derived from its own root, but, as was said before, like that of a branch which, united to the vine, bears fruit; but, severed from it, is dried up and withered. (4) All our blessings, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, depend on His intercession for us, which is one branch of His priestly office, whereof therefore we have always equal need. (5) The best of men still need Christ in His priestly office, to atone for their omissions, their shortcomings (as some improperly speak), their mistakes in judgment and practice, and their defects of various kinds. For these are all deviations from the perfect law, and consequently need an atonement. Yet that they are not properly sins, we apprehend may appear from the words of St. Paul, He that loveth, hath fulfilled the law; for love is the fulfilling of the law (See Rom. 13:10). Now mistakes, and whatever infirmities necessarily flow from the corruptible state of the body, are no way contrary to love; nor, therefore, in the Scripture sense, sin." - WESLEY,Plain Account, pp. 42, 43.

not? The difference lies in this, that in the latter, temptation stirs up the natural corruption of the heart with its bias toward sin; while in the former, the temptation is met with uniform resistance. (3) But how may I distinguish the temptations of the enemy, from the carnal mind or corruption of my own heart? Mr. Wesley admits that sometimes "it is impossible to distinguish, without the direct witness of the Spirit." In general, however, there need be no confusion. In the sanctified soul there is a fullness of love, humility and all the graces of the spirit, so that a temptation to pride, anger, or any of the works of the flesh is met with the instant recoil of the whole being. Holiness in man, as in Christ, is found in that fundamental ethical nature which loves righteousness and hates iniquity. Temptation and trial may appear to be evils, but in reality they are God’s method of establishing the believer in &nb

Dr. George Peck says, "First, I suppose all will admit that when the temptation gains the concurrence of the will, the subject contracts guilt. There can be no doubt here. Second, It is equally clear that when the temptation begets in the mind a desire for the forbidden object, the subject enters into temptation, and so sins against God. Third, It is also clear that temptation cannot be invited or unnecessarily protracted without an indication of a sinful tendency toward the forbidden object, and consequently, such a course not only implies the absence of entire sanctification, but involves the subject in actual guilt." - PECK,Christian Perfection, p. 435 Were we to discuss the problem at length we would raise the question: How could Adam and Eve ever fall, for they were complete in holiness? The answer is found in the simple recognition of the fact of the humanity of Adam. It was true, then, and now is, that the royal road of Satan to the heart of man is found through his natural appetites and desires. Temptation is ever based upon desire. It is upon this fact that he plays until be has produced an act of disobedience and again sown the seed of iniquity in the heart of man. But the questioner persists, how can sin actually get back into the heart of man after once it has been removed? The answer to this is found in a proper recognition of what sin as a principle actually is. It is here again that our human language breaks down in its efforts to describe spiritual relations. We speak of sin as a substance because of the beggary of

language. It is called the old man, the body of sin. But these terms are merely figures of speech. Sin, as a principle after all, is not a substance, it is a moral quality. It is the pollution of the blood stream of the moral nature. Were sin a substance or a thing, most assuredly it could never be placed back in the nature once it had been removed. But sin is not a substance, it is a moral condition. And just as the bloodstream of an individual, once having been cleansed by purgatives, could again become carelessly polluted by contamination, so the heart of man can again become polluted by disobedience and spiritual indolence. - DR. H. V. MILLER,When He Is Come, pp. 27, 28.

holiness and preparing him for the life to come. By them, God empties the appeals of the world of their urgency, and strengthens the motives of faithfulness in the kingdom of God.Blessed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him(James 1:12; Heb. 12:11) Christian Perfection a Present Experience.

St. James indicates that sin begins in lust or inordinate affection. "But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." Somewhere in the process legitimate desire passed over into inordinate affection, and here sin begins. "Then when lust (or inordinate affection) hath conceived, (the inward fact of sin) it bringeth forth sin (or outward manifestations of an inward sinful condition); and sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death" (James 1:14, 15)

Dr. Olin A. Curtis in his "Christian Faith" holds that character can be absolutely fixed by the free use of motives. He says, "In the motivity of every moral person there are, at the beginning of the test, two antagonistic groups of motives, the good and the bad. That is, any personal interest which can be related to conscience at all is necessarily either good or bad. By using the motive in either group, the motive so used is made stronger, and also the opposite motive, if there is one, is made weaker. Or, by rejecting a motive, it is made weaker, and also the opposite one is made stronger. That is, if you have an interest, and express it in specific volition, you will increase that interest and diminish any opposing interest; or vice versa. In this way, under the law of use, a motive can be emptied of all urgency. . . . . The exhaustion of any one motive tends to exhaust all the motives in the same group. The moral life is so related that if you touch it anywhere you must influence the whole. For example, no man can lose all interest in honesty and not begin to lose his regard for truth. When the group entire, of good motives or of bad motives, is exhausted, then the person’s moral character is fixed beyond any possibility of change." - CURTIS, Christian Faith, pp. 49, 50

Temptation and trial, if rightly understood, tend to exhaust motives to sin and strengthen those which establish the character in righteousness. On the other hand, the constant rejection of the good, and the acceptance of the bad, tend to fix the character in sin and unrighteousness. When all the motives to good are exhausted, so that the Holy Spirit has no further ground of appeal to the heart, the individual is said to "cross the dead-line" or to commit the sin against the Holy Spirit. There may be and doubtless is a final act, but it is such only as the final act in a series which has hardened the heart against every appeal of the Holy Spirit.

in the New Testament by the gift of the Spirit as a Paraclete or Comforter.And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live(Deut. 30:6).I indeed baptize you with water, declared the

forerunner of Jesus, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire(Matt. 3:11, 12). That these passages of scripture refer to a spiritual cleansing is confirmed by St. Peter in these words, And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith(Acts 15:9). As to the manner in which this work is wrought, the Scriptures are clear - it is always wrought by a simple faith in the atoning blood of Jesus Christ; this blood of atonement being not only the ground of what Christ has purchased for us, but the occasion of that which His Spirit works within us. Nor do the Scriptures teach that a higher degree of faith is demanded for sanctification than for justification. It is not so much the strength of the faith as its purity, that is required in any operation of grace. Furthermore, there is no specific degree of conviction demanded as a prerequisite to this faith - all that is essential is a firm belief that this grace is

Among the various terms that have been used to indicate the experience of entire sanctification, this expression "the fulness of the blessing" (Rom. 15:29), has found a place. . . . . Searching into the derivation of the Greek word, we discover that it comes from a verb that has two senses, one to fill and the other to fulfill, complete, perfect, accomplish. while both meanings are present in the use of the term in our New Testament, yet the latter ones predominate at a ratio of four to one. Taking this second meaning over to the noun, which is substantiated not only by the fact that the verb more often carries this sense but also by the ending that the noun has, then the thought conveyed is that which is completed, that is, the complement, the full tale, the entire number or quantity, the plenitude, the perfection. while the term had a general sense and is used thus in the Gospels, yet in the Pauline writings it is evident that it has passed for the most part into a definite, theological and doctrinal significance. It became a word that had a very definite connotation. . . . . Among the Christians of the day it had found its way to express the thought of a complete Christian experience relative to holiness of heart as the expression "second blessing" did in Methodist circles at a much later date, and as it does now among us. - DR. OLIVE M. WINCHESTER.

needed, and that God has promised it. In every case of evangelical perfection, three things are clearly discernible: (1) A consciousness of inbred sin, and a hungering and thirsting for full conformity to the image of Christ. (2) A firm conviction in the light of the scriptural provisions, that it is not only a privilege but a duty to be cleansed from all sin. (3) There must be perfect submission of the soul to God, commonly known as consecration, followed by an act of simple faith in Christ - a sure trust in Him for the promised blessing. "The voice of God to your soul is, Believe and be saved. Faith is the condition, and the only condition, of sanctification, exactly as it is in justification. No man is sanctified till he believes; and every man when he believes is sanctified" (WESLEY, Works, II, p. 224). "But what is that faith whereby we are sanctified, saved from sin and perfected in love? This faith is a divine evidence or conviction (1) That God hath promised this sanctification in the Holy Scriptures. (2) It is a divine evidence or conviction that what God hath promised He is able to perform. (3) It is a divine evidence or conviction that He is able and willing to do it now. (4) To this confidence that God is able and willing to sanctify us now, there needs to be added one thing more - a &nb

There can be no perfect consecration to the whole will of God until there has been a sincere repentance for the double-mindedness and wilfulness and stubbornness and love of the world, all

of which are marks of an unsanctified heart. The soul’s sorrow for its inward sin must be as deep and moving as was its sorrow for its outward sins. The one is just as loathsome in the sight of God as the other, and is just as effectual a bar to the perfect enjoyment of God’s grace and favor. But in approaching the throne of God with this deeper need, there is a point where the seeker knows that his sorrow and repentance for his heart depravity have reached their utmost depths; where his consecration to the will of God is complete and final; possessions, time, talents, ambitions, hopes, wishes, loved ones and friends, all yielded forever to Christ; the vast unknown future placed daringly and yet confidently in God’s hands, for Him to control and reveal as and when it pleases Him to do so; one’s dearest Isaac bound and placed on the altar, and the knife upraised without thought of any intervening divine hand, so that it may be said of us, as of Abraham, that by faith we actually offered him up to God. One knows beyond question in such an hour that his sacrifice is complete; there is nothing he could add to it, and nothing he would take from it. And in that glorious instant the seeker has the witness of his own heart that every condition it is humanly possible to meet has been met. - DR. J. GLENN GOULD,The Spirit’s Ministry, pp. 9, 10.

divine evidence or conviction that He doeth it" (WESLEY,Sermons, I, p. 390). The older theologians defined faith as the assent of the mind, the consent of the will, andrecumbency, or a reclining with undoubting confidence in the atoning merits of Jesus Christ. Thus as we have previously indicated, faith is incomplete without the element of trust

Evidences of Christian Perfection.It is the uniform testimony of those who believe and teach the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection, that the Spirit bears witness to this work of grace in the heart, exactly as He bears witness to Christian sonship. "None, therefore, ought to believe that the work is done," says Mr. Wesley, "till there is added the testimony of the Spirit witnessing his entire sanctification as clearly as his justification." "We know it by the witness and by the fruit of the Spirit" (WESLEY,Plain Account

Look for it every day, every hour, every moment. Why not this hour - this moment? Certainly you may look for it now, if you believe it is by faith. And by this token you may surely know whether you seek it by faith or by works. If by works, you want something to be done first before you are sanctified. You think, I must be or do thus and thus. Then you are seeking it by works unto this day. If you seek it by faith, you expect it as you are; and if as you are, then expect it now. It is important to observe that there is an inseparable connection between these three points - expect it by faith, expect it as you are, and expect it now. To deny one is to deny them all. - WESLEY,Sermons, I, p. 391 As when you reckon with your creditor or with your host, and as, when you have paid all, you reckon yourselves free, so now reckon with God. Jesus has paid all; and He hath paid for thee - hath purchased thy pardon and holiness. Therefore, it is now God’s command, "Reckon thyself dead unto sin"; and thou art alive unto God from this hour. Oh, begin, begin to reckon now; fear not; believe, believe, believe and continue to believe every moment. So shalt thou continue free; for it is retained, as it is received, by faith alone. - FLETCHER OF MADELEY The writers on this subject during the middle and last part of the 19th century were accustomed to use the term "naked faith." Rev. J. A. Wood explains the term as follows: "By simple faith is meant, taking God at His word without doubting or reasoning; and by naked faith is meant, faith independent of all feeling, and stripped of every other dependence but Christ alone. The holy Fletcher says, a naked faith, is a `faith independent of all feelings,’ in a naked promise; bringing nothing with you but a careless, distracted, tossed, hardened heart - just such a heart as

you have got now." - J. A. WOOD,Perfect Love, p. 104.

of the seeker's own heart; (2) the witness of God's Word; and (3) the inner illumination of the Holy Spirit" (GOULD,The Spirit's Ministry, p. 8). The sanctified soul may know by the testimony of his own spirit, and the witness of the Holy Spirit, that the blood of Jesus Christ has cleansed him from all sin. Here we have the testimony of consciousness, which we can no more doubt than our own existence. And in addition to this, there is the direct and positive testimony of the witnessing Spirit To the scriptural evidences already cited, we may add also, those personal examples which confirm the doctrine of evangelical perfection. Noahwas a just man, and perfect in his generations(Gen. 6:9). Job wasperfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil(Job 1:1). Zacharias and Elisabethwere both righteous before God walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless(Luke 1:6). Our Lord said of Nathanael,Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!(John 1:47). St. Paul also speaks of those in the apostolic church who were evangelically perfect.Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect (I Cor. 2:6); and Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded

"But does not sanctification shine by its own light?" "And does not the new birth too? Sometimes it does, and so does sanctification; at others, it does not. In the hour of temptation, Satan clouds the work of God, and injects various doubts and reasonings, especially in those who have either very weak or very strong understandings. At such times, there is absolute need of that witness, without which, the work of sanctification not only could not be discerned, but could no longer subsist. Were it not for this, the soul could not then abide in the love of God; much less could it rejoice evermore, and in everything give thanks. In these circumstances, therefore, a direct testimony that we are sanctified, is necessary in the highest degree." - WESLEY,Plain Account, pp. 75, 76.

would not interpret this experience in terms of Wesley's "second blessing properly so-called'; it is also true that this second experience made a distinct change in their lives and ministry. Universally unbiased Christians long for and seek a deeper experience than that which they obtain in regeneration. Thousands have enjoyed a " second blessing' without being instructed in the truth as taught by believers in the Wesleyan emphasis on the doctrine of entire sanctification" (DR. D. SHELBY CORLETT,Herald of Holiness, Vol. 27, No. 11)

We close this chapter on "Christian Perfection" or "Entire Sanctification," with what we regard as the clearest statement of the doctrine and experience ever written, aside from divine inspiration. This is the definition given by Arvid Gradin to John Wesley in 1738. On his return from America, Mr. Wesley says, "I had a long conversation with Arvid Gradin, in Germany. After he had given me an account of his experience, I desired him to give me, in writing, a definition of `the full assurance of faith'." The definition was given in Latin, and both the Latin statement and the English translation are included in Mr. Wesley's Plain Account of Christian Perfection, as follows:

"Requies in sanguine Christi; firma fiducia in Deum, et persuasio de gratia Divina; tranquillitas mentis summa, at que serenitas et pax; cum absentia omnis desideni carnalis, et cessatione peccatorum etiam internorum."

Dr. Pope in emphasizing the positive phase of Christian perfection says, "It is a perfection which is no other than a perfect, self- annihilating life in Christ: a perfect union with His passion and His resurrection, and the perfect enjoyment of the value of His name Jesus, as it is salvation from sin.

It is the perfection of being nothing in self, and all in Him. It is a perfection for which the elect with one consent have longed, from the apostles downward; neither more nor less than the unuttered groaning desire of the children of God in every age; the common, deep aspiration with only one note more emphatic than has always been heard, though even that has not been always wanting, the destruction of the inbred sin of our nature. He who searcheth the heart bath always known the mind of the Spirit, even when its deepest desire has not been clearly uttered. And He will yet, we dare to believe, remove the last fetter from the aspirations of His saints, and give them one heart and one voice in seeking the destruction of the body of sin as well as the mortification of its members." - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 99.

"Repose in the blood of Christ; a firm confidence in God, and persuasion of His favor; the highest tranquillity, serenity, and peace of mind, with a deliverance from every fleshly desire, and a cessation of all, even inward sins."

"This," says Mr. Wesley, "is the first account I ever heard from any living man, of what I had before learned myself from the oracles of God, and had been praying for (with the little company of my friends), and expecting, for several years" (WESLEY, Plain Account of Christian Perfection, p. 8)

29. Chapter 30 - CHRISTIAN ETHICS OR THE LIFE OF HOLINESS

Chapter 30 - CHRISTIAN ETHICS OR THE LIFE OF HOLINESS

Having considered the question of holiness as a doctrine and as an experience, it is but natural that we should now pass to a consideration of the same subject in its practical or ethical aspects. We have seen that a holy heart is the fundamental condition for holy living. It is specifically stated thatwe are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them(Eph. 2:10). When, however, we pass from a consideration of Christian experience to the life consequent upon it, we are turning in some sense from the field of dogmatics to that of ethics. Dogmatics gives attention to doctrines, and answers the inquiry, What ought we to believe? Ethics seeks to answer the question, What ought we to do? Arminian theology has always given much attention to the morals and institutions of Christianity, as an examination of the works of Wesley, Watson, Clarke, Pope, Raymond, Summers, Ralston, and Lee will show. Dr. Miley also gives attention to the necessity of moral government, but treats it in relation to his governmental theory of the atonement. Our purpose, however, is not to consider the field of general or philosophical ethics; nor even the field of Christian ethics considered as a science, but only to examine more immediately the life of holiness as related to the doctrine and experience of entire sanctification. After a brief consideration of the Relation of Theology to Ethics; Revelation as the Source of Christian Ethics, and the Scriptural Basis of Ethics, we shall give our attention to the following: (I) The Development of Ethical Theory in the Church; (II) The Principles of Christian Ethics; and (III) Practical Ethics. This latter will be considered under the threefold division of (1) Theistic Ethics: or Duties We Owe to God; (2) Individual Ethics: or Duties We Owe to Ourselves ; and (3) Social Ethics: or Duties We Owe to Others The Relation of Theology to Ethics.As theology is the science of God and the mutual relations of God and man, so ethics as the science of duty, has to do with the end, the principles and motives of obligatory conduct. When the material of the two sciences is drawn wholly from nature, we have Natural Theology, and Natural or Naturalistic Ethics ; when it is drawn from Revelation, we have Revealed Theology, and Revealed or theological Ethics. There is no disharmony, however, between the two sources of material, since the one must

[It must be evident that the outward or ethical life of the Christian takes its character from the quality of the inner or spiritual life. The life of holiness is, therefore, simply the out-reachings of a holy heart. What this holiness is, General Superintendent Nease describes as follows: "The term holiness, when employed as referring to the experience of the believer, of necessity implies the act, which is sanctification, and the Agent, which is the Holy Ghost. We therefore employ the term holiness in practical usage as the all-inclusive, denoting the completed act of divine grace. Holiness is cleansing. It is that will of the Father, that provision of the Son, that act of the Holy Ghost, whereby the believer’s heart, that is, his motive, his affections, his will - his entire nature, is cleansed from the pollution and the tendency to sin. Holiness is harmony. Complete inner harmony is not realized in regeneration. The Bible and experience agree that the unsanctified heart is a divided heart - a double heart. Outward defeat is occasioned by inward disharmony.

Sanctification rids the soul of the inner foe, and aligns the forces of the moral nature against the outer enemy. Holiness is abandonment. The fathers referred to the act of human co-operation in sanctification as 'crucifixion of self,' as 'deathbed consecration.' They meant a giving-over of the all-of-one's life to the plan and authority of Deity. The man who is sanctified is thus given over to God. Every tie, every influence, every reserve is severed that will deter from complete and unrestrained participation in the fellowship and service of Deity. Holiness is power. Power is in the spiritual realm - the realm immediately affected by sanctification. It is in essence, the embodiment of all that is essential in the combined realms of human experience. Sanctification affects all that one is. Such enduement of power - the ability to discriminate, to evaluate, to influence, to single one's devotion, to command one's will, can be realized only as 'power from on high' possesses the believer. It is the fulfillment of 'the promise of the Father.' It is 'Christ in you the hope of glory.' Holiness is perfection. A perfection in love - Christian perfection. The sanctified one is not beyond the ability, nor liability to sin, but he is cleansed from the desire and nature of sin. He is not beyond the possibility of fall, but he is within the provision of divine grace, so that he is preserved from willful transgression. Sanctification is not fixedness of character, but fixedness of attitude and desire, enabling the participant to 'grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' " - DR. ORVAL J. NEASE.] be in some sense supplementary to the other. In our discussion of General and Special Revelation (Volume I, Chapter VI), we pointed out that God discloses Himself to man, (1) through a primary revelation in nature, in the constitution of man, and in the progress of human history; (2) in addition to this general revelation manifested through His created works there is a special revelation made through the Spirit to the consciences and consciousness of men. So also in the field of ethics, God reveals Himself in two classes of law - natural and positive. (1) Natural law is that which God has written upon the heart of every man, or that which the light of reason teaches us is good or evil. Thus, the apostle says of the heathen in contradistinction to the Jews, that these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another (Rom. 2:14, 15). They are a law unto themselves, because they know in themselves what is good and what is evil, through reason which is to them the herald of divine law. Both history and experience teach us that all nations have a measure of divine revelation. This we have shown in our study of Religion and Revelation, and hence need only to point out that all nations acknowledge likewise, certain common principles of morality. Education, which has varied from age to age, cannot be the source of these uniform principles; consequently, we must find the common source of these maxims

[In the evangelical scheme doctrine and ethics are closely connected: its revelations of truth are the foundation of its new life; its morals and its doctrine are everywhere interwoven; and, finally, the ethics of the Christian religion are the crown and consummation of its entire system. - POPE,Compend. Chr Th., III, p.143 The truth, as we see it, is here the same as in dogmatics: as there are fundamental doctrines of religion adequately sustained by rational evidence constituting a system of natural religion, so there are certain prominent duties to the common intelligence obviously obligatory which constitute a system of what may be called philosophical ethics. 'And as there are doctrines known and authenticated solely by revelation constituting a system of revealed religion, so there are duties known and enforced in the same way constituting what might be called a system of Christian ethics. Nature and revelation, properly interpreted, are never antagonistic; their utterances are words proceeding out of the mouth of God, from which man may learn all

things needful for faith and practice. - RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, III, p.10.] in natural reason, which is from the Light that lighteth all men coming into the world. (2) Positive law is that which depends upon God’s free will, and, therefore, can be known only through revelation. It should be noted, however, that what in one respect is the subject of natural law, in another may exist as positive law. Thus natural law reveals the necessity of a certain period of rest each week as essential to man’s greatest efficiency in service; but this is also declared by positive law in the institution of the Sabbath, which is the setting apart of one day in seven as holy unto the Lord. In close connection with this, reason makes known also the necessity of divine worship; but that the time should be a full day, and this on a set day of the week, is a revelation of positive law. Similarly the Decalogue with its "ten words," all of which is based on man’s relation to God, to others and to himself, is likewise accessible to reason. However, because of man’s conscience being dimmed by failure to walk in the truth, the Decalogue, as a transcript of the law written in men’s hearts, was also given by positive decree. We may say, therefore, of the Decalogue, that its precepts as to their substance belong to natural law; but as to the manner of their manifestation, they are a part of positive or revealed law

Revelation as the Source of Christian Ethics.We are now brought to the position that Christian ethics must draw its material immediately from the Christian revelation. While we may and do admit that the light of the natural conscience furnishes corroborative testimony insofar as its feebler light can penetrate, we must affirm also, that nature alone can no more furnish Christianity with its system of ethics or morals, than it can furnish it with its system of doctrines. If dogma treats of God and the truth by which salvation is accomplished, so also ethics of the standards by which the Christian life is ordered, and by means of which it is given proper expression. Thus the morals or ethics of Christianity complete the science of religion ; for it is only through a combination of dogma and ethics that the plan of salvation can be revealed in its perfection. The fact, however, that there is a greater unanimity of thought respecting the standards of morality, than there is concerning dogma, may be attributed to the greater light which the moral life receives from natural reason. Dogma, on the other hand, is purely a matter of the interpretation of the Scriptures. The highest revelation of God to man is in Jesus Christ as the Word made flesh. Hence the positive element in Christian ethics is a course of life introduced into human conditions - a life actualized in human history by Jesus Christ as the God-man, and through the Spirit communicated to the community of believers. The life of Christ, therefore, whether in word, in deed, or in the spirit underlying these words and deeds, becomes the norm of all Christian conduct. His words furnish us with the knowledge of the divine will; His actions are the confirmation of truth, and His Spirit the power by which His words are embodied in deeds. With this statement as to the positive element in Christian ethics, we turn to the Scriptures as the recorded revelation of the incarnate Word, and in them we find our standards of Christian conduct, together with the promised power of the Spirit by which .these standards are to be maintained The Scriptural Basis of Ethics.Here we shall refer only to those scriptures which furnish the ground for the general system of Christian ethics, reserving such passages as refer to specific Christian duties for later consideration. The first question which arises is, Are the sources of Christian ethics to be derived solely from the New Testament, or are the Old Testament writings considered as a part of the Christian revelation? This subject has been previously considered in another connection (Volume I, pp.202-205), and it is sufficient to say here that the Old Testament insofar as it is applicable to

It should be observed that the scriptures are not devoted exclusively to a development of a system of moral government, nor do they teach it on the scientific plan of one of our modern writers on the subject of Moral Philosophy. But all the principles are taught in the inspired writings, and so plainly and forcibly asserted as to make the principles and facts much more readily comprehended by an unlettered and unsophisticated mind, than the best written modern volume on the subject of moral science. - LUTHER LEE,Elements of Theology, p. 332

Christian life is still binding upon men. Certain portions of it, however, especially the types or shadows of better things to come, had their perfect fulfillment in the great Antitype; while others of a ceremonial or political nature were abrogated as belonging only to the Mosaic economy. But as to the moral law of Moses, the substance of which was embodied in the Decalogue, this was not superseded, but referred to by our Lord as of abiding authority without any special re-enactment. Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: He said; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 5:17-19) The ethical teachings of the Gospels center in the idea of the kingdom, entrance to which is solely on the ground of repentance and faith. The acceptance of the call of God involves the subordination of all other loyalties. Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? . . . But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you (Matt. 6:31, 33). The sermon on the Mount has been called the Magna Charta of the kingdom. Here the true inwardness of its nature is set forth as an attitude of spirit - of thought, feeling and will which finds its highest expression in word and deed. The description which Jesus gives is not that of certain acts, but of a certain type of character. The true spring of obedience is found in divine love. When asked concerning the

[For as much as God requires that we should love, not above, but with all our strength, it is evident that nothing exceeding our abilities is required at our hands. - LIMRORCH,Theologia, Bk. 5: chapter 25 That it is possible to love God with all the heart is folly to deny. For he that saith he cannot do a thing with all his strength, that is, that he cannot do what he can do, knows not what he saith; and yet to do this is the highest measure and sublimity of perfection, and of keeping the commandments. - BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.] greatest commandment of the law, Jesus replied, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets (Matt. 22:37-40). The children of the kingdom are to be as wise as serpents, and harmless as doves (Matt. 10:16); they are to resist not evil (Matt. 5:39) and to Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell (Luke 12:5). According to Jesus, the supreme test of love is this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (John 15:13) and in close connection with this is the practical application, For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it (Luke 9:24) THE DEVELOPMENT OF ETHICAL THEORY IN THE CHURCH The periods which mark the development of ethical theory in the church, differ somewhat from those which are important in the history of dogmatics. For our purpose, the subject may be conveniently summed up in the

following periods: (1) The Patristic Period, from the earlier fathers to the time of Constantine; (2) The Middle Ages, from the time of Constantine to the close of the Middle Ages; (3) The Renaissance and the Reformation; and (4) The Modern Period The Patristic Period. During the first century, the interests of the church were primarily concerned with practical conduct rather than rational reflection. Harneck says that for the first century and a half, the church ranked everything secondary to the supreme task of maintaining its morality. The dominant note of the early church was that of divine love manifesting itself in the care of the poor, hospitality to strangers, avoidance of the sensuous luxury and vices of the pagans, and devotion to the purity of life set by Christ and the apostles. Not until the latter part of the second century was there serious reflection on ethical problems. In the progress of Christianity in conflict with paganism, the more rigid view of Montanism came to occupy a place in apologetics alongside the milder tendency of previous times. Equally dangerous but in another direction, were the mistaken views of Christian liberty on the part of the Gnostics, which led to the dangerous errors of the Carpocratians and the later pantheistical sects. It thus became the task of Christianity to more exactly determine its principles and applications of morality. Some preliminary work had been done in the Epistles of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle to Diognetus, but it remained for the later fathers to formulate the ethical principles of the church. In ethics as in dogmatics there is a difference of approach in the East and in the West. The former regarded Christian ethics as in some sense supplementary to the ancient Greek philosophy, which in itself was inadequate to a knowledge of God and immortality. Christianity, therefore, brought to completion the Greek ethical principles which were assumed to be grounded in universal reason. This is the position of Justin Martyr

[Clement of Rome in his First Epistle to the Corinthians states that the motive of Christian conduct is derived from "fear" or "reverence" of God. "Let us See how near He is," he says, "and how that nothing escapeth Him of our thoughts or our devices which we make. It is right, therefore, that we should not be deserters from His will." Ignatius insisted upon right beliefs as the basis for right moral practices. False theology, he maintained, led to wrong attitudes and bad conduct. "Faith is the beginning and love the end" of the Christian life. Among the more important of his maxims are "Let there be one prayer in common; one supplication; one mind; one hope, in love and in joy unblameable." "Shun divisions as the beginning of all evils." "Let all things be done to the honor of God." Polycarp in his "Epistle to the Philippians" appeals to the words of Jesus as sanctions. Faith, hope and love are the essentials of the Christian life. Heresy was regarded as a desire to live otherwise than according to the true faith. He warned especially against covetousness, "the love of money is the beginning of all trouble." The Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas have some similarities. Christianity is regarded as a new covenant which brings God and man into religious fellowship. The Shepherd of Hermas emphasizes the struggle necessary to maintain the Christian standards, and hence the need for reliance upon divine mercy and grace. Cheerfulness, however, is given special emphasis. "Put away sorrow from thyself"; "Clothe thyself with cheerfulness, which hath favor with God always, and is acceptable to Him, and rejoice in it" "For every cheerful man worketh good, and thinketh good and despiseth sadness; but the sad man is always continuing in sin." The Epistle to Piognetus emphasizes the spiritual principle which animates Christians and keeps them from being absorbed in the things of the world. God is the source of the Christian ideal, "loving Him thou wilt be an imitator of His goodness."] who made the Logos doctrine the foundation of his exposition. The latter, or Western fathers, maintained that ethically, Christianity

was something entirely new, and, therefore, was in no wise related to the ethics of paganism. Here Tertullian is the representative apologist. To him, Christianity was a spiritual power given to the church to preserve it from paganism, organize its children into a compact army to attack paganism, conquer it and judge it. Clement of Alexandria regarded philosophy as a propadeutic to faith, and his work is a blending of contributions from Greek thought and Judaism. A number of striking ethical ideas are developed in hisPaedagogus, StromataandExhortations. With Cyprian, one of the Latin fathers, the church came into prominence as the center of a whole field of ethics. This grew out of the controversy with the Montanists and the Novatians, and as a consequence, the relation of the individual to the church became the most prominent ethical relation of his life The Middle Ages.The conversion of Constantine in the fourth century brought about marked changes in the church. Freed from persecution by the State, prestige and power were soon achieved. An ecclesiasticism developed, which in turn began the persecution of pagans and heretics. Worldliness increased, and many Christians seeking for a way of sacrifice withdrew to monastic life. This gave rise to a different and distinct type of ethics

Ambrose (340-397) in his work entitledDe Officiis Ministrorum, gave to the church what is generally regarded as the first manual of Christian ethics. It was modelled after a Stoic work by Cicero, and the idea of natural law which it sets forth had a definite influence upon later scholastic ethics. This law of nature is the

[Dr. I. A. Dorner points out that the Montanists accepted the sudden outbursts of individual enthusiasm as the true medium through which the Holy Spirit communicates with the congregation, and consequently demanded absolute obedience to the dictates of this ecstatic prophecy as a condition of communion between the Spirit and the individual. The Novatians on the other hand, found the true vehicle of spiritual communion in the church itself considered as a totality, as an organization of the universal priesthood under presbyterial forms, and, therefore, were rigorous with respect to admission of members.] law of things as God created them, and from it there is something to be learned concerning the requirements of morality. Higher than this, there is within man a knowledge of the moral through reason and conscience; but highest of all is the will of God as expressed in the Scriptures, culminating in the teaching and example of Christ. The beginnings of asceticism, however, are very noticeable in that Ambrose recognized two levels of morality - one obligatory upon all, the other as including works done beyond the requirements in order to a higher degree of perfection. He also definitely adopted the four cardinal Greek virtues - Prudence, Justice, Courage and Temperance. Prudence, however, was with him, not so much reason or wisdom, as it was the personal knowledge of God manifesting itself in human conduct. Justice must be exercised, "first towards God, secondly towards our country, thirdly towards our parents, and lastly towards all." Courage he interpreted as fortitude in the trials of ordinary life, and temperance as self-respect, modesty in all forms, and a due appreciation of others. The work of Ambrose was transitional, and led directly to Augustine’s more distinctly Christian system of ethics

Augustine (354-430) systematized the ethics of the Western church, and the principles which he advanced, were regarded as authoritative during the greater part of the Middle Ages. Here the central and dominating idea of the Christian life is union with God, an experience of perfect peace and blessedness which can be achieved only in the life to come. Hence in his City of God, he distinguishes between the earthly city which is temporal, and the city of God which is eternal. With Augustine, the moral life has its basis in God, and is in accord with the world He has created. He,

therefore, opposes the theory that morality is based on social custom, a position which is commonly defined as "custom operating in consciousness." He also considered the Christian view of ethics as opposed to the Stoic apathy as regards the emotional life. He placed the greater emphasis, however, upon the will. Man must surrender his will in love. Two tendencies emphasized by Augustine led to ill effect in later history. (1) He conformed to the distinction that had become current, as to what was commanded for all, and what was counseled as going farther, and thus making for perfection. This led to an emphasis upon the works of supererogation, and the accumulation of merit, which in turn contributed to ascetic practices. (2) His idea of self-surrender, also, was no small incentive to the ecclesiastical suppression of individual liberty. He held that the church as a continuous organization had the truth and the authority to teach it. This required individual submission. Since it was of divine appointment that men should come into the church, they should do so willingly, but if not they were to be compelled to do so. It was, therefore, the sacred duty of the church to see that men came into the church, and if it lacked the power of compulsion, it was the sacred duty of the state to come to its rescue, and compel them to come, that the church might be filled. From these two tendencies, both ecclesiasticism and monasticism were given added impulse during the Middle Ages

Monasticism became the characteristic feature of mediaeval Christianity, and provided its conception of Christian ethics. Asceticism had become established among Christians even in the time of Augustine, and much was made of those elements in the Gospels and Pauline writings which seemed to approve ascetic practices. Monasticism as a revolt against the growing worldliness in the state church, arose independently and frequently in opposition to the ecclesiastical organization. For this reason, even when allied with the church in later times, it retained much of its independence. The monastic ideal, however, soon came to be predominant, so that the vowed monks became "the religious" or regular clergy, while the nonmonastic priests became "the seculars." Basil (100: 329-379) was probably the first to inaugurate a definite movement toward community life among the ascetics. Benedict (480-543) introduced a new rule. Previous to this the monks had dwelt largely upon self-conquest, Benedict spoke of self-surrender. His monasteries were organized along communal lines with democratic rule. Perhaps no rule was less ascetic than that of Benedict. Bernard of Clairvaux (1094-1174) by his great saintliness and personal power was able to effect great reforms along spiritual lines. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) and Dominic (11701221) brought about great changes in the conception of the ascetic life and its practices. They developed a human interest and love for mankind that drew them away from the cloister and sent them forth on an unhampered ministry of love. The ethical ideal of St. Francis was the imitation of Christ, specifically in spirit, but also largely in the details of conduct. The vows of poverty, chastity and obedience had as their purpose the full devotement of the individual to the welfare of others. Special emphasis was placed upon poverty. While the Franciscans were primarily evangelistic, the Dominicans established their houses near the universities and gave their attention largely to education. By this means they soon came to set the doctrinal standards of the church, and this through a period of several centuries. Among the later mystics, asceticism was of a higher type. John Scotus Erigena introduced Greek mysticism as found in Macarius the Egyptian, Dionysius and Maximus Confessor, and this became the starting point of mysticism in the Western church. The development took place in two forms - the, Romanic, as in Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventura, Gerson and Molinus; and the Germanic, as in Henry Suso, Ruysbroek, John Tauler and Meister Eckhart. So far as mysticism developed an

ethics, however, it retained the false principle of asceticism as a contradiction between matter and spirit, God and the world. The chief reason assigned in the failure of the mystics to develop a true ethics is the lack of a proper conception of personality. That the created soul is capable of receiving the divine, and by this means achieving a perfect union between the finite and the infinite, is an idea which first came into prominence with Luther and his doctrine of justification by faith

Thomas Aquinas (100: 1225-1274) treated ethics as an integral part of a general philosophical and theological system. In him, ethics reached its authoritative statement. The ultimate end for which man acts, or at least should act, he called "beatitude" or "true blessedness," which when attained is all-sufficient. Nothing can satisfy except the Infinite, or the eternal goodness of God himself. Thus he lays a firm foundation for ethical theory in Christian theism. The virtue, or proper excellence of a thing consists in its being well-disposed according to its kind. Man being constituted a rational soul, ethics must be according to reason. Virtues in man are therefore the habits of the soul in accordance with which it performs good acts. The virtues are classified as follows: (1) Moral - the four cardinal Greek virtues, Prudence, Justice, Temperance and Fortitude. (2) Intellectual - understanding, knowledge and wisdom; and (3) Theological - faith, hope and love. The first two may be known by reason, but the last only by revelation. The natural virtues lead to the development of character; the theological to spiritual happiness here and life in the world to come. Thomas treated the Greek cardinal virtues, however, after a Christian method. The passions in themselves he regarded as indifferent and, therefore, to be brought under the control of the will. Of the theological virtues, love or charity was the highest and included the others in itself. The influence of Augustine, however, is clearly seen, in that Thomas accepted the twofold attitude toward morality; and while he regarded the earthly and the heavenly as compatible, those who turned their attention to the heavenly received greater praise The Renaissance and the Reformation. As the dominant note of the Middle Ages was the subordination of the earthly life to that of the life to come, so it was followed by the reactionary development commonly known as Humanism. Here the emphasis was placed upon the Individual life and the present world. But humanism produced no profound or widespread ethical theory. It was in fact, irreligious. The traditional views of sin and the atonement meant little or nothing, and no place was found for the contemplative type of experience. Humanism was in some true sense a return to the pagan ideals of Greece and Rome, but it did have the effect of broadening the horizons of men. The forerunners of the Reformation - Wycliffe, (100: 1324 or earlier-1384) and Huss (1369 or 1373-1415) had pointed out the moral infirmities of the times, sought to awaken interest in classical studies, and also introduced a new feature into ethical teaching - that of exalting morality as a guide into the wisdom of Christianity for the government of affairs in practical life. This was developed by Petrarch (d. 1374), Marsilius, Ficinus (d. 1499), Louis Vives (d. 1540) and Erasmus (d. 1536). Savonarola (1452-1498) especially opposed the moral corruption and worldliness of both the secular leaders of the Renaissance and the higher ecclesiastical officials. He made an effort to establish the ethical conception of the Mediaeval church, in which the thought of other worldliness should dominate both thought and conduct. "We live in this world, 0 my brothers," he said, "only to learn how to die." The Protestant Reformation was, in some sense, a reaction from both Mediaevalism and the Renaissance. With the belief in other - worldliness inherited from Mediaevalism, and the insistence upon the present world as the contribution of the Renaissance, the ethical problem

[When the Reformation took its final stand upon Scripture, it not only escaped the great errors of the Middle Ages, but it also succeeded in establishing the true principles of Christian ethics. By the new doctrines of faith, and justification by faith, the fundamental ethical ideas of duty, virtue, and highest good, were, so to speak, melted down and recast. A new ethics appeared, bearing the characteristic marks of the double development of the Protestant or evangelical principle - the Lutheran Church with its talent for plastic representation, art, hymnology, science; and the Reformed Church, with its talent for practical action, discipline, missions, statesmanship. Though neither Luther nor Calvin has written on ethics, in the proper sense of the word, both have occasionally treated of various ethical subjects - especially in the form of expositions of the Decalogue in the Catechism. The Catechism is, indeed, the primitive form of evangelical ethics. Just as evangelical dogmatics arose from the "regula fidei" and the apostolical symbolum, so evangelical ethics grew out of the Deca1ogue. - I. A. DORNER, art. "Ethics," SCHAFF-HERZOG,Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.] of the Reformation period came to be, How to conceive of Christian ethics or morality, as including both the earthly and the transcendent. It insisted that life was not to be lived in a monastery but in active participation in human affairs. It opposed, however, the tendency of Humanism to make pleasure and intellectual culture the chief affairs of this life. Dr. Denny states the aim of the Reformation thus, "to expel things from religion and exhibit all its realities as persons and the relation of persons." Luther developed a form of ethical dualism in that he made morality the spontaneous manifestation of the inner life of the Spirit; and given this liberty of sonship, the Christian subjects himself to righteous service in a voluntary manner. "When we have taught faith in Christ," he says, "then do we teach also good works." Calvin was more systematic in his thinking, and grounded ethics in the nature of man as created by God. In hisInstituteshe includes ethics under regeneration, and expounds it in his study of the Christian Man, the Bearing of the Cross and similar subjects. He viewed the Decalogue as a statement of the fundamentals of the moral law engraved on the minds of men. To conform to the Decalogue is to obey God, and this is morality. Any tolerance of sin was a share in it. Hence in the Reformed churches, it became common practice to attach great value to the legal elements in the Old Testament, and to combine these into an ethical system in connection with the Decalogue

Other writings of this period which contributed to Christian ethics were those of John Bunyan (16281688) who made redeeming grace the dominant characteristics of all his writings, but developed no distinct ethical theory; George Fox (1624-1690), who was singularly clear in his judgment on great moral issues; Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667) in hisHoly Livingregards the essential thing in morality as purity of intention; and William Law (1686-1761) gives an exposition of the Christian life according to ethical principles inhis Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. This work has been compared to Thomas á Kempis'Imitation of Christ, in that underlying all is the principle of submission and the spirit of obedience which rules out all that is unholy. "All the wants which disturb human life, which makes us uneasy to ourselves, quarrelsome with others, and unthankful to God, which carry us from project to project, from place to place, in a poor pursuit of we know not what, are wants which neither God, nor nature, nor reason, hath subjected us to, but are solely infused into us by pride, envy, ambition and covetousness." (WILLIAM LAW,Serious Call). To these may be added the name of Joseph Butler (1692-1752) whose theory is similar to that of Thomas Aquinas, but was developed independently. Bishop Butler recognized two sources of ethical knowledge - nature and reason on the one hand and revelation on the other. To him, God is the source of the moral law in conscience, in the constitution of nature and in the Scriptures; and

all Christian morality is included in the love of God, of others and of self. Thus Christian ethics is at once empirical and transcendent, anthropological and theological The first theologian in the Reformed Church to treat Christian ethics as distinct from Dogmatics, was Danaeus (d. 1536). His work entitled Christian Ethics was published in 1577. In the Lutheran Church, Calixtus followed the same method in hisEpitome of Moral Theology(1634-1662). The Roman Catholic theologians sharply criticized this separation between Dogmatics and Ethics as tending toward humanism and minifying revelation. The Cartesian philosophy awakened a new interest in the study of ethics, especially in the Reformed Church; and the two movements of Pietism and Methodism likewise exerted a stimulating and purifying effect. Arminianism, especially, gave great promise to the ethical side of Christianity. As marking the close of the older order and the transition to a new period, we may mention Buddaeus,Institutes of Moral Theology(1711-1724), and Mosheim, Ethics of the Holy Scriptures(9 vols. 1735-1753). With Kant and his doctrine of the categorical imperative, a new period in the study of ethics began - one which freed the subject from many of the older restrictions, but which unhappily robbed it of its profound religious motive. For a time no principle of Christian ethics was adopted. Schwartz and Flatt adhered definitely to the Scriptures without attempting any principle of scientific classification. DeWette was probably the first in modern times to point out the necessity for such a principle, and from this time, Protestant works on ethics are characterized by an attempt to attain a more scientific character. It is to Schleiermacher, however, that we must turn as the founder of modern theological ethics. The subjectivism of Kant having reached its consequences in Fichte, philosophy again turned to objectivism. Schelling advanced the theory of the identity of the subject and object, and on this basis, Schleiermacher constructed his ethics. He returned to the old idea of the kingdom of heaven, which had entirely disappeared from the philosophy of Kant and Wolff. However, he did not with Buddaeus regard the kingdom as an indefinite realm beyond the grave; nor did he accept the position of the Roman Catholics in limiting it to the church on earth. Instead, he found the kingdom in every sphere of life, by the virtuous action of the individual. Following Schleiermacher, perhaps the most important work is Rothe’sTheological Ethics. This has been praised as presenting an insight "into the innermost marrow of ethical speculation," and as demonstrating "that Christianity is the realization of the highest thought of God" (Bunsen). On the other hand, it is deserving of just criticism, in that it makes the state rather than the church, the highest good, and maintains that it should be the object of the church to resolve itself into the state. In this he follows Hegel who made the state the supreme good, in direct opposition to the ethics of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church

Among the more modern works on Christian ethics are the following: Martensen,Christian Ethics(3 vols. 1871); Luthardt,History of Christian Ethics(1889); Smyth, Christian Ethics(3rd Ed. 1894); Strong,Christian Ethics(1896); Robbins,The Ethics of the Christian Life(1904); I. A. Dorner,System of Christian Ethics(1906); Stalker,The Ethics of Jesus(1909); Hall,History of Ethics Within Organized Christianity(1910); King,The Ethics of Jesus(1910); Alexander,Christianity and Ethics(1914); Scott,New Testament Ethics(1930); Niebuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics(1935); and Widgery, Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life(1940) The Principles of Christian Ethics

We have shown the relation of Ethics to Dogmatics; have indicated the source of Christian Ethics as centering in Divine Revelation; traced briefly the development of ethical theory in the church;

and must now consider the principles underlying Christian ethics and their application in daily life. In our examination of Christian Perfection as the norm of New Testament experience, we found that it was a purification of the heart from sin in order to a full devotement of the whole being to Jesus Christ. Grace must first express itself in Christian experience; and from the communication of this new life and love, new standards of daily living will be formed. Doctrine may not always issue in experience; but experience if it is to be maintained must always issue in Christian living. Every doctrine, therefore, not only has its experiential phase, but also its ethical expression. God is a Person, and man is a person, hence all their relationships must be ethical. The dominant note of Christian Perfection being that of full devotion to God, this devotement becomes a fundamental principle in Christian ethics. As such, it is exercised toward Christ in His divine-human nature as the mediatorial Person; and this both as Creator and Redeemer. As Creator, His law is written in the nature and constitution of man, and is commonly known as the law of conscience. As Redeemer, His whole life and history furnish a satisfaction to the Divine Will. There can be, therefore, no lack of harmony between the new law of Christ, and the old law of a fully redeemed and enlightened conscience. But the mediatorial cannot be properly understood unless it be seen that the Supreme Law-giver, and the perfect Example of His own presence are conjoined in the Deity and manhood of the Goodman. In order that Christ might give His people a new commandment, and a perfect law of liberty through which that commandment could be fulfilled, He himself received a new commandment and learned obedience by the things which He suffered. And having learned obedience, He presented himself as at once the perfect law-giver, and the perfect Example of His own precepts. Here we find the unsearchable unity of His two natures in one personal Agent investing the subject of Christian ethics, as it does also, that of Christian dogmatics. His moral obligation, however, could not be shared, for the mystery of His suffering was twofold for sin in us, and through temptation to impossible sin in Himself. For this reason St. Paul says thathe died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God(Rom. 6:10). In this death to sin, He secured for us forever, (1) the law of liberty by which we are delivered from the principle of sin; and (2) the law of love as a motive to righteousness. Here, then, is the fulfillmentof The oath which he swore to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life(Luke 1:73-75) The Law of Liberty. The new freedom provided by the death of Christ unto sin is called by St. Jamesthe perfect law of liberty(James 1:25); and again, the royal law, which according to the Scriptures is, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself(James 2:8). St. Paul speaks of it as the law ofthe Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which makes us free from the law of sin and death(Rom. 8:2). The external law cease to be the law of sin and death, for the consciousness of sins is removed in justification; and the inner law of life by the Spirit furnishes the motive and the strength of obedience [ON THE TRUE IDEA OF SPIRITUAL LIBERTY On the above subject, Dr. Thomas C. Upham gives us the following excellent discussion in his work entitled, "The Principles of the Interior Life." We present it in a greatly abbreviated form. He says, "It has probably come within the observation of many persons, that there is a form or modification of religious experience, which is denominated 'Liberty.' Hence, in common religious parlance, it is not unfrequently the case that we hear of persons being 'in the liberty,' or in the 'true liberty.' These expressions undoubtedly indicate an important religious truth, which has not altogether escaped the notice of writers on the religious life. The account as given by Francis de Sales of 'the liberty of spirit' is, that 'it consists in keeping the heart totally

disengaged from every created thing, in order that it may follow the known will of God.' To this statement of De Sales, considered as a general and somewhat indefinite statement, we do not find it necessary to object. Certain it is that he who is in the 'true liberty' is 'disengaged,' and has escaped from the enslaving influence of the world. God has become to him an inward, operative principle, without whom he feels he can do nothing, and in connection with whose blessed assistance he has an inward consciousness that the world and its lusts have lost their inthralling power. Liberty - considered in this general sense of the term - is to be regarded as expressive of one of the highest and most excellent forms of Christian experience. And we may add, further, that none truly enjoy it in this high sense but those who are in a state of mind, which may with propriety be denominated a holy or sanctified state, none but those whom God has made 'free indeed.' We proceed now to mention some of the marks by which the condition or state of the spiritual liberty is characterized. Nor does there seem to be much difficulty in doing this, because liberty is the opposite of inthrallment; and because it is easy, as a general thing, to understand and to specify the things by which we are most apt to be inthralled

"(1) The person who is in the enjoyment of true spiritual liberty is no longer inthralled to the lower or appetitive part of his nature. Whether he eats or drinks, or whatever other appetite may claim its appropriate exercise, he can say in truth that he does all to the glory of God

"(2) The person who is in the enjoyment of true spiritual liberty is no longer inthralled by certain desires of a higher character than the appetite - such as the desire of society, the desire of knowledge, the desire of the world's esteem, and the like. These principles, which, in order to distinguish them from the appetites, may conveniently be designated as the propensities, or propensive principles, operate in the man of true inward liberty as they were designed to operate, but never with the power to enslave

"(3) A man who is in the enjoyment of true religious liberty will not be inthralled by inordinate domestic or patriotic affections, however ennobling they may be thought to be - such as the love of parents and children, the love of friends and country. It is true that spiritual liberty does not exclude the exercise of these affection - which are, in many respects, generous and elevated - any more than it condemns and excludes the existence of the lower appetites and propensities

"(4) When we are wrongly under the influence of disinclinations and aversions, we cannot be said to be in internal liberty. Sometimes, when God very obviously calls us to the discharge of duty, we are internally conscious of a great degree of backwardness. We do it, it is true; but we feel that we do not like to do it. There are certain duties which we owe to the poor and degraded, to the openly profane and impure, which are oftentimes repugnant to persons of certain refined mental habits; but if we find that these refined repugnances, which come in the way of duty, have great power over us, we are not in the true liberty. We have not that strength in God, which enables us to act vigorously and freely

"(5) The person is not in the enjoyment of true liberty of spirit, who is wanting in the disposition of accommodation to others in the things which are not of especial importance. And this is the case when we needlessly insist upon having everything done in our own time and manner; when we are troubled about little things, which are in themselves indifferent, and think, perhaps, more of the position of a chair than the salvation of a soul; when we find a difficulty in making allowance for constitutional differences, in others, which it may not be easy or important for them to correct;

when we find ourselves disgusted because another does not express himself in entire accordance with our principles of taste; or when we are displeased and dissatisfied with his religious, or other performances, although we know he does the best he can. We may properly add here, that the fault-finder - especially one who is in the confirmed habit of fault-finding - is not a man of a free spirit. Accordingly, those who are often complaining of their minister, of the brethren of the church, of the time and manner of the ordinances, and of many other persons and things, will find, on a careful examination, that they are too full of self, too strongly moved by their personal views and interests, to know the true and full import of that ennobling liberty which the Saviour gives to His truly sanctified ones

"(6) The person who is disturbed and impatient when events fall out differently from what he expected and anticipated is not in the enjoyment of true spiritual freedom. In accordance with the great idea of God's perfect sovereignty, the man of a religiously free spirit regards all events which take place - sin only excepted - as an expression, under the existing circumstances, of the will of God. And such is his unity with the divine will, that there is an immediate acquiescence in the event, whatever may be its nature, and however afflicting in its personal bearings. His mind has acquired, as it were, a divine flexibility, in virtue of which it accommodates itself, with surprising ease and readiness, to all the developments of Providence, whether prosperous or adverse

"(7) Those who are in the enjoyment of true liberty are patient under interior temptations, and all inward trials of mind. They can bless the hand that smites them internally as well as externally. Knowing that all good exercises are from the Holy Spirit, they have no disposition to prescribe to God what the particular nature of those exercises shall be. If God sees fit to try, and to strengthen, their spirit of submission and patience by bringing them into a state of great heaviness and sorrow, either by subjecting to severe temptations from the adversary of souls, or by laying upon them the burden of deep grief for an impenitent world, or in any other way, they feel it to be all right and well. They ask for their daily bread spiritually, as well as temporarily; and they cheerfully receive what God sees fit to send them

"(8) The person who enjoys true liberty of spirit is the most deliberate and cautious indoing what he is most desirous to do. This arises from the fact that he is very much afraid of being out of the line of God's will and order. He distrusts, and examines closely, all strong desires and strong feelings generally, especially if they agitate his mind and render it somewhat uncontrollable; not merely or chiefly because the feelings are strong; that is not the reason; but because there is reason to fear, from the very fact of their strength and agitating tendency, that some of nature's fire, which true sanctification quenches and destroys, has mingled in with the holy and peaceable flame of divine love

"(9) He who is in true liberty of spirit is not easily excited by opposition. The powerof grace gives him inward strength; and it is the nature of true strength to deliberate. Accordingly, when his views are controverted, he is not hasty to reply. He is not indifferent; but he replies calmly and thoughtfully. He has confidence in the truth, because he has confidence in God

(10) The person of a truly liberated spirit, although he is ever ready to do his duty, waits patiently till the proper time of action. He has no choice of time but that which is indicated by the providence of God. The Saviour himself could not act until his 'hour was come.'.... An inthralled mind, although it is religiously disposed in part, will frequently adopt a precipitate and undeliberate course of

action, which is inconsistent with a humble love of the divine order. Such a person thinks that freedom consists in having things his own way, whereas true freedom consists in having things in the right way; and the right way is God's way

(11) The possessor of true religious liberty, when he has submissively and conscientiouslydone his duty, is not troubled by any undue anxiety in relation to the result. It may be laid down as a maxim, that he who asserts that he has left all things in the hands of God and at the same time exhibits trouble and agitation of spirit in relation to the results of those very things (with the exception of those agitated movements which are purely instinctive), gives abundant evidence, in the fact of this agitation of spirit, that he has not really made the entire surrender which he professes to have made. The alleged facts are contradictory of each other, and both cannot exist at the same time

"(12) Finally. In view of what has be3n said, and as a sort of summary of the whole, we may remark that true liberty of spirit is found in those, and in those only, who, in the language of De sales, 'keep the heart totally disengaged from every created thing, in order that they may follow the known will of God.' In other words, it is found in those who can say with the Apostle Paul, that they are 'dead, and their life is hid with Christ in God. The ruling motive in the breast of the man of a religiously free spirit is, that he may, in all cases and on all occasions, do the will of God. In that will his 'life is hid.' The supremacy of the divine will - in other words, the reign of God in the heart - necessarily has a direct and powerful operation upon the appetites, propensities, and affections; keeping them, each and all, in their proper place. Another thing, which can be said affirmatively and positively is, that those who are spiritually free are led by the spirit of God. A man who is really guided by his appetites, his propensities, or even by his affections, his love of country, or anything else than the Spirit of God, cannot be said to be led by that divine spirit. The Spirit of God, ruling in the heart will not bear the presence of any rival, any competitor, that is to say, in all cases of voluntary action, he does nothing under the impulse and guidance of natural pleasure or natural choice alone. His liberty consists in being free from self; in being liberated from the dominion of the world; in lying quietly and submissively in the hands of God; in leaving himself, like clay in the hands of the potter, to be molded and fashioned by the divine will ..... Spiritual liberty implies, with the fact of entire submission to God, the great and precious reality of interior emancipation. He who is spiritually free is free in God. And he may, perhaps, be said to be free in the same sense in which God is, who is free to do everything right, and nothing wrong

"This is freedom indeed. This is the liberty with which Christ makes free. This is emancipation which inspires the songs of angels - a freedom which earth cannot purchase, and which hell cannot shackle." (pp. 56-62).] This is the foundational fact of the New Covenant, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts (Heb. 8:10). While in Christianity, this law is supernatural, it is in some true sense, the law of reason restored, and more than restored. The Divine Spirit in the hearts of regenerate men seeks to work out perfect obedience to the law of righteousness as taking place by the bestowment of a new life in harmony with the external law, it will be seen that the believer unfolds in his spiritual life according to his own nature, and not by means of outward compulsion. This inner law, therefore, amounts to self-government restored. It is the rule of God's Spirit in a renewed self, according to the original idea of the Creator for man. Men are thus in their new natures under the authority of the Holy Spirit, and having their souls in subjection, they become a law unto themselves, not without law to God, but under the law of Christ

(I Cor. 9:21). Thus the law is not made void, but established through faith (Rom. 3:31). We are indeed delivered from the law of sin and death, but not from the law of holiness and life. While the law is written upon the heart, it is still a law, and, therefore, necessitates the dignity of an external standard also, in conformity with the inner law of life. The fundamental fact then, in Christian ethics, is the law of life, by which man is delivered from outward compulsion, and given the freedom to develop according to the new law of his nature. Thus he keeps the law, by the unfolding of his inner nature which is now in harmony with that law. The keynote of this new nature is love, and thus love is the fulfilling of the law The Law of Love. We have seen that holiness and love are closely related in the nature of God. Holiness is the divine nature interpreted from the standpoint of self-affirmation, while Love is that same nature viewed as self-communication. Both are, therefore, equally of the essence of God. The holiness of God requires that He always act out of pure love; while love seeks always to impart Himself and that self is holy. (Cf.Christian Theology, I, pp. 382ff.) We have seen, also, that the Wesleyan conception of Christian Perfection is a purification of the heart from all that is contrary to pure love. Considered from the standpoint of the inner Law of Liberty, Christian Perfection is deliverance from sin; considered from the standpoint of the royal law, Love is both the principle and the power of perfect consecration to God. Charity or divine love, which has its source in the nature of God, and which is imparted to the individual soul by the Holy Spirit through Christ, becomes, therefore, in its full ethical meaning, the substance of all obligation - whether to God or man. To the individual self, it is the fulfillment of a perfect character, for love is thepleroma(plhrwma) of religion as well as law. St. Peter makes it the crown of all graces introduced into the life and sustained by faith (II Peter 1:5-7). Love thus becomes the sum of all interior goodness, and the bond of perfectness which unites and hallows all the energies of the soul. St. Paul makes love the end of the commandment in much the same sense that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness. (I Tim. 1:5). Here charity or holy love is represented not only as the crowning grace of Christian character, but the point of transition in the relation of the individual to the social structure. It is, therefore, the anakafalaiwsiV or summing up of the law in perfect love which never fails (I Cor. 13:8). It is a love, says Dr. Pope, "which neglects no injunction, forgets no prohibition, discharges every duty. It is perfect in passive as well as active obedience. It ’never faileth; it insures every grace adapted to time or worthy of eternity. Therefore it is that the term perfect is reserved for this grace. Patience must have her perfect work; but love alone is itself perfect, while it gives perfection to him who has it." (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p.177)

Conscience as the Regulative Factor in Christian Experience and Conduct. We have discussed the law of liberty as an inward deliverance from the being and power of sin, and the law of love as the propulsive power of righteousness; it remains now for us to discuss conscience as the regulative factor in Christian experience and conduct. It is not our purpose, however, to discuss the place of conscience in philosophical ethics, but to use it in the Pauline sense as an integral part of vital religious experience. He says, Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned (I Tim. 1:5). Here St. Paul analyzes Christian experience as follows: A stream of charity or divine love, flowing from a pure heart, regulated by a good conscience, and kept full and fresh and flowing, by an unfeigned faith. This faith refers, of course, to the constancy of trust in Christ, who by His Spirit sheds abroad the love of God in the hearts of the purified

1. Conscience in ordinary usage "covers everything in man’s nature that has to do with the decision and direction of moral conduct" (Standard Dictionary). While This may be a true description of conscience in popular speech, it is too vague for theological use. In our attempt to be more specific, however, we must constantly bear in mind the following facts: (1) Man is a moral being by virtue of being a person; for moral nature is an essential element in personality. (2) The spirit as the controlling factor in man’s complex being, is a unit, and, consequently, is not divisible into parts. Being thus indivisible it always acts as a unity, and intellect, sensibility

[As science means knowledge, so conscience etymologically means self-knowledge. In the moral being, conscience is the queen of every inward spring of action, will is her subject; and as all legislative function and delegated judicial authority emanates from the sovereign, so conscience is, objectively, the unwritten law of the heart, as founded on those eternal principles of right and equity and truth that are as rays from the throne of God; and, subjectively, it passes judgment upon the thoughts of the heart and the actions of the body. If conscience be obeyed, it approves, and then it is pure; but if it be dishonored and its voice disregarded, such disloyalty can only lay up materials for remorse. This authoritative principle of the mind and soul of man is referable only to the original gift of moral and spiritual life as the soul of man. "In the likeness of God made he him"; and as mental consciousness is our evidence of the existence of thoughts, desires, feelings, and other states of the mind, so conscience is a standing testimony of the divine genesis of the soul, as a direct afflatus from God. This fundamental element of man’s moral being is proof to him of his religious relation to his Maker; it declares the mysterious intercommunication that subsists between the spirit of God and the spirit of man; and it indicates the natural revelation of God’s will made to man through reason. Conscience is the representative of this inner revelation, which, proceeding forth from the creative spirit of God, infuses itself into the spirit of man, and as a plastic energy forms and molds him, by conveying to him the cognizance of God’s will and of man’s duties in His sight. Thus conscience is our moral sense continually held in check by the Spirit of God; it is the very soul of our loyalty toHim; it is the "religion" of a true communion. WHEWELL,Elements of Morality, sect. 263.] and will are present in every activity. But while the soul always moves as a unit, one form of activity may so predominate at a given time, as to be discriminated and defined. For this reason, we define the intellect as the soul thinking; the sensibility, as the soul feeling; and the will as the soul choosing or exercising volition. So, also, if we restrict our definition of conscience to certain modes of self-activity, we shall not be understood as implying that the whole self is not active, but only that the peculiar functions of the moral nature are predominant. We may, therefore, define conscience as "the self passing judgment upon its conformity, or nonconformity, in character and conduct to moral law, that is, as right and wrong, with the accompanying feeling or impulse to obey the judgment of righteousness." (ROBBINS, The Ethics of the Christian Life, p. 79.) In this view of conscience, the functions of discovery or annunciation of moral law are not attributed to it. It is rather as Kant represents, to be regarded as a judge presiding over a court (Cf.Christian Theology, I, p. 307) , who decides that this desire, this affection, this purpose, or this deed is in accordance with moral law, and therefore right. Upon this decision, a feeling corresponding to the judgment follows, either impelling to action in accordance with the decision, or dissuading from any action which may not be in harmony with it

2. Conscience derives its authority from the law whose requirements it enforces. As it is the majesty of the law which gives validity to the decisions of the judge in civil courts, so it is the law of

God which gives validity to the decisions of conscience. Its province, therefore, is not legislative but judicial. Its decisions are always those of a just and incorruptible judge according to the laws he is set to apply. Since then, the authority of conscience is derived from the authority of the law according to which its decisions are made; and since this law is found primarily in the nature and constitution of man, it follows that the authority of conscience is not external but internal. Its voice does not come from without, but rises from the depths of his innermost being. It is the whole of his being interpreting man to himself. The law by which it judges is the inner moral law of man's nature, and any external law derives its obligatory force from an appeal to this essential law of man's moral being

3. From the view of conscience just stated, it follows that its decisions before the law will always be infallible, that is, they will always be in accord with the law of reason. This would be true if men were in their normal state. But another factor enters here. Man is not in his normal State. The law of his being is obscured and perverted as a consequence of original sin. Hence although conscience always makes its decisions according to the law, the latter being obscured or perverted, the decisions will in these instances be erroneous. For this reason, God has given to man an external law as a transcript of his own true inner life, and this law is found in the Word of God

4. While conscience in the absolute sense is the utterance of God's voice in the soul, and is thus beyond the power of education or development (Cf. Volume I, p. 129); the term is also used in a relative sense as involving our own moral consciousness under the eye of God. In this sense, it is the positive assimilation within

[W. Fleming in his "Manual of Moral Philosophy" mentions the defects of conscience as follows: "Conscience may be defective in respect to its law or rule, or in respect to its own certainty or clearness

"First, in respect to its rule, conscience may be true, that is, it may be plainly and clearly in accordance with the will of God, or the ultimate and absolute rule of rectitude. It may be erroneous, that is, its decisions, instead of being in accordance with right reason and the revealed will of God, may be not in conformity with the one or the other. And this error may be vincible or invincible, according as it might and ought to have been removed, or as it could have been removed, by the diligent use of means to enlighten and correct the conscience. Conscience as erroneous has been denominated lax, when on slight grounds it judges an action not to be vicious which is truly - vicious, or slightly vicious when it is greatly so; scrupulous, when on slight grounds it judges an action to be vicious when it is not truly vicious, or greatly vicious when it is not so; perplexed, when it judges that there will be sin, whether the action is done or not done

"Secondly, in respect to its certainty, conscience is said to be certain or clear, when there is no fear of error as to our judgment of an action as right or wrong; probable when in reference to two actions, or courses of action, it determines that the probability is that the one is right rather than the other; doubtful, when it cannot clearly determine whether an action is or is not in accordance with the law of rectitude."] the soul, of those principles of truth and goodness necessary to bring man's will intoconformity with the will of God. Two things are involved, (1) the inner impulse, and (2) the light of truth. The former is conscience proper which says "Find the right and do it"; the latter or moral judgment is strictly speaking no part of conscience, but the standard by which

conscience operates. Since this moral judgment is true only insofar as it is enlightened by the Word of God, we are led to the conviction that in the Christian life, the Scriptures are the only authoritative rule of faith and practice. Further still, it will be seen that the conscience in this relative sense as involving the whole moral process, is subject to education and development, as conscience in the subjective sense is not. Hence the Scriptures refer to this relative aspect when they speak of a good or pure conscience; or of an evil and defiled conscience 5. We are now prepared to understand the meaning of St. Paul when he speaks of a good conscience as

[Conduct is based upon two things, namely, knowledge and conscience. Some teachers of psychology would prefer to say that conduct is based upon conscience alone, and then attribute to conscience two faculties. First, impulse, which is accepting or rejecting right or wrong when it appears; second, discrimination, which is the faculty of conscience that tells right from wrong. In this short discussion we prefer to hold that conduct is based upon two things, knowledge or light, and conscience, and then confine conscience to one function, namely, impulse, accepting or rejecting when right or wrong appear. In any case, we will all admit that some people have more knowledge or light than others have, and that some consciences, with proper training and education, have greater power of discrimination than others. These facts must be taken into consideration in the study of ethics. R. T. WILLIAMS,Sanctification, The Experience and Ethics, pp.51, 52

Dr. Olin A. Curtis regards conscience as having two coworkers the judgment, by which the man decides whether a given matter is right or wrong; and the will, by which the man makes a choice among the possible courses of action. In popular speech the judgment is considered a part of conscience; but, strictly speaking, there is no moral quality in the judgment; it is moral only in the loose sense that it is now dealing with moral matters. He points out, also, that in conscience proper, there are three features - moral distinction, moral obligation, and moral settlement. By moral distinction is meant the intuitive knowledge that there is a right and a wrong. Moral obligation follows immediately, for as soon as this distinction is made, Right says "You ought." When this sense of obligation is analyzed it will be found to contain threemomenta, the obligation of allegiance, the obligation of search, and the obligation of action. Moral settlement follows personal volition under the sense of obligation. If the person has willed against his obligation, he has distress of spirit; if he has been true to his obligation, he has a flash of moral content. - CURTIS, The Christian Faith, pp. 31-33.] the regulative faculty of the soul. A good conscience is one which is enlightened by the Spirit of truth, and, therefore, always makes its decisions according to the standards of God’s holy Word. Similarly, also, the conscience may be distinguished as pure (I Tim. 8:9; II Tim. 1:3); evil (Heb. 10:22); defiled (Titus 1:15); weak (I Cor. 8:7); and seared (I Tim. 4:2). To these are sometimes added such descriptions of conscience as steady or wavering, morbid or sound, enlightened or dark. In its objective sense, conscience may be distorted by ignorance or vice, and so form erroneous judgments; and as subjective, it may justify and bring peace as the effect of goodness; or it may condemn by the pangs of remorse. It is for this reason that the earlier moralists spoke of it as the sunthrhsiV or "inner guard" which kept watch over the hidden sources of the will

William Whewell in his "Elements of Morality" gives the following two rules as being indispensable for the healthy action of conscience

(1) We should never undertake any action of moral import, much less embark on any course of action without first obtaining a distinct utterance from the conscience, in affirmation or derogation of the moral lawfulness of such action. We must not allow ourselves to act on a mere probable opinion, or doubt with respect to the right or wrong of the action. "He that doubteth is damned if he eat" (Rom. 14:23)

(2) It is an absolute rule, and one for universal observance that we should never act contrary to the dictates of conscience; even though it be warped by error or prejudice. The moral tone of every action depends on its close dependence with the inner rule; and the morality of the agent maintains a relative proportion with respect for the decision of conscience, and an honest determination in following it out to its legitimate conclusion. To act contrary to conscience must always be wrong, irrespective of the abstract right or wrong of the action; and whether that wrong be capable of correction or not. For moral culture is the abiding duty of man; our position today must not be taken as a fixed point, but as a state of transition to something better. The law of the mind must be brought gradually into closer conformity with the law of God, that is absolutely "holy and just and good"; and converting the soul" in proportion as it seeks to assimilate its teaching. Conscience is never formed, but is always in the course of formation. Therefore, though for the present, we may err in following the guidance of a mistaken conscience, yet it is better to err for a while in this direction than to be disloyal to the inner rule, which would only weaken its check upon our actions, when conscience becomes more completely informed by the supreme rule. To be unconscientious is always to be immoral. He, therefore, whose conscience is clouded by error, must abide by the consequences of such error; but he sins not in the mere following of his conscience. But he whose conscience has a wrong direction, which with proper pains and regard for the truth might be adjusted, sins when he acts in accordance with its dictation. (WHEWELL,Elements of Morality, section 275.) PRACTICAL ETHICS

Practical ethics is the application of moral principles in the regulation of human conduct. Having discussed these principles, we must now consider their specific Christian application in the manifold and complex situations of life. Here as in other departments of theology, the methods of classification vary. Generally, however, the subject matter is arranged in the twofold division of (1) Duties to God, and (2) Duties to man; or the threefold classification of (1) Duties to God; (2) Duties to self; and (3) Duties to others. As to the order of treatment adopted here, we may say that since God is the foundation of all moral obligation, theistic ethics naturally comes first. Strictly speaking, all obligation must be to God as the Moral Governor, and all duties must, therefore, be duties to God. Here there is a parallel to the truth in dogmatics that all sin is ultimately against God. The duties to self come second in order, as essential to the formation of Christian character. This is necessary in a system which holds that the tree must first be made good if the fruit is to be good (Matt. 12:33); and, also, that there can be no fruit except the branch abide in the vine (John 15:4, 5). Christian character is unfolded only in loyal relation to the divine. Lastly, there is the regulation of the external conduct toward others, as having its source in, and flowing from the character of the individual. We shall then, in our treatment of Practical Ethics, observe the following outline: (I) Theistic Ethics: or Duties to God; (II) Individual Ethics: or Duties to One’s Self; and (III) Social Ethics: or Duties to Others. Following this, we shall give brief attention to the Institutions of Christianity as being a part of Social Ethics, and yet differing in this, that they are more specifically corporate than individual in character. Here we shall mention (1) Marriage, and the duties of the

family; and (2) The State, and the duties of citizenship. This will bring us to a consideration of the Church, which forms the subject matter of the two following chapters (I) THEISTIC ETHICS: OR DUTIES TO GOD The three theistic virtues are faith, hope and charity. These, whether considered in themselves, in their effects, or in their growth and perfection, occupy the first place in the Christian life. Upon these, all other virtues depend. As compared with the so-called moral virtues - prudence, justice, courage and temperance, the theistic virtues constitute the end or objective of the Christian life; while the moral virtues are either the means by which this is attained or the consequences which flow from it. The theistic virtues are superior also, in that by them we are actually united to God - to God as truth by faith; to God as faithful, by hope; and to God as the supreme good, by love. Viewed from the ethical standpoint, we may analyze these virtues as follows: (1) Faith is at once an act and a habit, an act in that it is the outreach of the whole being toward another, consciously exercised; it is a habit, in that it is a conscious repose in the merits of another. Faith is sometimes distinguished from knowledge in this, that faith rests upon the authority or testimony of another; while knowledge arises from the perception of truth in the object itself. The sins against faith are infidelity, heresy and apostasy. Infidelity is unfaithfulness to God; heresy is unfaithfulness to truth or persistence in error or; while apostasy is in its strictest sense, a defection from religion. (2) Hope is that divine virtue which furnishes the motive whereby we trust with unwavering confidence in the Word of God, and look forward to the obtainment of all that He has promised us. Like faith, hope may be viewed either as an act or a state, and in either instance, the motive and the objective are the same. Hope relates to the future and, therefore, implies expectation, but every expectation cannot be classified as hope. Only desirable objects can be hoped for. The sins against hope may be twofold - either despair or diffidence on the one hand, or presumption and false confidence on the other. Despair is the abandonment of all hope of salvation. Diffidence consists in hoping without due confidence. Presumption is taking advantage of God’s goodness to commit sin; while false confidence is hoping in an inordinate manner. (3) Charity or divine love is the virtue whereby we give ourselves wholly to God as the sovereign good. It is a divinely infused virtue, the motive of which is God’s goodness, and its object both God and our neighbor. Charity considered as an ethical virtue in its broadest sense signifies complacency in what is good. In a stricter sense, it is that affection which wishes well, or desires what is good, to another. If we desire good to another, not on his own account but for ours, we have the love of concupiscence, because it proceeds from a desire for our own advantage. If we wish well to another for his own sake, we have the love of benevolence; and if this is mutual, we have the love of friendship. Charity may be either perfect or imperfect. In order to be perfect it must (1) be inspired by a perfect motive; and (2) it must loyally adhere to God with the highest appreciation. If it fails in either of these aspects, it falls short of perfect love. Three things demand our attention in the further consideration of this subject: (1) Reverence as the Fundamental Duty to God; and (2) The Duty and Forms of Prayer; and (3) The Supreme Duty of Worship

Reverence as the Fundamental Duty to God. Reverence has been defined as a "profound respect mingled with fear and affection," or a "strong sentiment of respect and esteem, sometimes with traces of fear." Coleridge defined it as a "synthesis of love and fear." As

[Reverence is the supreme and eternal duty and grace of the created spirit. It is both the source and the issue of all godliness. The three passages, "Holy and reverend is his name" (Psalms 111:9); "Hallowed be thy name" (Matt. 6:9); "Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts" (I Peter 3:15), in

their combination teach us first how awful is God in Himself, then that the coming of His kingdom is the universal acknowledgment of His majesty, and finally that this reverence must be the inmost sentiment of our individual hearts. Reverence is fear tempered by love. In the Old Testament the fear predominated, in the New Testament the love; but the sentiment of reverence pervades all religion on earth and in heaven. Whether as sacred dread or loving fear, it abideth always. As the spirit formed by religion it is universal in its influence. It is the habitual sense of the presence of God that gives dignity of life, and makes the character of him who cultivates it venerable. It extends to all divine things as well as to the name of God himself: to His Word, to His ordinances, to His created temple of the world, and to all that is His. In His presence more particularly it is awe. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp.225, 226.] such, reverence is the supreme duty of man the creature to God the Creator. It is the sentiment from which all worship springs. Awe adds to reverence the implication of solemn wonder mingled with dread, in view of the great and terrible presence of Deity, or of that which is sublime and sacred by virtue of that Presence. Reverence when expressed silently is known as adoration, and carries with it the added idea of homage or personal devotion. Praise is the audible expression which extols the Divine Perfections; and Thanksgiving is expressed gratitude for the mercies of God. The duty of the devout spirit, therefore, is to offer to God the adoration of a creature, the homage of a subject, and the praise of a worshiper. St. Paul in his enumeration of the works of the flesh, mentions two as violations of divine things -idolatry and witchcraft (Gal. 5:20). (1) Idolatry is commonly defined as the paying of divine honors to idols, images, or other created objects; but it may consist, also, in excessive admiration, veneration or love for any person or thing. Thus covetousness is regarded as idolatry (Col. 3:5). (2) Witchcraft is the practice of the arts of a sorcerer or sorceress, which was commonly believed to be the consequence of intercourse with

[Superstition is not an excess of religion - at least in the ordinary sense of the word excess - as if anyone could have too much of true religion, but any misdirection of religious feeling, manifested either in showing religious veneration or regard to objects which deserve none; that is, properly speaking, the worship of false gods; or, in the assignment of such a degree, or such a kind of religious veneration to any object, as that object, though worthy of some reverence, does not deserve; or in the worship of the true God through the medium of improper rites or ceremonies It may arise from a sense of guilt, from bodily indisposition, or from erroneous reasoning. - WHATELY

Godlessness is practical atheism, or living as if there were no God. When it accompanies a knowledge and acknowledgment of God’s existence and claims, it is the last and worst of all vices, as wilfully aiming the death-blow at man’s highest being and mission. The perversion of religious culture, as manifested in the conduct, is perhaps more offensive than that in the views. Hypocrisy would cover the absence of true reverence for God by playing a part and putting on all the outward show of piety. Cant is hypocrisy as exhibited in language and air. Bigotry is the manifestation of an irrational or blind partiality for a particular party or creed. Fanaticism adds to the blind partiality of bigotry an equally blind hatred of all opposers, and a pretension to inspiration. These are all religious vices of the most insidious and dangerous character; hypocrisy and cant dethrone truth and make man a living lie; bigotry and fanaticism dethrone reason and moral principle and give the man over to prejudice and passion. - GREGORY,Christian Ethics, p. 210.] Satan. The injunction, therefore, forbids all enchantments, necromancy, spiritism, orother of the so-called black arts The

Duty and Forms of Prayer.Prayer is a duty which is obligatory upon all men as an expression of the creature’s dependence upon the Creator. It may be said that what the habitual sense of reverence is to adoration and praise, the spirit of dependence is to prayer. Dr. Wakefield defines prayer as "the offering of our desires to God through the mediation of Jesus Christ, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and with suitable dispositions, for things agreeable to his will." (Wakefield,Christian Theology, p. 492) . Desire is excited by a sense of want or a felt need, and leads immediately to prayer. One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after (Psalms 27:4). Without a proper appreciation of the importance of divine blessings, prayer will be unavailing. Hencethe kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force

[Rev. Luther Lee points out that "the duty of prayer has its foundation in reason, and may be seen to be suited to our relation to God, and wonderfully adapted to the other parts of the economy of gospel salvation, and suited to promote piety and devotion." He calls attention to the following points. (1) Prayer is suited to the relation we sustain to God. God is the Author of all being, and the source of all blessedness; while we are His creatures, receiving all the good we enjoy from him. (2) Prayer, in its very exercise is admirably adapted to preserve a knowledge of the true God, and to keep man’s erratic mind from running into idolatry. It has been seen that prayer implies an apprehension of God’s universal presence and everywhere operative power. To pray is to bring God directly before the mind, in all the infinity of His attributes, so far as the human mind can grasp an idea of the infinite God. (3) The exercise of prayer must promote a sense of our dependence upon God, which it is all important to keep fully awake in the mind. It has been seen that prayer implies this sense of dependence, that there is no true prayer without it. (4) Prayer, upon the principles advanced above, must tend to promote devotion. It will produce this result as a mere mental habit, allowing it to be performed with honesty of intention. Devotion to the world, and constantly occupying the mind with worldly matters, will increase worldly mindedness; and soconstant habit of abstracting the mind from matters of the world, and putting forth an effort to concentrate the thoughts and desires on god in prayer, must tend to lessen worldly mindedness, and increase a disposition to worship, and a deeper feeling of devotion, when we attempt it. (5) Prayer, as a required duty, is peculiarly adapted to help the exercise of faith, which in the gospel, is the fundamental condition of salvation. (6) The mental and moral state of the soul, which is necessary in order to offer acceptable prayer to God, is just that state which renders us proper recipients of His saving grace. - Luther Lee,Christian Theology, pp.356, 357.]

(Matt. 11:12). Prayer must be offered to God, through Christ, and in the Spirit, in order to be acceptable. Prayer must also be offered for things agreeable to the will of God, and the petitions must be presented with faith in His promises. Dr. Pope points out that "the formal acts of prayer are manifold, expressed by a number of terms common to both Testaments, and combining the spirit and the act. The leading word proseuch is one of those. It is always prayer to God, and that without limitation. When St. Paul exhorts, in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God, he distinguishes from this general prayer the dehsiV or supplication for individual benefits. It is the difference between prayer and petition. The requests of the supplication, aithmata , simply express the individuality of the prayer: the supplication noting our need (dei), and the request the utterance of that need. When our Saviour said, In that day ye shall ask me nothing (John 16:23), He used another term signifying, in the case of the disciples, the interrogation of perplexity: there it is erwtan, which is changed for aitein

in what follows: Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. The former word is used of our Lord’s own prayer, never the latter: hence the former has in it more of familiarity, and is never used of human prayer. Save, indeed, in one passage, which leads us to the prayer of intercession. St. John changes aithsei into erwthsh concerning

[On the general duty of secret prayer it may be remarked, (1) Every person, so far as circumstances will allow, should have some place which is to him his closet of prayer. The spirit of the command requires this. Without it, prayer will be likely to be neglected. (2) As no time is settled by the word, for the performance of this duty, it demands a reasonable construction and application, in this particular, on the part of Christians. The fact that no law prescribes how many times, and at what hours secret prayer shall be performed, shows the wisdom of the Law-giver. No rule could settle these points, which would not be impossible to some, or diminish devotion with others. These points are settled specifically by the law of Mahomet, and the result is, prayer with them has become a mere form. It being left by Christ to be settled by the enlightened judgment, under a sense of accountability to God, and a general rule requiring secret prayer, which judgment will be made in view of surrounding circumstances, and the strength of the feeling of piety, the tendency is to promote the spirit of devotion more than any specific rule could do. - Lee,E1ements of Theology, p. 359.] cerning the sin unto death, I do not say that he shall pray for it (I John 5:16): we may ask in confidence concerning every other sin, but concerning this we are to leave the erwtan to Christ. Intercessory prayer has no term to express our precise idea of it. The exhortation is generally to supplication for all saints, and for all men, after the example of the Lord’s intercession. In the passage to Timothy St. Paul uses for once the word enteuxeiV, intercessions, which, however, means familiar and confident prayers, as coming from the word entugcanein literally to fall in with a person and enter into familiar speech with him. In the strength of Christ’s intercession we also are commanded to intercede, or to speak confidently with God on behalf of others: save indeed with the one reservation mentioned above. Intercessory prayer must blend with all our supplications." (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 228, 229.) The general duty of prayer is usually divided as follows: (1) Ejaculatory Prayer; (2) Private Prayer; (3) Family or Social Prayer; and (4) Public Prayer

1. Ejaculatory Prayer is a term applied to "those secret and frequent aspirations of the heart to God for general or particular blessings, by which a just sense of our habitual dependence upon God and of our wants and dangers may be expressed while we are employed in the common affairs of life" (Wakefield). It denotes a devotional attitude of mind and heart in which a constant spirit of prayer is maintained. It includes all those impromptu expressions of prayer and praise which flow from a heart which is cultivated toRejoice evermore,

[In speaking of ejaculatory prayer, Dr. Wakefield says, "The cultivation of this spirit is clearly enjoined upon us by St. Paul, who exhorts us to ’pray without ceasing,’ and ’in every thing’ to ’give thanks’; and also to set our ’affection on things above,’ exhortations which imply a holy and devotional frame of mind, and not merely acts of prayer performed at intervals. The high and unspeakable advantages of this habit are, that it induces a watchful and guarded mind; prevents religion from deteriorating into a lifeless form; unites the soul to God; induces continual supplies of divine influence; and opposes an effectual barrier, by the grace thus acquired, against the encroachments of worldly anxieties and the force of temptations. The existence of this spirit of

prayer and thanksgiving is one of the grand distinctions between nominal and real Christians; and by it the measure of vital and effective Christianity enjoyed by any individual may ordinarily be determined. - WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, p. 295.] pray without ceasing, and In every thing give thanks(I Thess. 5:16-18). This form of prayer was held by the fathers as a distinguishing mark of genuine piety, but the habit needs to be guarded against any formality which would leave the impression of irreverence

2. Private Prayer is expressly enjoined by our Lord in the words,But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly(Matt. 6:6). The duty of private prayer is further enforced by the example of our Lord and His apostles. The reason for the institution of private prayer is shown by our Lord's words, to be that of friendly and confiding communion with God in all those matters which pertain to the deeper feelings and interests of the individual. The strict performance of private prayer has ever been regarded as one of the surest marks of genuine piety and Christian sincerity

3. Family or Social Prayer grows out of the nature of the social structure itself. Family prayer is basic as respects the whole system of Christian worship. The worship of patriarchal times was largely domestic; and the sacred office of father or master of the household passed from Judaism to Christianity. Early Christian worship was at first chiefly confined to the family, and only gradually took on wider significance. Hence family worship became an essential factor in the public services, by inculcating a spirit of devotion and by training in the forms of worship. Parents may as well conclude, therefore, that they are under no obligation to feed and clothe their children, or to educate them for lawful employment or one of the professions, as to conclude that they are under no obligation to afford them the proper religious instruction. Social prayer may be broader than the family; or it may be limited to a few individuals from different families. Here again we have the words of our Lord,That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven(Matt. 18:19). "From all these considerations, we conclude," says Dr. Ralston, "that family prayer, though not directly enjoined by express precept, is yet a duty so manifest from the general principles of the gospel, the character of the Christian, the constitution of the family, the benefits it imparts, and the general promises of God, that it must be of binding obligation on every Christian who is the head of a household." (RALSTON,Elements of Divinity, p.780.)

4. Public Prayer is used in a wide sense to include every branch of public worship, such as prayer, praise, the reading of the Scriptures, and the singing of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. Public prayer was a part of the Jewish worship, at least from the time of Ezra, and was performed in the synagogues. Our Lord frequently attended and participated in these services, and by this means placed His approval upon the practice of public prayer. This duty, however, is also founded upon the express declaration of the Scriptures. In his instructions to Timothy, St. Paul says,I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men(I Tim. 2:1); and again,I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting(I Tim. 2:8). The Epistle to the Hebrews contains a similar injunction also, 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. 10:24, 25). Public worship is designed to

benefit each individual worshiper, to keep alive the sense of dependence upon God as the Giver of every good and perfect gift, and to publicly express the grateful remembrance of every material and spiritual blessing The Supreme Duty of Worship. The union of all the offices of devotion constitutes divine worship. This is the highest duty of man. It includes the active offering to God of the tribute due Him, together with the supplication of His benefits. Both the active and passive phases are involved, as in the text, The Lord is good unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him(Lam. 3:25) Worship blends meditation and contemplation with prayer, and these through the spirit, strengthen the soul for its work of faith and labor of love. As worship marks the consummation of all ethical duty to God, so the end of all worship is spiritual union with God. This is the goal set for the church by our Lord in His high-priestly prayer. He prayedthat they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us(John 17:21). This is not, however, a pantheistic union, as pagan mysticism taught, but a personal, spiritual union, in which the identity of the individual is preserved. It is a union of affection, of like-mindedness, and identity of purpose. "Worship is the recognition of Christ," says Bishop McIlvaine, "and the ascription to Him of everything which is beautiful and glorious and desirable. It is the necessary tendency of all true worship to assimilate the worshiper into the

[Worship has played an important part, not only in the history of the Christian Church, but in the history of the world. Even in the most primitive forms of human life and civilization, worship has always been a prominent activity. As civilization advances, the forms of worship change, but the practice of worship never dies. The great moments of life, birth, marriage and death, have ever been the occasions for special acts of worship. It may be said that over the whole course of history, man has paid more attention to his worship than to any other activity. We need, therefore, to clearly distinguish its meaning, that we may better enter into this valuable experience. Intelligent participation in worship is more valuable than the unintelligent following of mere custom The following definitions of worship may be noted. "Worship is the adoration of God, the aspiration of supreme worth to God, and the manifestation of reverence in the presence of God." - Sperry. "Worship is both a means and an end in itself. It is unquestionably the chief means of inspiring and motivating Christian conduct and character; and it is also a satisfying experience of self-expression, self-dedication and adoration for the glory of God." - FISKE

Worship has been called the "I thank you" of the heart. It is an act of spiritual politeness, as reasonable and appropriate as it is improving and beautiful. A sense of decency and gratitude urges us to it, and the comfort and satisfaction it brings is proof of its propriety. - POTTS,Faith Made Easy, p. 367

Every truth contains within itself its peculiar duty. Every revelation of God is always a commandment, telling us something of him which we did not know before, and bidding us do for him that which we were not doing before. The truth is grasped and realized only in the performance of the duty; the duty must find its inspiration in the truth lying behind it. A man who aims faithfully and persistently to do the right will not long be kept in darkness as to what is right. A religion which is from God must touch practically upon human life at every point. - BISHOP McILVAINE.] likeness of the being worshiped. Thus the public and private worship of Christ becomes one of the chief agencies in our redemption. The thoughts and feelings of the heart demand for their completeness, a corresponding expression. Faith finds this expression in the services of the church and the duties of the Christian life

[Evelyn Underhill points out that in the phenomena of worship, two currents of life meet - one proceeding from the transcendent God, the other flowing from the religious life of the subject. The descending current includes all forms of revelation, the ascending, all forms of prayer. Nor does the mutual action of the two currents exclude the primacy of the divine action; for this is manifest, not only in the descending current of the Word, of Revelation and the Sacraments, but also in its immanent action within the life of souls. This acknowledgment of our total dependence upon the free action of God, iminanent and transcendent, is and must ever be a part of true worship. It is interesting to note that the term "prevenient grace" so popular in Arminian theology, is again coming into use, in connection with the idea of worship. Man could never have produced this disposition of the soul. It does not appear spontaneously from within the created order. The awed conviction of the reality of the eternal over against us - this sense of God in one form or another, is in fact a revelation of prevenient grace, proportioned to the capacity of the creature. It is something wholly other than ourselves, and not deducible from finite experiences, it is "the splendor and distinctness of God." The easy talk of the pious naturalist, therefore, as to man's approach to God, is irrational, impudent and irreverent, unless the priority of God's approach to man be constantly kept in mind. (Cf. EVELYN UNDERHILL,Worship.) Our religious life requires giving. It withers under the constant desire to simply get. He who has not learned to worship inclines to the belief that there is no being more worthy of reverence than himself. He becomes as selfish as Shylock in that very exercise, one great design of which is to counteract the selfish tendencies of life. The essence of worship is, that in itself it is dethroned and God enthroned. By it we recognize Him as somewhat other than a very powerful person whom we may use for our convenience and benefit. A doubter who in his vast uncertainty changes his aim to giving, and away from himself, is the one whose gloom will lighten. - PRUDDEN. (Cf. POTTS,Faith Made Easy, p. 367.)

Worship rises high above all forms. If it attempts to find utterance through them it will set them on fire, and glow and burn in their consuming flame and rise as incense to God. If it starts out with the impartation and the receiving of the great thought of God; if it waits to hear His infinite will and eternal love, it spreads its pinions to fly to His bosom, there to breathe out its unutterable devotion. We have here the way of worship. They cry with a loud voice, saying, "Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb" (Rev. 7:917). It is not the learning of some new thing; not a new shading of some thought which is a matter of interest; it is not the repeating, parrot-like, of some new form. But it is the cry of the soul, deep, earnest, intense, loud; the farthest removed from what might be regarded as cathedral service, with the intoning of prayer and praise, and where the light falls but dimly, the muffled music and sentiment rolling back upon the mind in subdued sensibility. I suppose this is about the best earth-born, man-made form of worship one can find. But that which is here described is something altogether different. It is also equally far removed from a gathering of the people, who, without solemnity or soul earnestness wait to be sung at, and prayed at, and preached at, until the time comes when they can decently get away. The worship here seen rises from every soul; it is the outbursting passion of every heart; it breaks forth like a mighty tornado. One thing seems certain, the worship of the blood-washed company 15 not the still small voice.(DR. P. F.Sermon: The Lamb Amid the Blood-washed, pp. 166, 167.) (II) INDIVIDUAL ETHICS: OR DUTIES TO ONESELF

Individual ethics is that division of practical ethics which treats of the application of the moral law to the regulation of man's conduct insofar as it has reference to himself as an individual moral agent.

There is a sense, of course, in which man's character is dependent upon his external obligations, but it will be simpler to treat individual ethics as forming the Christian character; and reserve the treatment of external obligations for the division of Social Ethics. Man's duty to himself is frequently summed up in Self-conservation, Self-culture, and Self-conduct. For the purpose of this Work, however, with its emphasis upon the development of the Christian life, a simpler outline will be more appropriate. We shall, therefore, give attention to the following: (1) The Sanctity of the Body; (2) The Province of the Intellectual, Emotional, Moral and Aesthetic Powers of the Mind; and (3) The Development of the Spiritual Life The Sanctity of the Body. Since man's physical existence is essential to the fulfillment of his mission in this life, it is his first duty to conserve and develop all the powers of his being. Christianity regards the body, not as a prison house of the soul, but as a temple of the Holy Spirit. This gives sanctity to the body; and the preservation of this sanctity becomes a guiding principle in all matters of physical welfare. The specific duties pertaining to the body are as follows:

1. There must be the preservation and development of the bodily powers. This becomes a high and holy duty, for man's existence in the world depends upon this bodily organism. This is intuitively recognized as soon as the agent comes to realize the relation existing between the soul and the body. He who neglects his physical being, places his whole mission in jeopardy; and he who destroys it, brings his mission to an end. Hence self-murder is strictly prohibited. Wherever there is a morally enlightened conscience, men have agreed that suicide is contrary to the end for which life is given. So, also, self-mutilation is forbidden. This includes any bodily injury or dismemberment, such as disfigures the body or prevents the complete functioning of the physical organism. Christianity is opposed to ascetic practices also, such as were found among the mystics of the Middle Ages, and as they are practiced in pagan countries at the present time. The fasts and self-denials which Christianity enjoins upon men, are intended to invigorate rather than enfeeble the human system

2. There must be the care and culture of the body through exercise, rest, sleep and recreation. Man was made for labor and for rest, and both are essential to his physical well-being. The mere possession of wealth does not exclude man from the duty of labor. The world owes no man a living who is able to earn it for himself. Holiness dignifies labor and makes it delightful, whether with the hands, the head or the heart. It also dignifies rest and makes the Sabbath a symbol of the spiritual "rest of faith." Too often there is a failure to discern the true meaning of the Sabbath which is not only for worship but also for repose. Many never give their bodies a Sabbath, Sunday being as laborious as the other days of the week. As the soil of Israel came into possession of its Sabbath by seventy years of captivity, so those who fail to make the Sabbath a day of worship and rest, may finally observe these Sabbaths by enforced rest through the providence of God. In the highly specialized forms of labor demanded by modern civilization, the tension of both mind and body is such that periods of rest and recreation become an essential factor in the preservation of the body. This recreation should be such as to renew the physical powers, and minister to both the mental and spiritual life of the individual

3. The appetites and passions of the body must be subjugated to man's higher intellectual and spiritual interests. Some have assumed that holiness implies the destruction or near destruction of the physical appetites and pleasurable emotions. This is not according to the Scriptures. Holiness destroys nothing that is essential to man, either physically or spiritually. The appetites and

passions remain, but they are freed from the incubus of sin. The earlydisciples ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart(Acts 2:46); and one of the apostles warns against thoseseducing spirits who go about forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth(I Tim. 4:1, 3). Holiness, however, does not necessarily compel a normal condition of the appetites and passions. Sometimes perverted appetites exist for a time in those who have clean hearts, but who have not had as yet, any light on these specific matters. Both perverted and unnatural appetites are so subject to the power of God as to be instantly regulated or destroyed through faith. All appetite is instinctive and unreasoning. It knows nothing of right and wrong, but simply craves indulgence. It never controls itself, but is subject to control. Hence St. Paul says,But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway(I Cor. 9:27)

4. The care of the body demands proper clothing, not only for protection and comfort, but for propriety and decency. The question of dress, therefore, not only concerns the welfare of the body, but becomes, also, an expression of the character and aesthetic nature of the individual. It is for this reason made a matter of apostolic injunction. In like manner also, that women adorn themselves [kosmei'n] in modest apparel [ejn katastolh/' kosmivw/, in apparel becoming], with shamefacedness [metaV aijdou'" with modesty or shamefacedness] and sobriety [swfrosuvnh", soundness of mind]; not with broided hair, [plevgmasin, wreaths]; but (which becometh women professing godliness) [oJV prevpei gunaixiVn ejpaggellomevnai" qessevbeian which is becoming for women undertaking the worship of God] with good works (I Tim. 2:9, 10). The second text bearing upon this subject is from St. Peter.Whose adorning[kovsmo"]let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair[ejmplokh'" tricw'n braiding of hairs],and of wearing of gold[periqevsew" crusivwn placing around of golden chains],or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price(I Peter 3:3, 4). The root word which is here translated adorn, is kosmevw and signifies to adorn (Luke 21:5; Titus 2:10; I Peter 3:5); to decorate or garnish (Matt. 12:44; 23:29; Luke 11:25); to trim a lamp (Matt. 25:7). It is used in three forms in the texts above mentioned, kosmei'n to adorn; kosmivw/ becoming; and kovsmo" adorning. With these interpretations before us, we may draw from them the following scriptural principles, which though directed primarily to women, are applicable in spirit to all. (1) Women are to adorn themselves with becoming taste in all matters of dress. This implies dress appropriate to the age, the occasion and the station in life. Here adorning is not condemned but beautifully commended as coming the profession of holiness. (2) The highest artistic taste is to be found in modesty and sound-mindedness. Proper dress should accentuate the beauty and modesty of the wearer. (3) Ornaments of gold or pearl or other costly array are prohibited as being out of harmony with the spirit of meekness and modesty, and as unnecessary to true Christian adornment. We may say then that the Christian should dress in a manner that will not attract undue attention, either by expensive apparel or eccentric plainness; and that will leave upon observers, the impression of the wearer as being of a meek and quiet spirit

5. The body must be preserved holy. Holiness may be said to belong to the body in two particulars: (1) It is holy according to the use to which it is put by the spirit. To render the body impure by devoting it to unholy service is sin. To give it over loosely to its own appetites is sin also,

whether these be natural or abnormal. Hence St. Paul says,For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour(I Thess. 4:3, 4); and again, Flee fornication.Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body(I Cor. 6:18).(2) The body is holy in itself, but only in a secondary sense. Holiness as it applies to the body is wholeness or healthfulness. The body in this sense is holy, as it is healthy. It is true that it is now under the consequences of sin, and hence is called an earthen vessel. But this tenement of clay, is an important and necessary link in the process of redemption, and the body of each saint will, in the resurrectionbe fashioned like unto his glorious body(Phil. 3:21). During this life, the body must be the object of sanctified care, and true holiness always gives superior attention to it. But the supreme reason for the sanctity of the body, lies in the fact that it is the temple of the Holy Spirit. It is God's dwelling place. What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in y6ur spirit, which are God's(I Cor. 6:19, 20). The sanctity of the body, therefore, not only excludes the grosser sins -adultery, fornication, uncleanness and lasciviousness, but also the sins of intemperance -drunkenness, revellings, and such like(Gal. 5:19, 21). We may say that whatever tends to injure the body or to destroy its sanctity as the temple of the HolySpirit, is forbidden by Christian teaching and practice The Intellectual, Emotional, Moral and Aesthetic Powers of the Mind.The term Mind as used in psychology is generally limited to the intellectual powers; but in theology, it commonly refers to the life of the soul in contradistinction to the physical life of the body. As the bodily manifestations depend upon the deeper physical life, so the manifestations of the soul, whether intellectual, emotional or volitional, depend upon the deeper life of the spirit. Our Lord indicates the necessity of developing all the powers of the mind, in His statement of the first commandment. He says, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment(Mark 12:30). Here the heart refers to man's inmost being - the seat of his affections, with the emphasis upon adherence to principle and purpose. The love of the soul refers to the glow of feeling which attaches to it, and comes from communion with God through the beauty of His word and works. It is the Spirit in creation, seen and recognized by the Spirit within. The mind has reference to the intellectual powers, through which love is understood and interpreted. By the term strength as here used, is meant the full devotion to God of all the powers of personality as thus developed. We may say, then, that the love of the heart is purifying, the love of the soul enriching, and the love of the mind interpretative. The first has as its object God as the supreme Good; the second, God as supreme Beauty manifested in order and harmony; and the third, God as the supreme Truth or Reality. The varying emphasis upon the different phases of love found in this commandment, give rise to those anomalies of Christian experience so frequently observed in the church. There are those whose goodness is unquestioned,

[These several factors, which together make up religion, limit and sustain one another; for, as the feelings, for example, are indebted to the will for true profundity, so, on the other hand, energy of will depends on depth of emotion. But these all unite together, and the central point of union we call faith. Faith is a life of feeling, a life of the soul, in God (if we understand by soul the basis of personal life, wherein, through very fullness, all emotion is still vague); and no one is a believer, who has not felt himself to be in God and God in him. Faith knows what it believes, and in the light

of its intuition it views the sacred truths in the midst of the agitations and turmoil of this world's life; and though its knowledge is not a comprehensive knowledge, although its intuition is not seeing face to face: although in clearness it is inferior to these forms of apprehension, yet in certitude it yields to neither; for the very essence of faith is, that it is firm, confident certitude respecting that which is not seen. Faith, finally, is the profoundest act of obedience and devotion. - Martebsen,Christian Dogmatics, p. 11.] but who, nevertheless, are unduly narrow in their range of vision. There are those with brilliant intellectual powers, who have but little depth of emotion; and there are those who are both good and inspirational, who have never thought their way through the doctrines which they so dearly love

1. The development of the intellect is essential to a useful Christian life. The desire to know is human and God-given, and in Christian experience, this desire is greatly intensified. Ignorance is no part of holiness. We may note, (1) That Christ is the truth, and hence the followers of Christ become "disciples" or learners. One who does not love truth, whether that truth be of a scientific, philosophical, or other cultural nature, has little appreciation of the wonderful works of God which were created through Christ the eternal Logos. One who has not a burning desire for spiritual truth, may seriously question, also, any claim to the gift of the promised Comforter, who is expressly stated to be the Spirit of Truth. (2) It is the intellect and the understanding which give vision to the soul. Hence only with the broadening of the intellectual horizons, and a spiritual insight into

[The doctrine, which we propose to advance on this somewhat difficult subject, may be regarded as implying the admission of two things: First, that the mind, in some important and true sense, is departmental; that it exists in three departments of the Intellect, the sensibilities, and the Will; and that the emotional or emotive states constitute a distinct and important subordinate division in these departments: and Second, that the operations of the Holy Spirit on the human mind are various; that they may embrace the whole of these departments, reaching and controlling the whole mind; or that, under certain circumstances, they may stop either at the intellectual department or at the emotive division of the sensitive department, producing certain important results, but leaving others without being realized. We proceed then to remark, in the first place, that it is the office of the Holy Spirit to operate, on the appropriate occasions of such operations, upon the human intellect; and especially by guiding it in the perception of the truth. The mode of the Spirit's operation upon the intellectual part, as it is upon other parts of the mind, is in many respects mysterious; but the ordinary results of His influence is the communication of truth; that is to say, the soul, when it is thus operated upon, knows spiritually what it did not know before. And it may properly be added, that the knowledge which is thus communicated will vary, both in kind and degree, in accordance with the nature of the subject or facts to be illustrated, and with the special circumstances, whatever they may be, which render a divine communication necessary. But it is not ordinarily to be expected that the operation, of which we are now speaking, will stop with the intellect. - UPHAM,Interior Life, pp. 138, 139.] truth, can there be the enrichment of the affectional nature, and the deepening of the spiritual life. In the more immediate relation to the spiritual life, however, this grace is administered through the truth in answer to faith, and is effected by the Spirit. (3) The discriminations of the heart are frequently communicated to the mind also. Rev. T. K. Doty points out that "the doctrine of holiness, before a jargon, is now more reasonable and plain, because the processes of reasoning are carried on from the standpoint and impulse of another experience. In the same way, semi-worldly practices, under a little instruction, and many

times without it, become obnoxious, and are discarded. It is also true that the mind, formerly misdirected by sinful affections, is now occasionally hindered by the purified affections, because the latter lean toward those things already supposed to be proper and right. Such suppositions measurably prevent freedom of investigation." (T. K. DOTY,Lessons in Holiness, p. 86.) (4) The breadth of understanding also makes for stability of character. Indecisions and instability are frequently the consequences of shortsightedness. Wide horizons and far distances, therefore, are essential to a continuity of purpose. St. Paul recognized this truth when he wrote that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal (II Cor. 4:17, 18). Self-culture, then, requires the development to the highest degree possible, of the power to see, to think, to remember and to construct. This calls for exact and wide observation, profound thought, and the under-

[We have said that man owes it to himself that to the extent of his ability he seek the perfection of his powers; especially that he so educate his intellect that he be a man of extensive Information, of sound judgment, and a correct reasoner; that he so discipline his volitioning faculty that he may always hold his appetites, desires, and affections under control, keeping their gratification within the limits prescribed by our Creator, never allowing their gratification to peril a greater good than it confers. - Raymond, Systematic Theology, m, p.104.] standing of things in their systematic order and completeness

2. The emotions are closely related to the intellect and the will. "By an original law of our mental nature," says Dr. Upham, "the perception of truth which is the result of an intellectual act, is ordinarily followed by an effect upon that portion of the mind which is usually designated as the emotional or emotive susceptibility; a part of the mind which as it is subsequent in the time of its action, is sometimes figuratively described as ’b mg back of the intellect’." An emotion, considered from the religious standpoint, may be defined as a movement, [INTELLECTUAL VICES

Dr. Gregory in his "Christian Ethics" calls attention to the necessity of avoiding ignorance, stupidity, heedlessness, rashness, credulity and skepticism, as being fatal to any true mission. These vices all have their root in a vincible ignorance, and the agent is therefore bound to avoid them. He enumerates the following:

1. Ignorance may appear as want of knowledge as to the nature and consequences of any action, or want of knowledge of the mission of duty or any of its parts. In whatever form, it is reproach to the agent and a hindrance to his mission

2. Stupidity is often not so much a defect of nature as of moral energy; and when it his this last origin it becomes immoral. The man refuses to awake to observation, reflection and judgment; and his native powers, therefore, become weak. . . .Such stupidity is immoral and vicious in proportion to the neglected endowments and the lost opportunities

3. Heedlessness is rather occasional disregard of the nature and consequences of actions than perpetual forgetfulness. When the man allows himself to become engrossed with a few things, and these perhaps unimportant, and loses sight of the many and more important things which should properly be kept in view in deciding his action, the consequences of evil overtake him

unexpectedly, and he falls in his undertakings. Such heedlessness is evidently immoral and guilty

4. Rashness is the hardy daring of consequences seen or unseen. The man is so intent on a particular end, that though he may have abundant occasion to anticipate evil consequences, he determines to risk them, and recklessly persists in his course until the blow falls. Passion is usually the leader in this vice. It is a worse vice than stupidity or heedlessness, for the depravity it manifests is in the fullest sense wilful, and shows the reckless determination to override the moral judgement and gratifying passion at whatever cost or hazard

5. Credulity and skepticism are opposite forms of the same vice. Want of the proper intellectual culture leaves the agent weak in judgment, and, having little grasp of principles and less power of making safe deductions from facts, he gives or withholds his faith according to his own wishes or the opinions of anyone who may have influence over him. If he be of an ardent temperament, he will be ready to believe anything, or he will be credulous; if he be of an opposite temperament, or have an ambition to be thought brilliant or original, he will be equally ready to doubt everything, or, he will be skeptical.] sensibility, or excitement of the heart which is manifested in consciousness. It is immediately related to the intellect, being the glow of truth consciously realized and felt. All holy emotions, therefore, involve a divine as well as a human movement, but the spiritual sensibilities do not necessarily preclude those which are purely human. The ebb and flow of the emotional life is sometimes an occasion of stumbling to young or inexperienced Christians. When, however, it is seen that [THE SPRINGS OF POWER

Power of action depends upon power of motive, and, therefore, upon power of feeling. The feelings are as important and worthy of a part of man as the intollect or will. From the very nature of the hutnan soul, there can be no powerful and persistent will in executing the mission of life unless there be powerful and sustained feeling. It is, therefore, man’s duty to aim to develop all the natural affections and desires, in their proper proportion and harmony, in order that he may become a man with the full dignity of manhood, and may have a powerful motive - basis for his life. It is, therefore, man’s duty to avoid all repression, perversion, or disproportionate development of the feelings. Insensibility and passion are alike immoral and vicious

Insensibility holds the same relation to the feelings which stupidity holds to the intellect. It arises in a similar way, from the repression of feelings; so that the genesis already given of stupidity will apply to it. When it becomes general, it is one of the most deadening of vices. When it is confirmed and wilful, it becomes obduracy, and must appear both repulsive and guilty to every right - thinking being, and that whether it takes the form of insensibility to man’s own highest interests and destiny, or to the claims of his fellows for affection and sympathy, or to God’s claims

Passion arises from the inordinate and ungoverned action of the affections and desires, as developed out of harmony and proportion, and made the end of action rather than its spring. When passion has completed its development, reason and will become its slaves, and the man loses his truest manhood

It is obvious that under a wrong and evil culture each of the springs of action furnishes the germ of some passion. First, from Lower Feelings. In the undue development of the appetites and animal sensibilities arises the milder vice of sentimentality, which leads its victim to weep with equal ease over the agonies of a pet canary and a victim of the Inquisition; together with all those base and

brutal vices of gluttony, intemperance, sensuality, which are usually designated by passion in its base sense. second, from the Higher Feelings. In the proper development of the higher feelings there arises, from the side of the affections, pride, or that inordinate self-esteem which shows itself in the disposition to overrate what one possesses, and in haughtiness and loftiness of manners; egotism, which leads one to make himself prominent; vanity, which is allied to pride, egotism and conceit, self-praise and self-commendation, and which is manifested in a desire to attract notice and gain admiration in a small way, and which would, therefore, be ridiculed as weak if it were not condemned as immoral; and all other forms of selfishness from the side of the desires aimless restlessness, irrational curiosity, unbridled ambition, and base covetousness, which are all easily understood, and which are all condemned by mankind as viclous. - Gregory,Christian Ethics, pp. 206, 207.] emotion depends upon the perception of new truth, or upon familiar truths seen in new aspects, the secret of stability and faith will have been learned. Truth seen and realized through the Spirit, brings the glow of emotion; but that same truth, even though it be fully incorporated in the spiritual life of the individual, may become familiar and hence lose its emotional glow. The essential thing, then, in the development of the emotional life is to search the Word for new truth, or to plead the Spirit's guidance into the deeper aspects of truths already known. Feeling apart from truth leads into dangerous fanaticism; truth which gives rise to strong emotion becomes a supreme power in the life of holiness. The man who moves others is the man who is himself moved upon by the truth. To act from principle is worthy, but to act from principle on fire, is the high privilege of every New Testament Christian. The emotional aspects of truth, however, are not lost when the conscious glow subsides. These have been built into the life-deeper down than temporary feeling, and as such give dominancy to motive, purpose and character. Under the New Testament dispensation, the whole process is lifted by the Spirit into what St. Paul calls,a being changed into the same image from glory to glory(II Cor. 3:18). "But the transfiguring glory, which changes the soul more fully into the divine image, is the work resulting from the manifestation in us of the divine

[When the Lord sanctifies a soul, that soul knows what the conscious indwelling glory is, but it knows very little of what the outworkings of that glory are, in being and in life. Glory as a joy, as a flame kindling and burning in every sentiment and emotion is glorious, but glory in being, in character, in life is far more glorious. When Moses saw the flame in the bush and heard God talk to him, and removed his shoes because the place whereon he stood was holy ground, he was surely moved by emotions which he had never before felt, and a transfiguring glory came into his soul. But afterward on the Mount, the fire so continuously burned in him and about him that it permeated every part of his being. It was something more than emotion for he "wist not that his face shone." Out beyond emotion, there was a dominancy of divine glory - more than will, purpose, emotion, character. Somewhat like unto this there is a glory that transforms the affections, directs the purpose and strengthens the will. It is enclosed, so to speak, in a rough onconducting, translucent manhood, but the transforming by the Spirit of God goes on and on, as we gaze into the glory of God as revealed in the face of Jesus Christ, in the mirror of His word. - Dr. P. F. BRESEE,Sermon: The Transferred Image, p.149.] glory - more and more marvelous, ever more and more complete - and yet seemingly, more and more incomplete, because of the added revelation of our possibilities and privileges in Christ Jesus. There is no top to the divine heights; there is no shore to the ocean of God's perfections. The soul bathes and drinks, and drinks and bathes, and says, 'I know Him better and love Him more forever and forever and, yet, I stand awe

inspired in the presence of the infinite glory, which, though I come nigh, is ever unapproachable; though I bathe my soul in it and am filled yet its measureless heights and depths and length and breadths overwhelm me.' " - Dr. P. F. Bresee, Sermon: The Transferred Image

3. The moral nature requires development. Here we refer primarily to the discipline of the will with its obligation and responsibility. It is only by choices that moral character is formed, and conduct is wholly dependent upon moral character. Hence the impulses and volitions of the soul must be brought under the control of the will and subordinated to the highest good. Two things are involved - the adoption of correct moral standards, and the discipline of the will. (1) Correct moral standards are derived ultimately from the Word of God, and are communicated to the individual by means of the social structure. They may be learned from teachers, from a study of the Scriptures or other works bearing upon this subject, from the observance of correct social practices, from the examples of good men, and in some sense from native intuition. But they must be learned - they cannot be had otherwise. It is the duty of each individual, therefore, to cultivate the highest standards of ethical life, and to conscientiously

[Spiritual emotions are expressed like all others. Their channels are natural, rather than supernatural. A lack of thoughtfulness regarding this truth has greatly hindered the work of salvation at many times and places. The multitude count it as a sin to appear spiritually moved, especially in some ways, and to any great degree. But, really, it may sometimes be sinful not to be so. If ordinary pleasures and pains be allowed to manifest themselves in the voice, and by various physical movements, there is no sound reason why purely spiritual pleasures and pains may not have the same privileges. The many attacks on these religious manifestations are really on religion itself. They are attempts to cramp it into frozen and unyielding forms that soon leave it empty and void. - T. K. Dory,Lessons in Holiness, p. 95.] observe every rule of moral obligation. (2) The discipline of the will is effected only through controlled choices. Man learns to do by doing, and he gains facility only in constancy of action. Duty at first costs self-denial, and is determined only by severe conflict. There must be vigorous effort and eternal vigilance. However, with each duty done, new strength is acquired according to the law of habit, and the pathway of duty becomes easier and brighter. It is as the path of the just that shineth more and more unto the perfect day(Prov. 4:18). The province of discipline, whether by the self or by others, is exceedingly important. Without it there can never be developed that strength of purpose and ruggedness of character which becomes the true soldier of the cross. Too often through misguided [VICES CONNECTED WITH THE WILL The vices more immediately connected with the will as distinguished from the intellect or emotions are servility and independence, fickleness and obstinacy

Servility includes not only the assent to be a slave and obey a master regards only his own ends, but all mean and cringing submission or fawning sycophancy. It includes the blind surrender of the will to any finite and fallible leader whatever, whether in fashion, business, politics, morals or religion; and the equally blind and irrational surrender of the will to perverse public sentiment in any of its aspects

It may manifest itself in hypocrisy, when the man does not dare openly to assert his freedom of opinion or action. It cringes to escape harm, flatters to win favor, makes a show of humility to procure praise, and

Indulges in false disparagement to gain compliments. It shows itself in general trimming and time-serving, in which the man sacrifices his manhood and becomes the mere plaything of circumstances. In all its forms and manifestations, servility must be achnowledged at once base and immoral

Independence, in its immoral form, is the opposite of servility. It is obvious that there is an independence, which consists in proper self-assertion, and which is praiseworthy and virtuous. The improper and vicious independence consists in unnecessary and improper self-assertion, as against rightful authority or just law, or where it involves a culpable disregard for the opinions or feelings of others. A weakness, no less immoral than that exhibited in servility, may be shown in "speaking one's mind" on all occasions, without reference to timeliness of the utterance

Fickleness and obstinacy are vices of opposite characters. In the former, the will changes constantly, without reference to any proper reasons or motives; in the latter the will remains fixedly the same, with out any regard to any proper reasons or motives. Both are irrational. Both are likewise immoral, as it is man's duty to give heed to all consideration fitted to influence a rational being. Both prevent the accomplishment of man's mission; the one keeping him from turning his energies in any one direction long enough to accomplish anything, and the other turning them persistently in some wrong direction. Gregory,Christian Ethics, pp. 207, 208.] love, the youth are shielded from the responsibility of their own choices, and, therefore, suffer from arrested development. This is manifested not only in a lack of self-discipline, but also in a failure to appreciate the just obligations they owe to others.For this reason we are exhorted to despise not the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when we are rebuked of Him, For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. . . .Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby(Heb. 12:6, 11)

4. Man has an aesthetical nature also, which requires cultivation. The various phases of personality, such as the intellect, the sensibilities and the will, must not only be given attention, but Christian character demands that these be developed in such proportions as to

[The law of habit is one of the most powerful principles connected with man's culture. First, it requires that the act, or exercise of the power be repeated at regular and moderate intervals. Second, this repetition results in inclination or tendency to the act repeated, although at the outset it may be disagreeable and even repulsive. Third, this tendency increases in power with the repetition of the act, and gives increasing pleasure to him who complies with it, and growing pain to him who resists it. Fourth, when the tendency is fully confirmed, the agent comes at last to perform the accustomed act with no conscious effort. His being has acquired a sot in that accustomed direction of action, which renders it certain that he will continue to perform the act with ease and power, without even thinking of it. - Gregory,Christian Ethics, p. 203 The power of habit when perverted, becomes a destructive force. In explanation of this, Dr. Bowen says, "The process is a simple one, being merely a transference of the affections from the end to the means. By the association of ideas that which was at first loved or practiced only as an instrument becomes the leading idea and the chief object of pursuit. Thus, in the downward course, money, at first desired only as a means of gratifying the appetites, or of answering some higher ends, becomes itself an appetite and passion, and the vicious habit of avarice is formed. And so, in our

upward progress, the honesty which was at first practiced only because it was the best policy, the worship of God which was first paid only as the price of heaven, becomes at last the unbought and unselfish homage of the soul to uprightness, holiness and truth." - Bowen,Metaphysics and Ethics, p. 308

Dr. Gregory in speaking of the law of habit says, "This beneficent arrangement furnishes one of the greatest encouragements to parents and instructors of the young. By firmly and prudently holding the young to prescribed tasks and courses of conduct, which may at first be irksome, hut which are necessary and right, the proper habits are formed; and what is done at first unwillingly and only from the pressure of a superior will, comes to be done gladly and for its own sake." - Gregory,Christian Ethics, p. 203.] result in a balanced, harmonious and well-integrated personality. For this the psalmist prayed when he said,Teach me thy way, 0 Lord; I will walk in thy truth: unite my heart to fear thy name(Psalms 86:11). The world not only has an aspect which we call the true, but also that which we call the beautiful. (Cf.Christian Theology, I, pp. 307, 308.) God reveals Himself through the latter as well as the former. Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary, and we are commanded to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness (Psalms 96:6, 9). The beautiful and the sublime, whether in nature or the works of art, are designed of God to elevate and ennoble the soul. Insensibility, therefore, to the beautiful is indicative of incomplete manhood, and it is the Christian’s duty to avoid any repression or perversion in the development of his aesthetic nature. Instead, he is to cultivate a taste which is quick to discern beauty, correct in the judgment of it, and catholic in the sense of recognizing and appreciating beauty wherever found The Development of the Spiritual Life.The Scriptures abound with commands, instructions, injunctions

[One’s religious views may be held at second hand, that is, in a philosophical or aesthetic way. And just because religious perception deals with an objective element, that of thought and fancy, it may be sundered from its vital source in the affections, and be exercised in a merely aesthetic or philosophic way, independent of personal faith. Thus there are philosophers, poets, painters, and sculptors, who have represented Christian ideas with great plastic power, yet without themselves having a religious possession of those ideas; being brought into relation to them only through the medium of thought and fancy. Thus, too, a large proportion of men of the present time hold religious views only in an aesthetic way, or merely make them the subject of refined reflection; hold them only at second hand, because they know nothing of the personal feelings and the determinations of conscience which correspond to them; because, in other words, their religious knowledge does not spring from their standing in right religious relations. The adoption of religious notions, nay, even of a comprehensive religious view of life, is, therefore, by no means an infallible proof that a man is himself religious. The latter is the case only when the religious views are rooted in a corresponding inward state of the mind and heart; when the man feels himself in conscience bound to these views; in short, when he believes them. And even though a man, with the help of Christian views could achieve wonders in art and science, could prophesy, and cast out devils, yet Christ will not acknowledge him unless he himself stands in right personal relations to these views. It is especially necessary at the present time to call attention to this double manner in which religious notions may be entertained. - MARTESEN,Christian Dogmatics, p. 10.] and exhortations concerning the development of the spiritual life. Three aspects of this development may be presented. (1) St. Peter closes his second epistle with the words, But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ(II Peter 3:18); and he marks out the stages of this

progress as follows:Giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ(II Peter 1:5-8). Here the apostle makes all the Christian virtues to root in faith, and to find their perfect fruitage in charity or divine love. (2) St. James represents theChokmahor Wisdom Literature of the New Testament and, therefore, makes spiritual development to spring from the wisdom of the Word. As thedoxaor glory of God represents His nature and attributes as belonging to Himself, and yet in thought distinguishable from Himself; so thechokmahor wisdom of God, while

[Rev. J. A. Wood in his work entitled "Perfect Love" cites the following as evidences of advancement in holiness: (1) An increasing comfort and delight in the holy Scriptures. (2) An increasing interest In prayer, and an increasing spirit of prayer. (3) An increasing desire for the holiness of others. (4) A more heart-searching sense of the value of time. (5) Less desire to hear, see, and know for mere curiosity. (6) A growing inclination against magnifying the faults and weaknesses of others, when obliged to speak of their characters. (7) A greater readiness to speak freely to those who do not enjoy religion, and to backward professors of religion. (8) More disposition to glory in reproach for Christ's sake, and suffer, if need be, for Him. (9) An increasing tenderness of conscience, and being more scrupulously conscientious. (10) Less affected by changes of place and circumstances. (11) A sweeter enjoyment of the holy Sabbath, and the services of the sanctuary. (12) An increasing love for the searching means of grace. - WOOD,Perfect Love, pp. 311, 312

Mr. Wesley mentions the following as hindering growth in holiness, in that they "grieve the Holy Spirit of God." (1) By such conversation as is not profitable, not to the use of edifying, not apt to minister grace to the hearers. (2) By relapsing into bitterness or want of kindness. (3) By wrath, lasting displeasure, or want of tender-hearted ness. (4) By anger, however soon it is over; want of instantly forgiving one another. (5) By clamor or brawling, loud, harsh, rough speaking. (6) By evil speaking, whispering, talebearing; needlessly mentioning the fault of an absent person, though in ever so soft a manner - Wesley,Plain Account of Christian Perfection. p. 80.] distinguishable in thought from the nature of man, is yet such an impartation of the divine nature as works in him, holiness of heart and life. Hence we read thatthe wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy(James 3:17). This wisdom is received through faith, and herein is the connection between the thought of St. James and that of St. Peter; it is administered by the Spirit, and this leads us to the position of St. Paul. (3) In the thought of St. Paul, the development of the spiritual life is accomplished through co-operation with the Spirit of God. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. . . .But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law(Gal. 5:16, 18). It is through the indwelling presence of the holiness, but is led into the deeper unfolding of grace and Spirit, therefore, that the soul is not only preserved in truth. It is for this reason the apostle prays that wemay be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God(Eph. 3:18,19) The literature of devotion which makes the greatest and most direct contribution to the spiritual life has been built up from the rich spiritual

experiences of the saints in all ages. The Scriptures are, of course, the only inspired and authoritative literature on this subject; and even within the Scriptures themselves, the Psalms are usually regarded as belonging specifically to the devotional field. Here is a record of God's dealings with the souls of men, given to the church as an inspired language, by means of which, men have been enabled to voice the deepest emotions and highest aspirations of their souls. But as belonging properly to the field of devotion, we may note also, the spiritual flights of the ancient prophets, the gracious words which fell from the lips of our Lord himself, and the inspired utterances of His holy apostles - all of these enable the souls of men to enter more deeply into communion with their Lord through the Spirit. Outside the Scriptures, also, there has been built up a wide field of devotional literature, likewise born from the deep and rich experiences of men who have entered deeply into the knowledge of God. So important is this field that we give below a few of the more commonly known and accepted works in the devotional field

Among the devotional writers, whose works have been generally accepted throughout the church, may be mentioned the following: Thomas á Kempis,The Imitation of Christ;Theologica Germanica, first discovered and published by Martin Luther; Francis de Sales,Defence of the Standard of the Cross, andAn Introduction to the Devout Life. Among the Quietists we may mention, Molinos,Spiritual Guide; Madame Guyon,Method of Prayer; and Fenelon,Maxims of the Saints. Other writings more strictly Protestant are Bunyan,Grace Abounding,and Pilgrim's Progress; Bishop Andrewes,Private Devotions; Bishop Jeremy Taylor,Holy Living(1650) andHoly Dying(1651); Samuel Rutherford,Letters. Among the Friends are the writings of George Fox, Robert Barclay, William Penn and John Woolman. Following these we have William Law, the non-jurist, whoseChristian Perfection(1726) was abridged by John Wesley (1740); also hisSerious Call(1729);The Spirit of Prayer(1750) andThe Spirit of Love(1754). Among the Methodists we have Wesley,Journal; Sermons; and especially hisPlain Account of Christian Perfection. We may mention, also, as of exceptional devotional value, The Journal of Hester Ann Rogers; theLife of William Bramwell;Memoirs of Carvosso, and Fletcher'sAppeal. Nothing is more conducive to the devotional life than the prayerful perusal of the writings of such eminently pious men as those mentioned above. Because of their peculiar value, we give in the following notes, theSpiritual Reflectionsof Mr. Wesley, and theReligious Maximsof Dr. Thomas C. Upham. The serious and prayerful perusal of these will prove of great value to the spiritual life [SPIRITUAL REFLECTIONS

Mr. Wesley in his "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," gives us the following spiritual reflections, which he recommends for deep and frequent consideration. The full text will be found on pp. 95ff in the work mentioned above

(1) The sea is an excellent figure of the fullness of God, and that of the blessed Spirit. For as the rivers all return into the sea; so the bodies, the souls, and the good works of the righteous, return into God, to live there in His eternal repose The bottom of the soul may be in repose, even while we are in outward troubles; just as the bottom of the sea is calm, while the surface is strongly agitated. The best helps to growth in grace are the ill-usage, the affronts, and the losses which befall us. We should receive them with all thankfulness, as preferable to all others will has no part therein. The readiest way to escape from our sufferings is to be willing they should endure as long as God pleases. One of the greatest evidences of God's love to those that love Him to send them afflictions, with grace to bear them

(2) True resignation consists in a thorough conformity to the whole will of God, who wills and does all (excepting sin) which comes to pass in the world. In order to this we have only to embrace all events, good and bad, as His will

We ought quietly to suffer whatever befalls us, to bear the defects of others and our own, to confess them to God in secret prayer, or with groans which cannot be uttered; but never to speak a sharp or peevish word, nor to murmur or repine hut thoroughly willing that God should treat you in the manner that pleases Him

We are to hear with those we cannot amend, and to be content with offering them to God. This is true resignation. And since He has borne our infirmities, we may well bear those of each other for His sake

(3) There is no love of God without patience, and no patience without lowliness and sweetness of spirit. Humility and patience are the surest proofs of the increase of love. True humility is a kind of self-annihilation, and this is the center of all virtues (4) The hearing men, and suffering evils in meekness and silence, is the sum of a Christian life

God is the first object of our love: its next office is to bear the defects of others. And we should begin the practice of this amidst our own household. We should chiefly exercise our love toward them who most shock either our way of thinking, or our temper, or our knowledge, or the desire we have that others should be as virtuous as we wish ourselves to be

(5) God hardly gives His Spirit even to those whom He has established in grace, if they do not pray for it on all occasions, not only once, but many times. On every occasion of uneasiness, we should retire to prayer, that we may give place to the grace and light of God, and then form our resolutions, without being in any pain about what success they may have In the greatest temptations, a single look to Christ, and the barely pronouncing His name, suffices to overcome the wicked one, so it be done with confidence and calmness of spirit. All that a Christian does, even In eating and sleeping, is prayer, when it is done in simplicity, according to the order of God, without either adding to or diminishing from it by his own choice Prayer continues in the desire of the heart, though the understanding be employed on outward things In souls filled with love, the desire to please God is a continual prayer

(6) It is scarcely conceivable how straight the way is wherein God leads them that follow Him; and how dependent on Him we must be, unless we are wanting in our faithfulness to Him

We ought to be in the church as the saints are in heaven, and in the house as the holiest men are in the church; doing our work In the house as we pray in the church; worshiping God from the ground of the heart

We should he continually laboring to cut off all the useless things that surround us: and God usually retrenches the superfluities of our souls In the same proportion as we do those of our bodies

We scarce conceive how easy it is to rob God of His due, in our friendship with the most virtuous persons, until they are torn from us by death. But if this loss produce lasting sorrow that is a clear proof that we had before two treasures, between which we divided our heart

(7) If after having renounced all, we do not watch incessantly, and beseech God to accompany our vigilance with His, we shall again be entangled and overcome

It is good to renew ourselves from time to time, by closely examining the state of our souls, as if we had never done it before; for nothing tends more to the full assurance of faith, than to keep ourselves by this means in humility, and the exercise of all good works To continual watchfulness and prayer ought to be added continual employment. For grace fills a vacuum as well as nature; and the devil fills whatever God does not fill

(8) One of the principal rules of religion is, to lose no occasion of serving God. And since He is invisible to our eyes, we are to serve Him in our neighbor; which He receives as if done to Himself in person, standing visibly before us A constant attention to the work which God entrusts us with is a mark of solid piety

Charity cannot be practiced right, unless, first, we exercise it the moment God gives the occasion; and second, retire the instant after to offer it to God by humble thanksgiving. - John Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection, pp.95-102 RELIGIOUS MAXIMS The following have been selected from the "Religious Maxims" of Dr. Thomas C. Upham found in his work entitled, "Principles of the Interior Life." Their perusal and observance will contribute much to the devotional life of those who seek a closer fellowship with God

I

Think much, and pray much, and let your words be few, and Uttered with seriousness and deliberation, as in God’s presence. And yet regard may be had to times and seasons. We may innocently act the child with children, which in the presence of grown persons would have the appearance of thoughtlessness and levity; and may perhaps at times express our gratitude to God, and our holy joys, with an increased degree of freedom and vivacity, especially in the company of those who bear the same image, and who know what it is to rejoice in the Holy Ghost

II Be silent when blamed and reproached unjustly, and under such circumstances that the reproachful and injurious person will be likely, from the influence of his own reflections, to discover his error and wrong speedily. Listen not to the suggestions of nature, which would prompt a hasty reply; but receive the injurious treatment with humility and calmness; and He in whose name you thus suffer will reward you with inward consolation, while he sends the sharp arrow of conviction into the heart of your adversary

III In whatever you are called upon to do, endeavor to maintain a calm, collected and prayerful state of mind. Self-recollection is of great importance. "It is good for a man to wait quietly for the salvation of the Lord." He who is in what may be called a spiritual hurry, or rather who runs without having evidence of being spiritually sent, makes haste to no purpose

IV

Seek holiness rather than consolation. Not that consolation is to be despised, or thought lightly of; but solid and permanent consolation is the result rather than the forerunner of holiness, therefore he who seeks consolation as a distinct and independent object will miss it Seek and possess holiness, and consolation (not perhaps, often in the form of ecstatic and rapturous joys, but rather of solid and delightful peace) will follow as assuredly as warmth follows the dispensation of the

rays of the sun. He who is holy must be happy

V

"Be not disturbed because the eye of the world is constantly and earnestly fixed upon you, to detect your errors and to rejoice in your halting. But rather regard this state of things, trying as it may be, as one of the safeguards which a kind Father has placed around you, to keep alive in your own bosom an antagonistic spirit of watchfulness, and to prevent those very mistakes and transgressions which your enemies eagerly anticipate

VI Do not think it strange when troubles and persecutions come upon you. Rather receive them quietly and thankfully, as coming from a Father's hand. Yea, happy are ye, if, in the exercise of faith, you can look above the earthly instrumentality, above the selfishness and malice of men, to Him who has permitted them for your good. Thus persecuted they the Saviour and the prophets

VII.

"Be ye angry and sin not." The life of our Saviour, as well as the precepts of the apostles, clearly teaches us that there may be occasions - on which we may have feelings of displeasure, and even of anger, without sin. Sin does not necessarily attach to anger, considered in its nature, but in its degree. Nevertheless, anger seldom exists in fact, without becoming in its measure inordinate and excessive. Hence it is important to watch against it, lest we be led into transgression. Make it a rule, therefore, never to give any outward expressions to angry-feelings (a course which will operate as a powerful check upon their excessive action), until you have made them the subject of reflection and prayer. And thus you may hope to be kept

VIII In the agitations of the present life, beset and perplexed as we are with troubles, how natural it is to seek earnestly some place of rest And hence it is that we so often reveal our cares and perplexities to our fellowmen, and seek comfort and support from that source. But the sanctified soul, having experienced the uncertainties of all human aids, turns instinctively to the great God; and hiding itself in the presence and protection of the divine existence, it reposes there, as in a strong tower which no enemies can conquer, and as on an everlasting rock which no flood can wash away. It knows the instructive import of that sublime exclamation of the psalmist, 'My soUl, wait thou only upon God; for my expectation is from him" (Psalms 62:5)

IX

Speak not often of your own actions, nor even, when it can be properly avoided, make allusions to yourself, as an agent in transactions which are calculated to attract notice. we do not suppose, as some may be inclined to do, that frequent speaking of our actions is necessarily a proof, although it may furnish a presumption of inordinate self love or vanity; but it cannot be denied that by such a course we expose ourselves to temptations and dangers in that direction. It is much safer, and is certainly much more profitable, to speak of what has been done for us and wrought in us - to speak, for instance, of ourselves s the recipients of the goodness of God - than to speak of what we ourselves have done. But even here, also, although it may often be an imperative duty, there is need of deliberation and caution

X The divine life, which in every stage of its existence depends upon the presence of the Spirit of God, places a high estimate on mental tranquility. It is no new thing to remark that the Holy Spirit

has no congeniality with and no pleasure in the soul where strife and clamor have taken possession. If, therefore, we would have the Holy Spirit with us always, we must avoid and flee, with all the intensity of our being, all inordinate coveting, all envying, malice and evil speaking, all impatience, jealousy and anger. Of such a heart, and such only, which is calm as well as pure, partaking something of the self-collected and sublime tranquillity of the Divine Mind, can it he said, in the truest and highest sense, that it is a temple fitted for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT The Ten Commandments of the Old Testament as re-enacted in the New Testament have been tabulated by Rev. R. Crittenden as follows:

1. And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, 0 Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord (Mark 12:29)

II. For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God (I Thess. 1:9) III. But I say unto you, Swear not at all (Matt. 5:34) IV. And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath (Mark 2:27) V. Honour thy father and thy mother (Matt. 19:19) VI. Thou shalt do no murder (Matt. 19:18) VII. Thou shalt not commit adultery (Matt. 19:18) VIII. Thou shalt not steal (Matt. 19:18) IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness (Matt. 19:18) X. And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness (Luke 12:15) (III) SOCIAL ETHICS: OR THE DUTIES WE OWE TO OTHERS As Christ summed up the first table of the law in one broad and comprehensive duty of love to God, so also, He did likewise with the second table in an equally comprehensive duty of love to man. To set the matter in proper relation to that which precedes it, we shall repeat the entire text. Jesus said unto him,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. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets(Matt. 22:37-40). The First of the two Commandments has already been considered, and the second now demands our attention. We may be allowed also, to again call attention to the fact that in the Christian system, the love which forms the basis of duty to others, is not merely the affection of the natural heart alone, but that love which is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit, and which is perfected only as the heart is purified from sin. It is not pretended, however, that we are bound to love all men alike, irrespective of their character, or regardless of the relation which we sustain to them. This love, therefore, needs careful analysis. (1) We are required to love all men with the love of good will. We can wish no ill to any man, and must use all reasonable effort to promote the feeling of good will toward all our fellow creatures. (2) We are to love the unfortunate and distressed with the love of pity. This duty is enforced by our Lord in His description of the judgment (Matt. 25:35-46); and specifically by St. Paul in the text:Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head(Rom. 12:20). (3) We are to love good people with the love of complacency. This in its highest sense is Christian love, and can be felt toward none except such as are true Christians. We shall not transcend the teachings of Christ if we say that Christians are under obligations to each other, which do not bind them to other men. This obligation has its source in the "new Commandment" which Christ gave to His disciples.A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another: as I have loved you, that ye also love one another(John 13:34). By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples (John 13:35). The Commandment,Thou

shalt love thy neighbour as thyself is found in the Old Testament(Lev. 19:18); but this is to be distinguished from the new Commandment, in that the former was based on the love of benevolence, the latter on the love of complacency. The old Commandment required love to man as man; the new Commandment requires the love of character, or the love of a Christian as a Christian. Further still, the old Commandment was based upon the love of man for man as a creature of God; the love of the new Commandment is based upon the example of Jesus Christ as the Redeemer. The application of the law of love is stated in the Golden Rule. Here again Christ is His own best interpreter. He says,All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets(Matt. 7 12). The law of equal love therefore requires that a man treat every other as he himself would like to be treated in the same circumstances

Violations of Brotherly Love.In this connection, St. Paul gives attention to those emotions, passions and practices which violate both in spirit and in conduct, the universal law of love. He mentions the following:

1. First of all, he calls attention to anger, which is a strong emotion of displeasure, excited either by a real or supposed injury; wrath, or deep and violent anger; and hatred - a strong aversion or abhorrence, coupled with ill will. These emotions or passions may or may not be expressed. They are not necessarily wrong in

[This law of equal love to men is to be interpreted in consistency with all our manifest personal and domestic duties. Any other interpretation of it is wrong. In this view the subject is plain. Are you a husband? treat your wife a you would like to be treated if you were a wife. Are you a wife? treat your husband as you would like to be treated if you were a husband. Are you a parent? treat your child as you would like to be treated were you a child. Are you a child? treat your parents as you would like to be treated were you a parent. Are you a brother or sister? treat your brother or sister as you would like to have them treat you under like circumstances. Are you a ruler? treat your subjects as you would like to be treated were you in their place and they in yours. Are you a fellow citizen? treat your fellow citizens as you would like to have them treat you. Does a stranger cross your path? treat him as you would like to be treated were you a stranger. Do you find a fellow being in distress? treat him just as you would like to he treated were you in distress. In all this, the thing supposed is what you would require of your fellow being in perfect honesty. - Lee,Elements of Theologyp. 381.] themselves, but become so when they violate the law of love. Thus it is written that God is angry with the wicked every day (Psalms 7 11); and again, The fear of the Lord is to hate evil (Prov. 8:13). Christ looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts (Mark 3:5). St. John speaks also of the wrath of the Lamb, and of the great day of his wrath (Rev. 6:16, 17). It is clear, therefore, that these emotions become evil, only as they are so misdirected and uncontrolled as to contravene the law of love. For this reason, when they are mentioned in the .Scriptures it is generally in connection with other and more malevolent passions. Thus St. Paul says, Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour be put away from you with all malice(Eph. 4:31). Here anger .and wrath are associated with bitterness and clamor. St. John tells us thatwhosoever hateth his brother is a murderer(I John 3:15); and our Lord himself declaresthat whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment(Matt. 5:22)

2. Closely associated with the foregoing are malice (a malignant design of evil) ; variance (quarrels) ; emulations (jealousies) ; wrath (resentments) ; and strife (brawlings or altercations) . These when brought into relation with civil government lead to sedition, which .may be defined as conduct tending toward treason, but without the overt act; that is, discontent with, or resistance to, properly constituted government. In their application to the Church, they give rise to heresies or sects. The term signifies opinion as opposed to authorized doctrinal standards, especially when used to promote schism or divisions. Hence St. Paul says, A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition

[Holy wrath in human personality is an expression of the soul in .its attitude toward wrong or supposed wrong. while it is somewhat mixed with various other emotions and may be faulty in the holiest of men because of its finite relationships, yet it is still a semblance to the infinite wrath of God in respect to its orderly procedure and control. As divine wrath or anger is majestic in its harmony with truth, and its expression is sanctioned by the entirety of every divine attribute, so also, holy anger in sanctified personality is a principle of life and expression which does not unbalance reason nor bring the various parts of selfhood into confusion. - PAUL S. HILL.] reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself(Titus 3:10, 11)

3. Growing out of the preceding, but with a more objective emphasis, are those violations of brotherly love which are occasioned by a lack of strict adherence to truth in conversation. Here may be mentioned: (1) All censoriousness and evil speaking. St. Paul commands that all evil speaking, be put away (Eph. 4:31); and St. James exhorts the brethren to Speak not evil one of another (James 4:11). Dr. Wakefield says of evil speaking, "It consists in relating that which is

[Mr. Watson gives us an excellent statement of the law of love, as follows: "It excludes all anger, beyond that degree of resentment a culpable action in another may call forth, in order to mark the sense we entertain of its evil, and to impress that evil upon the offender, so that we may lead him to repent of it, and forsake it. This seems the proper rule by which to distinguish lawful anger from that which is contrary to charity, and therefore malevolent and sinful. It excludes implacability; for if we do not promptly and generously forgive others their trespasses, this is deemed to be so great a violation of that law of love which ought to bind men together, that our heavenly Father will not forgive us. It excludes all revenge; so that we are to exact no punishment of another for offenses against ourselves; and though it be lawful to call in the penalties of the law for crimes against society, yet this is never to be done on the principle of private revenge; but on the public ground that law and government are ordained of God, which produces a case that comes under the inspired rule, ’Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.’ It excludes all prejudice; by which is meant a harsh construction of men’s motives and characters upon surmise, or partial knowledge of the facts, accompanied with an inclination to form an ill opinion of them in the absence of proper evidence. This appears to he what the Apostle Paul means when he says, ’Charity thinketh no evil.’ It excludes all censoriousness or evil speaking, when the end is not for the correction of the offender, or when a declaration of the truth is not required by our love and duty to another; for whenever the end is merely to lower a person in the estimation of others, it is resolvable solely into a splenetic and immoral feeling. It excludes all those aggressions, whether petty or more weighty, which may be made upon the interests of another, when the law of the case, or even the abstract right, might not be against our claim. These are always complex cases, and can but occasionally occur; but the e which binds us to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, binds us to

act upon the benevolent view of the case, and to forego the rigidness of right. Finally, it excludes, as limitations to its exercises, all those artificial distinctions which have been created by men, or by providential arrangements, or by accidental circumstances. Men of all nations, of all colors, of all conditions, are the objects of the unlimited precept, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Kind feelings produced by natural instincts, by intercourse, by country, may call the love of our neighbor into warmer exercise as to individuals or classes of men, or these may be considered as distinct and special, though similar affections superadded to this universal charity; but as to all men, this charity is an efficient affection, excluding all will and all injury" (Watson,Institutes).] improper or wrong in an absent person when duty or truth does not require it. For, whenever the end is merely to lower a person in the estimation of others, it is resolvable into a splenetic and immoral feeling" (WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, p. 517) . (2) All corrupt communications.Let no corrupt communication proceed out of .your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers(Eph. 4:29). This is not limited to obscenity only, but to all forms of corrupting speech - words tinged with envy or .jealousy; tones which indicate anger or impatience; and everything which is either corrupt in form or unholy in .spirit. (3) Lying and deceptiveness. Deceptiveness may .be regarded as the root of the depraved nature, and lying as its corrupt expression. Hence St. Paul says, Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds(Col. 3:9). Lying strikes at the very foundation of the social structure, sets man against man, and nation against nation. It destroys the only foundation for confidence and faith, and for this reason St. John passes severe judgment upon all who indulge in it. He says,All liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone(Rev. 21:8); and again, in speaking of the holy city,There shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie(Rev. 21:27)

4. Revenge is prohibited by express command. While it is lawful and right that offenders against society should be punished by properly constituted authority, private revenge is not permissible. The divine injunction is,Recompense to no man evil for evil(Rom. 12:17); andAvenge not yourself, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord(Rom. 12:19). An implacable or unforgiving spirit is also a great violation of the law of love. If ye forgive not men their trespasses, says our Lord, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses(Matt. 6:15) But brotherly love not only has its prohibitions, it has its positive assertions as well. Consequently, it maintains that true brotherliness must have due regard to the rights and privileges of others. These are generally summed up as the right to (1) life, (2) liberty and (3) property

1. Man has the right to live. This not only refers to actual bodily existence, which we have already discussed in our treatment of the sanctity of the body; but all that it means as our Lord interpreted it when He said, I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly(John. 10:10). Human culture not only includes the enjoyment of physical values, but also the apprehension of the true and the appreciation of the beautiful. Hence society is under obligation to provide the individual with the opportunity to secure proper food, clothing and shelter; and also the opportunity for the cultural advantages of intellectual and spiritual development. "The underlying principle postulated in all these cases is the doctrine of equality, equality of rights, not equality of condition. That is to say, every man has the same right to use the means of happiness providentially within his reach as any other man has to use the means of happiness providentially

within his reach. These rights have respect to life, liberty and reputation" (RAYMOND,Systematic Theology, III, p.150)

2. Man has a right to personal liberty. As generally received, this liberty consists in freedom from compulsion or restraint, and applies to both body and mind. "Liberty of person," says Dr. Wakefield, "consists in exemption from the arbitrary will of our fellowmen, or in the privilege of doing as we please, so as not to trespass on the rights of others. This kind of liberty belongs to men in a social state, and can be maintained only by established laws. Hence, liberty of person, as it recognizes the rights of every member of society, and depends upon the restraints of law, is evidently included in what we call civil liberty" (WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, p. 521). Civil liberty includes also the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press and the freedom of assembly; and to this must be added, religious freedom, or freedom to worship God according to the dictates of one’s conscience

3. Man also has a right to private property. The right of private property is of inestimable value, and any violation of it is to be justly condemned. It is secured to men by the divine commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20:15). In the New Testament the Commandment "Thou shalt not covet" (Exodus 20:17) is carried up into the principle of justice in the heart, from which corrupt affection arises every injury done to the property of men. St. Paul expressly declares also,

[Liberty of person must be distinguished from what is sometimes called natural liberty. This is supposed to consist in a freedom to do in all things as we please, without any regard to the interests of our fellowmen. To such liberty, however, we have no just right, either natural or acquired. The liberty to rob and to plunder may be the natural right of the wolf or tiger; but if mankind are by nature fitted and designed for the social state, which will hardly be denied, it cannot be the natural right of men. when, therefore, we speak of liberty as a natural right, we mean that kind of liberty which is in accordance with the rights of all men

Liberty of speech and of the press is the right of every citizen "freely to speak, write, and publish his sentiments" on all suitable subjects. The word "press" is here employed in its most comprehensive sense, denoting the general business of printing and publishing. Hence the liberty of the press is the liberty to publish books and papers with out restraint, except such as may be necessary to guard the rights of others. Men are not at liberty in all cases to speak or publish against others what they please. Without some restraint they might, by false reports or malicious publications, injure the reputation, the peace, or the property of their fellowmen. It is therefore proper, while the civil authorities guarantee to every man freedom of speech and of the press, that it should hold him responsible for the abuse of this right. For a person to defame another by a false or malicious statement or report is either slander or libel. When the offense consists in words spoken, it is slander; when in words written or printed, it is called libel. The latter, because it is generally more widely circulated than the former, - and is, therefore, likely to do greater injury, is supposed to be the greater offense

Liberty of conscience, or religious liberty, consists in the unrestrained privilege of adopting and maintaining whatever religious opinions our judgment may approve, and of worshiping God according to the dictates of our conscience

Thus we have seen that the proper administration of justice will secure to us the three great natural rights of man - life, property and liberty. But these rights may be forfeited by crime. If a man commits murder he forfeits his life, and lawfully suffers death. If he is guilty of rebellion, his . estate may be seized and confiscated. If he steals, he loses his right to liberty, and is justly imprisoned. How far the natural rights of every man may be restrained by public authoritv is a point, however, on which different opinions have been held - WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, pp. 521-523.] That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter: because that the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also have forewarned you and testified(I Thess. 4:6). Theft consists in taking property without the knowledge or consent of the owner. Robbery is taking property from its lawful possessor by violence; and fraud is the injury of our neighbor through deception. These common forms of dishonesty are all violations of justice, and are forbidden by the Eighth Commandment In addition to the rights of life, liberty and property involved in ethical justice, Christianity requires also

[The right of property is of incalculable value to human beings. It enables them to secure happiness in a great measure proportionable to their skill, economy, and moral virtues. It multiplies objects of enjoyment, and lays a foundation for voluntary industry and enterprise. It is one of the main pillars of civilization. It leads to the perfection of all those arts and sciences which are connected with civilized life, and is the basis of all mechanical, mercantile and manufacturing pursuits. The protection of men by the state in the enjoyment of the rights of property is only second, therefore, to their protection in the enjoyment of personal rights and liberties. - WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, p. 520 The right to property may be acquired: (1) directly by the gift of God. A man who enters unappropriated lands and continues to occupy and improve the same, acquires thereby a right to said lands that is exclusive of all others, which right he may transfer by gift or sale. If he leave without a transfer of his right, the lands then become unappropriated, and may be entered upon by others; but while he or his successors remain in actual possession they may not be disturbed. (2) The right of property may be acquired directly by labor. whatever is the product of one’s own labor is his to the exclusion of all others. when products are the resultants of combined labor each party is evidently entitled to only that part of the product which his own labor has produced. Capital is the result of past labor; when, therefore, the laborer uses the capital of another, he and the capitalist must share the product in just proportion to the labor each has bestowed. In the arrangements of civilized society the just distribution of products among laborers and capitalists has been, in all ages, and is still, a question of great difficulty. We have not the assurance to attempt the solution of a problem which the philosophers and statesmen of the ages have failed to solve. (3) The right of property may be acquired by exchange, by gift, by will, by inheritance, by accession and by possession. when one delivers property to another for a consideration, it is called exchange; if he receive other commodities, it is barter; if money, sale; when he disposes of his property without a consideration, it is a gift; when he directs as to the disposition of his property after death, his heirs are said to acquire their right by will. If a man die without a will, being possessed of property, the government divides his estate, as it supposes he would have done had he made a will. whatever value one’s property produces is his - this is called property acquired by accession. If a man have peaceable possession of property for a term of years, this peaceable possession entails upon others the moral obligation to leave him undisturbed (cf. RAYMOND,Systematic Theology, III, pp. 134-137).] the exercise of benevolence toward all men. "Benevolence is not merely a negative affection, but brings forth rich and varied fruits. It produces a feeling of delight in the happiness of others, and

thus destroys envy; it is the source of sympathy and compassion; it opens its hand in liberality to supply the wants of the needy; it gives cheerfulness to every service undertaken in the cause of our fellowmen; it resists the wrong which may be inflicted upon them, and it will run hazards of health and life for their sake. Benevolence has special respect to the spiritual interests and salvation of men. It instructs, persuades and reproves the ignorant and vicious; it counsels the simple; it comforts the doubting and perplexed; and it rejoices in those gifts and graces of others by which society may be enlightened and purified" (WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, pp. 523, 524). It will

[In addition to the above statement, Dr. Wakefield points out (1) that true Christian benevolence is disinterested. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." We do not say that it implies an absence of all reference to our own good. A total disregard of our own gratification is obviously impossible; for such a state of feeling would contradict the most active and efficient principles of human nature. But though, strictly and philosophically speaking, benevolence may not divest us of all reference to our own interests, yet it implies those feelings which render our happiness dependent on promoting the happiness of others. To be kind to men simply because they are kind to us, or to alleviate their wants merely because it contributes to our own interest, is not benevolence, but selfishness. (Cf. Luke 6:32, 33.) (2) True benevolence is unrestricted in its objects. Disdaining the dictates of a narrow and calculating policy, it inclines us, to the utmost of our ability, to promote the happiness of others Unrestricted by the ties of consanguinity, the habits of association, circumstances of locality, or natural sympathy, Christian charity extends its benignant wishes to our entire race. Dissolving the fetters of sectarian bigotry, overleaping the boundaries of political proscription, and renouncing the system of a selfish reciprocity, its aspirations are bounded only by the residence of man. (3) Benevolence is self-sacrificing and laborious. The zeal of apostles, the patience of martyrs, the travels and labors of evangelists in the first ages, were all animated by this affection; and the earnestness of Gospel ministers in all ages, and the labors of private Christians for the benefit of the souls of men, with the operations of those voluntary associations which send forth missionaries to the heathen, or distribute Bibles and tracts, or conduct schools, are all its visible expression before the world. (4) True benevolence manifests itself in acts of practical mercy and liberality, to the needy and the miserable. This fruit of benevolence is more particularly denominated charity, the field for the exercise of which is very extensive The entire neglect to exercise this practical benevolence is highly inconsistent with the character of a good man. "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (I John 3:17). (Cf. WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, pp.523-526.)] be seen that the duties of benevolence differ greatly from those of simple reciprocity. (1) Benevolent services are outside the range of obligation, and therefore our fellowmen may neither demand them of us, nor censure us if we do not render them. Here the duty and responsibility are purely to God and not to them. (2) Benevolence demands upon the part of the recipient an obligation of gratitude toward the donor. This is not true in the case of reciprocity. No gratitude is due for the payment of an honest debt. (3) The duties required by reciprocity may be enforced by civil authority, but the [WATSON ON PROPERTY RIGHTS

Property is not disposable at the option of man, without respect to the rules of the divine law; and here, too, we shall perceive the feebleness of the considerations urged, in merely moral systems,

to restrain prodigal and wasteful expenditure, hazardous speculations, and even the obvious evil of gambling. Many weighty arguments, we grant, may be drawn against all these from the claims of children and near relations, whose interests we are bound to regard, and whom we can have no right to expose even to the chance of being involved in the same ruin with ourselves. But these reasons can have little sway with those who fancy that they can keep within the verge of extreme danger, and who will plead their "natural right" to do what they will with their own. In cases, too, where there may be no children or dependent relatives, the individual would feel less disposed to acknowledge the forces of this class of reasons, or think them quite inapplicable to his case. But Christianity enjoins "moderation" of the desires, and temperance in the gratification of the appetites, and in the show and splendor of life, even where a state of opulence can command them. It has its admonitions against the "love of money ; against "willing to be rich," except as "the Lord may prosper a man" in the usual track and course of honest industry - authoritative cautions which lie directly against hazardous speculations; and it warns such as despise them of the consequent "temptations" and "spiritual snares" destructive to the habits of piety, and ultimately to the soul, into which they must fall - considerations of vast moment, but peculiar to itself, and quite out of the range of those moral systems which have no respect to its authority. Against gambling, in its most innocent forms, it sets its injunction, "Redeeming the time"; and in its most aggravated cases, it opposes to it not only the above considerations, as it springs from an unhallowed "love of money"; but the whole of that spirit and temper which it makes to be obligatory upon us, and which those evil and often diabolical excitements, produced by this habit, so fearfully violate. Above all, it makes property a trust, to be employed under the rules prescribed by Him, who as Sovereign Proprietor, has deposited it with us, which rules require its use certainly (for the covetous are excluded from the kingdom of God); but its use, first for the supply of our wants, according to our station, with moderation; then, as a provision for children, and dependent relatives; finally, for purposes of charity and religion, in which grace," as before stated, it requires us "to abound"; and it enforces all these by placing us under the responsibility of accounting to God Himself, in person, for the abuse or neglect of this trust, at the general judgment (Cf. Lee,Elements of Theology, pp. 435, 436.) obligation of benevolence rests entirely upon the good Which may be accomplished. Great caution, however, is always needed in the administration of benevolences, lest we unwittingly encourage idleness and dependence; but it is better to err on the side of liberality, than to lean toward stinginess and hardness of heart THE INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY

Man not only has duties to God, to himself and to other men, but he is a part of a social structure which demands certain organizations for the perpetuity of the race, for its conservation, and for its spiritual illumination and guidance. These are the Family, the State and the Church. Viewed from the divine standpoint, these are three departments of God’s one invisible government; viewed from the human standpoint, they are the means by which the individual enlarges his personality and usefulness. Here we shall give attention to the Family and the State only, reserving our discussion of the Church for later chapters (I) MARRIAGE AND THE FAMILY

Marriage is the earliest form of human relationships, and therefore the source and foundation of all others. Historically, both the Church and the State are but the outgrowth of the family, which in each instance is the unit of the social structure. Marriage may be defined as the voluntary compact between one man and one woman, based upon mutual affection, whereby they agree to live together as husband and wife, until separated by death. Several important factors must be taken

into account:

1. Marriage is primarily a divine institution. This is clear (1) from the distinction of sex in creation (Gen. 1:7); (2) from the divine declaration (Gen. 2:18); (3) from the fact that the husband and wife acknowledge its divine origin in making their vows of mutual fidelity before God; and (4) from the added fact that its existence before the origin of civil society in the broader sense, proves it to be a divine institution. Since the essence of the marriage contract is the mutual vows taken in the Sight of God and the presence of witnesses, it should not be entered into unadvisedly, "but reverently, discreetly and in the fear of God." The ceremony should be performed by a minister of Christ, for he alone is authorized to represent the law of God, and to receive and register the vows made in the divine presence. God, having instituted marriage at the beginning, it is clearly the duty of man in general, to live in the wedded state. There are, however, grounds for exception in particular instances

[In regard to the duty of every person to marry, Mr. Watson says, "There was no need of the law being directed to each individual as such, since the instincts of nature and the affection of love planted in human beings were suilicient to guarantee its general observance. The very bond of marriage, too, being the preference founded upon love, rendered the act one in which choice and feeling were to have great influence; nor could a prudent regard to circumstances be excluded. Cases were possible in which such a preference as is essential to felicity and advantages of that state might not be excited, nor the due degree of affection to warrant the union called forth. There might be cases in which circumstances might be inimical to the full discharge of some of the duties of that state; as the comfortable maintenance of a wife, and proper provision for children. Some individuals would also be called by Providence to duties in the church and in the world, which might better be performed in a single and unfettered life; and seasons of persecution, as we are taught by St. Paul, have rendered it an act of Christian prudence to abstain even from this honorable estate. The general rule, however, is in favor of marriage; and all exceptions seem to require justification on some principle grounded upon an equal or paramount obh.gation."Watson, Theological Institutes, II, p. 543

Dr. Gregory states the "Prerequisites of the Marriage Compact" as follows: "Bodily defect and mental imbecility, hereditary disease, and extreme old age have been thought sufficient to prevent those who labor under them from entering upon the married state. But, beyond this, it is evident that morality must require: First, that the parties shall be capable of giving a voluntary and deliberate consent. Hence, all forced marriages are immoral, as the compact is not voluntary. All marriages, entered into before the age at which it may reasonably be supposed that the parties fully understand the conditions, duties and responsibilities of the marriage state, are immoral, as the compact is not deliberate. Secondly, that the relations of consanguinlty and affinity previously subsisting between the parties shall not be too near. By the Roman law, marriages were declared incestuous, 'when the parties were too nearly related by consanguinity that is, being of the same blood, as brother and sister; or by affinity that is, by being connected through marriage, as father-in-law and daughter-in-law.' The Levitical law corresponded closely to the Roman in this respect. That marriages between those who are thus closely related are unnatural, and hence immoral, may be shown by the following considerations: (1) the natural affections which relatives have is incompatible with conjugal love; (2) the prohibition of such marriages is requisite to domestic purity, and to health and welfare, bodily and mental, of the children; (3) the prohibition is

necessary that the ties which bind society together may be multiplied by marriages between those who are not previously related. Thirdly, that neither of the parties be already united in marriage, or obligated to marriage, to another. The betrothal is only less sacred than the marriage, and interposes an effectual barrier to marriage with another person. It should be borne in mind, however, that the betrothal is not marriage, but a mutual promise of future marriage; and that it must therefore be governed, not by the law of marriage, but by the law of promise. Fourthly, that there be mutual affection as the only true basis of a moral, peaceful and happy domestic life. "The manner in which marriage has been sanctioned and celebrated has been very different in different countries and ages. It is evident that the preservation of a pure morality requires some proper public sanction at the entrance into the marriage relation, by the ministers of religion, or by authorized officers of the civil law. Laxness in this respect always tends to immorality." - GREGORY,Christian Ethics, pp. 271, 272

Whether marriage be a civil or religious contract has been a subject of dispute. The truth seems to be that it is both. It has its engagements to men, and its vows to God. A Christian state recognizes marriage as a branch of public morality, and a source of civil peace and strength. It is connected with the peace of society by assigning one woman to one man, and the state protects him, therefore, in her exclusive possession. Christianity, by allowing divorce in the event of adultery, supposes, also, that the crime must be proved by proper evidence before the civil magistrate; and lest divorce should be the result of unfounded suspicion, or be made a cover for license, the decision of the case could safely be lodged nowhere else. Marriage, too, as placing one human being more completely under the power of another than any other relation, requires laws for the protection of those who are thus exposed to injury. The distribution of society into families also, can only be an instrument for promoting the order of the community, by the cognizance which the law takes of the head of a family and by making him responsible, to a certain extent, for the conduct of those under his influence. Questions of property are also involved in marriage and its issue. The law must, therefore, for these and many other weighty reasons, be cognizant of marriage; must prescribe various regulations respecting it; require publicity of the contract; and guard some of the great injunctions of religion in the matter by penalties. - Watson,Theological Institutes, II, p. 546.]

2. Marriage is also a civil contract. This arises from its connection with civil society in the following or like instances. (1) A Christian state recognizes marriage as a matter of public morality, and a source of civil peace and strength. The peace of society is promoted especially by the separation of one man and one Woman to each other, and the civil law protects them in their mutual rights and obligations. (2) Marriage distributes society into families, and the law takes cognizance of this, by making the head of the family responsible in a large measure for the conduct of those under his influence. (3) Property rights are also involved in marriage and its issue, and these must be secured by the state. (4) The state by common moral consent, has the prerogative of determining what marriages are lawful; to require publicity of the contract, and to prescribe various regulations respecting it. It is evident from the above reasons, that marriage cannot be left entirely to religion, thus shutting out the cognizance and control of the state. But neither can it be left wholly to the state. Marriage is a solemn religious act, and the vows are made to God; so that when the rite is properly understood, they agree to abide by all the laws with which He has guarded the institution

3. Marriage is the union of one man and one woman. It is, therefore, not only opposed to polygamy, but to all other forms of promiscuity. That the Christian form of marriage is monogamic is based on the following considerations: (1) That God constituted marriage in the beginning, as the union of one man with one woman (Gen. 2:18, 21-24). (2) That the primary ends of marriage are best secured by this form-such as mutual affection, mutual interest in the children, and provision for their proper training. (3) That any other form of marriage divides the affections of the parents, and reduces women from wives and companions to slaves and drudges. But the highest authority which the Church has for its belief in monogamic marriage is to be found in the confirmatory words of our Lord himself, when He said,Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder(Matt. 19:4-6)

4. Marriage is a permanent institution, and can be dissolved naturally only by the death of one of the parties. There are, however, unnatural methods by which this relation is severed. (1) It is dissolved by adultery. Christ's teaching at this point is specific.But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery(Matt. 5: 32). (2) Protestantism has quite generally interpreted St. Paul to teach that wilful desertion also dissolves the marriage bond. He says,But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace(I Cor. 7: 15). Dr. Gregory points out, however, that "It is probable, from the tenacity with which the Scriptures elsewhere adhere to adultery as the proper ground of divorce, that desertion justifies divorce only as it implies adultery, as the two doubtless always went together in that licentious age" (GREGORY,Christian Ethics,p.273). It seems clear, therefore, that the gospel does not allow divorce except for the single cause of adultery. As to the positive

[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 bath 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. - Hodge,Systematic Theology,III, pp. 393, 394 As it respects divorce, the Christian law cannot be understood without reference to the Mosaic legislation, which it generally comprises. Our Lord makes very express reference to the matter: correcting ancient traditional errors on this subject, just as He corrected traditional errors on the subject of adultery. He could not have declared more absolutely than He did that marriage is a permanent compact, which neither the parties concerned nor any human power can dissolve; save on the conditions appointed by God himself. Whatever those conditions might have been in the days of the people's hardness of heart (Matt. 19:8) it is clear that our New Lawgiver has decreed that only one offence, fornication, shall dissolve the marriage bend: Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for forulcation, and

shall marry another, committeth adultery" (Matt. 19:9; Mark 10:11, 12). Under the old law, the penalty of adultery was death; our Lord's legislation tacitly abolishes that: moreover, He gives porneivathe same meaning as moiceiva,which generally signifies the same offence committed by a married person. A remarkable phase of the same question occurs in connection with the new relations between married persons of differing faith. Our Lord had intimated that the divorced might marry again. St. Paul, in his treatment of the question as to the desertion, deliberate and final, of an unbelieving partner, says that the forsaken one is free: "let him depart: a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" (I Cor. 7:15). What the extent of this freedom is Scripture does not say; but it has generally been held that desertion is, equally with adultery, valid ground of divorce under the New Law. - POPE, Compend.Chr. Th.,III,p. 240.] considerations in favor of the permanency of marriage, We may note the following: (1) It must be permanent in order to the accomplishment of the moral and Spiritual ends of the individuals entering into this compact. (2) Permanency is demanded in order to the establishment of the interesting and influential relations of acknowledged children and parents, from which the purest and most endearing affections result. (3) It is necessary, also, to the proper training of children in obedience and virtue within the home, and to their affectionate advice and direction when they go out from the home. (4) Lastly, God has declared, both by His law in man S nature with its growing affections, and by explicit statement in His Word, that marriage is and ought to be a permanent estate

[Dr. Charles Hodge has the following excellent treatment of Divorce: Its Nature and Effects. He says, "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 thevinculum matrimonil, 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. 24:1, 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 Matt. 5:31, 32; 19:3-9; Mark 10:2-12; and Luke 16:18. 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 offense. 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 offense is not committed if the specified ground for 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 Conjuglis Adulterinis,' and elsewhere, that neither of the parties after divorce could contract a new marriage. In his'Retractiones,' however, he expresses doubt on the subject. It passed, however, into canon law, and received the authoritative sanction of the Council of Trent. . . . The indisposition of the mediaeval 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 10:11, 12, and in Luke 16:18, 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.' 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." - HODGE, Systematic Theology, III, pp. 391-393 The Roman Catholic Church regards marriage as a sacrament, which Protestantism denies. The Roman Catholic Church also denies the right of remarriage to all divorced persons, regardless of the grounds of divorce. It claims the right, however, to establish impedimenta, or causes why certain parties cannot lawfully be joined in matrimony, and, therefore, the right of annulment. Of these impediments, some are merely forbidding(impedimenta impedientia); others are annulling (impedimenta dirimentia). The former make the marriage illicit, the latter render it also invalid. The annulling impediments are (a) error regarding the person's identity; (b) violence or compulsion; (c) blood relationship in direct line indefinitely; collaterally as far as the fourth degree; spiritually, between godchildren and godchildren's parents; affinity arising from marriage to the fourth degree. Betrothal constitutes an impediment extending only to the first degree. (d) Solemn profession of religious and sacred orders; (e) disparity of religion, when one of the contracting parties is not baptized; (f) crime, such as adultery with the mutual promise of marriage; (g) violent abduction and detention of a woman with a view to marriage; (h) clandestinity, wherever the decree of the Council of Trent in reference to this matter is promulgated. The decree requires the marriage to be celebrated before the parish priest, or some other lawfully delegated priest and two or three witnesses. (Cf. Wilmers,Handbook of the Christian Religion, pp. 376, 377.)

Due to the fact that in Mark 10:11, 12 and Luke 16:18, our Lord asserts without qualification that remarriage after divorce is adultery, there have always been those in the church who make a sharp distinction between divorce and remarriage allowing the first for the cause of adultery, but denying the second in any case. This view makes divorce merely a separation without breaking thevinculam matrimonii. However, the exception made by our Lord, though stated but once, must be regarded as having full authority, and the term divorce as He used it, must be admitted in its widest acceptation. But the divorce evil is of such magnitude, that it demands drastic though wise action on the part of the church, and utmost caution on the part of the ministry. Even though it be granted that the innocent party is according to the Scriptures free to remarry, there are other considerations that must be taken into account. There is ever the possibility that the guilty party may be converted, in which event there is a possibility of healing the estrangement and preserving the original agreement. Then there is the necessity of social adjustment on the part of the children, which must be given serious consideration. While divorce usually takes place when the parties are sinners, remarriage makes great problems for them, if later they become Christians. These

problems are perhaps the most serious that ministers are called upon to face In their pastoral work. While faithfulness is demanded, in no case should these peculiarly perplexing problems be treated with severe legality and harshness. In many instances, only the providences of God can untangle the tangled skein

5. The purpose of marriage as a public institution is, according to Mr. Paley, to promote the following benefits: (1) The private comfort of individuals. (2) The production of the greatest number of healthy children, their better education, and the making of due provisions for their settlement in life. (3) The peace of human society, by assigning one woman to one man, and protecting his exclusive right by sanction of morality and law. (4) The better government of society, by distributing the community into separate families, and appointing over each the authority of master of a family, which has more actual influence than all civil authority put together. (5) The additional security which the state receives for the good behavior of its citizens from the solicitude they feel for the welfare of their children, and from their being confined to permanent habitations. (6) The encouragement of industry. These benefits are so evident that they need but little comment. Since they are chiefly economic, they will be given further consideration in our discussion of the duties of the married state. It is sufficient here to mention only the moral and spiritual benefits which accrue to the individuals and to the community at large. Mr. Watson has well said of marriage, that "It is indeed scarcely possible even to sketch the numerous and important effects of this sacred institution, which at once displays, in the most affecting manner, the divine benevolence and the divine wisdom. It secures the preservation and tender nature of children, by concentrating an affection upon them, which is dissipated and lost wherever fornication prevails. It creates conjugal tenderness, filial piety, the attachment of brothers and sisters, and of collateral relations. It softens the feelings, and increases the benevolence of society at large, by bringing all these affections to operate powerfully within each of those domestic and family circles of which society is composed. It excites industry and economy; and secures the communication of moral knowledge, and the inculcation of civility, and early habits of submission to authority by which men are fitted to become the subjects of a public government, and without which, perhaps, no government could be sustained but by brute force, or it may be, not sustained at all. These are some of the innumerable benefits, by which marriage promotes human happiness, and the peace and strength of the community at large" (WATSON,Theological Institutes, II, pp. 543, 544). This brings us to a consideration of the so-called domestic duties as follows: (1) The Duties of Husbands and Wives; (2) the Duties of Parents and Children; and in a limited sense (3) Duties of Masters and Servants

Duties of Husbands and Wives. The marriage state demands first of all, the duty of mutual affection. This requires that the husband and wife shall preserve the same tender regard for each other, as that which furnishes the basis of the marriage compact. Where this principle is duly regarded, mutual affection increases with the years, and becomes deeper and stronger as each seeks to become more unselfish, more self-sacrificing and more lovely for the sake of each other. No higher standard of the marriage relation is conceivable, than that found in the holy Scriptures. This we anticipated in our discussion of creation (Cf. Christian Theology, II, pp.13, 14), but must now give it further consideration

[Dr. Robbins in his "Ethics of the Christian Life" in commenting on the injunction "Husbands love your wives even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it" (Eph. 5:25) points out that here is the thought of God, and not the thought of man. "How pure! How lofty! How ennobling!

What dignity it puts upon the wife! With what moral baauty, a reflection from the radiance of the unapproachable Master himself, it clothes the husband! He loves not for what selfishly he can get, but for what he can get by unselfishly giving, giving to the wife, giving to the children, not in material gifts alone nor chiefly, but in the far better and more costly gift of a constant self-sacrifice, manifested in countless ways, gladly made to secure the best culture of mind and heart of all who are brought within the charmed circle of this earthly paradise He alone who as husband loses sight of self-will knows what exhaustless resources of benediction lie in wifehood, and who as father trains sons and daughters in his own likeness of self-sacrificing service to others will discover the possibilities of blessing in fatherhood" (pp. 55, 56).] from the ethical viewpoint. The standards mentioned are given to us by St. Paul in connection with the symbolism of Christ and the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. 5:22-33); and in a briefer enunciation of principles found in His Epistle to the Colossians (Col. 3:18, 19). The latter is as follows:Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them. Here there seems to be an emphasis upon the active and passive phases of love; the former, that of the husband in his active care for the entire range of wifely needs; the latter, that of the wife in confiding in his strength; using With prudence and economy, the means of support, "and to be herself the chief joy and attraction in a home made attractive by thrift and the gentle ministries of a true womanly and wifely affection" (GREGORY,Christian Ethics, p. 280). If we examine these principles in the light of St. Paul’s larger statement, we shall find (1) That the supreme duty of the husband to the wife is love. Womankind lives by love; and this love is what a pure woman craves from her husband above all else. In the absence of this, no degree of care, comfort or adornment will prove satisfying; with it, even the humblest abode is illumined with peculiar glory. Nothing can take the place of appreciative love. (2) This love is not a mere sentiment. In St. Paul’s view, the husband is a living sacrifice in giving himself to the best interests of his wife, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave himself for it. (3) He is to provide for the comfortable support of his wife, protect her from injury and insult, and to devote his powers to elevate and bless her. For this reason he is called the saviour of the body. (4) Lastly, St. Paul submits as a test of the quality of this love, that men ought to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hateth his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church (Eph. 5:28, 29). The climax of this devotion is found in the perfect union of hearts and lives, and hence St. Paul says, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh (Eph. 5:31). The duties of the wife are likewise expressed. For the love shown to her by her husband, she is to submit herself in confidence and love to him. This is qualified by the expression, "as it is fit in the Lord." The plain meaning is this, that the wife is to submit herself unto her husband with the same affectionate and submissive love, which they both bear to their Lord. Coarse natures have sometimes conceived of this text as demanding subordination of the wife to the mere will and whim of the husband, but this is carnal selfishness, not love. Love finds its truest liberty in the service of its object. The mutual love of husband and wife prompts each to serve the other "in the gladness of mutual captivity. The weakness of the wife waiting on the strength of the husband becomes strengthened by a might which holds him in a bondage more complete than slave ever knew, for it is the bondage of a willing spirit" (ROBBINS,The Ethics of the Christian Life, pp. 334, 335)

[But apart from the mystical fellowship which it illustrates, no higher tribute to marriage is conceivable than this. It carries the dignity and sanctity of the marriage relation to the highest point short of making it a sacrament. It is the most intimate and sacred union conceivable; the mutual complement necessary to the perfection of man and womsn, and one which cannot be supposed to subsist with more than one person. As an institution for continuing the human race it is as pure in its own sphere as that union between the Bridegroom and the Brtde to which the spiritual increase of the Church itself is due. This sheds a strong light upon the various kinds of dishonor done to the ordinance. The violations of ethical obligation refer to the two final causes of marriage. First, in all those tempers and acts which interfere between the persons to impair the perfection of their unity, Christ's union with the Church being always in view: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church (Eph. 5:22, 25). Here there is much to ponder. The inmost grace of the wife as such is the love of submission: the earthly reflection of that loyal homage of devotion which the man was commanded to offer: "He is thy Lord; and worship thou him" (Psaims 45:11). The inmost grace of the husband is perfect self-sacrificing love. The two are one; and their union is sacred. Their communion, therefore, down to the slightest offices of affection, must be pure. Thence arise interior ethics which need not be dwelt upon; a hint of which, however, St. Paul gives when he says, "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time . . . . that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency" (I Cor. 7:5). This leads to the other class of offenses: the sinful indulgence of those lusts which war against the second primary purpose of marriage: adultery, with all the train of vices that precede, accompany, and follow it. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 239.] 1. The mutual affection of husband and wife demands strict fidelity to the marriage contract. It especially forbids every violation of the law of chastity, as destroying the purity and harmony of the home, and corrupting society at large. Hence in all ages, and by all laws of God and man, it has been treated as an aggravated and serious offense. In Jewish law, the crime of unchastity was punished with death (Lev. 20:10). But fidelity to the marriage compact not only forbids criminal relations, but whatever tends to weaken the mutual esteem of husband and wife. Here may be mentioned especially, the want of mutual kindness and attention, or the preferring of the society of others to that of each other

2. Mutual co-operation is essential on the part of husband and wife, if the family is to accomplish its highest mission. The two must recognize a common purpose and labor together in a common cause. "The so common estrangement of husband and wife," says Dr. Gregory, "often begins just here. The two recognize no common mission, sympathy, and work; the man becomes absorbed in his business or his profession, and the woman in fashion or household cares; they cease to look for common thoughts, common interests, and common joys; their love loses its height and purity and unselfishness, and wedded life loses its attractiveness and grandeur and becomes a commonplace and base thing, shorn of all noble aspiration and true inspiration. Mutual sympathy and co-operation in the one great work of life furnish the true preventive of such evils. In the one chosen pursuit along which the husband makes his way in the world, the wife must bring to bear her powerful aid, in the inspiration of intelligent wifely interest, sympathy, and effort; and so the two, 'thought in thought, purpose in purpose, will in will,' may together accomplish tenfold more than would be possible to the man alone" (GREGORY,Christian Ethics, p. 279)

3. The marriage relation demands organization. In all organized societies, whether in church or state, there must be a head - some responsible party; so also it must be in the family. Here the husband is the constituted head. This is clearly taught, both by the law of nature and by the Scriptures (Eph. 5:22-33; Col. 3:18, 19; I Peter 1:7). The outside contacts of the home demand that someone be responsible for the family as a whole. Each family must have a head, and God has seen fit to make the husband the head of the home. For this he is better fitted by nature than the wife who requires more seclusion, protection and appreciative love. Within the home, the wife rules as queen. By her kindness of heart, the depth of her feelings and affections, and the delicate discrimination and insight which she possesses, she is eminently fitted for rule in the domestic realm which is her chief glory. Here she must ever be the mistress and the central object of attraction. The husband is better fitted for the harder and more public pursuits of life. God has made him stronger physically, and thereby better qualified him to be the leader, supporter and defender of the home. He is the natural protector of his wife. Upon him, therefore, devolves the duty and responsibility of providing for the home, and this is exacted of him by the laws of both God and man. It is written that if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel (I Tim. 5:8)

[Some may talk of man's superiority by nature, but that is only a dream of the imagination. The doctrine here advocated, is not based upon man's supposed superiority, but upon nature's law of adaptation. Man is doubtless superior to woman in some respects; as a general rule, he can stand under greater weight, run with greater speed, and clamber over rocks and mountains with greater ease, but in point of all that can delight the eye of God and holy angels, he is not woman's superior. But he is better adapted to the sphere our doctrine assigns him, and she is better adapted to the sphere assigned her by the same doctrine. The natural qualities of women, aided by their position in society, tend powerfully to develop correct moral and religious principles; and immorality is less frequent, and piety more common among them than among men. The position of woman as the subject of the conjugal and maternal relations gives her the almost entire control of the care each successive generation is intrusted in the earliest periods of its existence. From her the first impressions on the susceptible mind of infancy are received. The infant character is molded and modified in many respects by her hand. Her gentleness, whether exalted or grovelling, is the school of childhood. In this maternal school we take our lessons; under this discipline we form our characters for time and eternity. The maternal office is, therefore, an office of the greatest dignity and usefulness, and challenges our highestadmiration and esteem. - LEE,Elements of Theology, p. 390.]

Duties of Parents and Children.In this relation, the first duty devolves upon the parents. But as the children increase in years and understanding, they become involved in the obligation of duties to parents. The duty of parents to children cannot of course be adequately stated, but may be summed up in general, as follows: (1) Parental affection; (2) Parental care and training; and (3) Parental government and direction

1. The first duty of parents to children is that of parental affection, upon which all else depends. It is the motive from which springs the obligation to protect and rear the children as worthy members of the social structure. It becomes the duty of parents, therefore, to cherish this affection in its purest and most unselfish form, for upon it depend the character and destiny of the children

[The origin and growth of such affection are provided for in the constitution of the family itselL It has its first natural root in the mutual affection of husband and wife, and is not to be expected in any proper measure where this does not exist. It has its second natural root in the relation of the children to the parents as "bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh." Paul presents a principle of universal application when he declares that "no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it." It has its third natural root in the innocent helplessness of the child, which makes the bosom of its parents so long its place of security and rest. This is the most powerful of all influences for the development of the fatherly and motherly tenderness; and the parents, who turn the children over to the almost exclusive care of menials and hirelings, place themselves in measure beyond its reach, and so make the highest and purest and most intense development of parental affection impossible. It has its fourth root in right and adequate views of the immortal existence and boundless possibilities of the child nature, and of the grandeur of training it for immortal goodness and glory. The parental love that does not strike deep root in this is of the earth and time only, and furnishes no fit motive to the training of the children for the highest mission. - Gregory, Christian Ethics, p. 281.]

2. The second duty is that of' parental care and training. This of necessity includes the proper nourishment of the body, and a wholesome physical environment; the education of the mind in accordance with the gifts and abilities of each particular child; and the development of high moral standards. Hence St. Paul commands parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. 6:4). The importance of early training is set forth in the proverb, Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it (Prov. 22:6). All this will be of little avail, unless the child is brought early to a knowledge of Christ's saving power, and experiences the divine grace which changes the heart and implants within it the principle of obedience to God. Childhood conversion may appear to many as being narrow in its range of experience, but the essential, the change of the heart, is the same, whether in children or mature persons

3. The third parental duty is that of family government. Children are without the knowledge necessary to direct themselves, and it becomes the duty of the parents therefore to exercise wise control in the direction of their conduct. This authority must be absolute in infancy and early childhood, but will be relaxed proportionately to the ability of youth to govern itself. That family government should be firm, but kind and liberal, is implied in the words of St. Paul, And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath (Eph. 6:4); and Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged (Col. 3:21)

[The character of the parent must itself have been formed upon his teaching to make it effective upon his child. If a father would have his son live as in the presence of the unseen and eternal, if he would have him live above the world while living in it, if he would have him use the world as not abusing it, if he would have him attain to self-mastery, if he would have him live for the kingdom of God, the parent must himself exemplify these virtues. In a word, let both father and mother manifest the power of the new life hid with Christ in God in the unrestrained and familiar intercourse of family life; let this object lesson be reinforced by judicious instruction and admonition, then, in that case, the ancient proverb will be verified, "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when lie is old, he will not depart from it" (Prov. 22:6). Children are continually, though unconsciously to themselves, taking snapshots of the characters of their elders, and will

carry their spiritual photographs as unfading impressions on their souls. - Robbins,The Ethics of the Christian Life, p. 336.] The duties of children to their parents are to be found in the reciprocation of the parental duties, and may be summed up under two general heads, (1) Obedience, and (2) Reverence. As to obedience, the scriptural injunction is. Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right (Eph. 6:1); and Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well pleasing unto the Lord (Col. 3:20). It is the child's duty to yield cheerfully to the instruction and direction which the superior wisdom of the parents may dictate. Parents are God's constituted officers to administer the government of their respective families; and to obey them in the exercise of their legitimate authority is to obey God. Like other rulers, parents may abuse their power, but in such a case the child is to obey only "in the Lord." As to reverence, this includes the deference and respect due all superiors, and especially parents. So important is this, that it is enforced by one of the Commandments of the Decalogue:Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee(Exod. 20:12). St. Paul callsthis the first commandment with promise(Eph. 6:2). The word honor as here used, includes affection and obedience; and we may say also gratitude. It seeks, therefore, to requite in every way, the parental love so lavishly bestowed, and to provide generously for the parents when age with its helplessness and infirmity, overtakes them. Herein especially is the spirit of Christianity manifested

[Children are committed to the care of their parents in a state of helpless dependence, from whom they must receive every care, and be nurtured by the most tender hand, to keep alive the feeble vital spark with which their existence is first kindled, until the fires of life shall burn stronger. Each of the parents has an appropriate work to perform, but the mother's gentle hand and heart of love are put in immediate requisition, and have most important purposes to answer. An immortal being is in her arms and on her bosom; a soul with boundless faculties of thought and feelings hangs upon her lips of tenderness, and drinks intelligence from her kindling eye. Faculties capable of angelic intelligence, and heavenly virtue are slumbering in her arms and reposing on her breast. She must first call them into exercise, and give them impulses which they will never cease to feel. By the kindness of her heart, by the delicacy of her feelings and sentiments, and by her nice discrimination and accurate judgment, she is well fitted for her task. She plies her labors with unwearied assiduity; As months roll away, her immortal charge improves under her care, till the laughing lips and kindling eye respond to her own deep sympathies, and love and happiness fill the soul and expand its powers. This tender and watchful care has to be continued for years, but it is soon merged in other and sterner duties, as the infant becomes a prattling child, and as the child becomes a youth. This prepares the way for a second branch of duty. It is the duty of parents to govern their children. This is a work of great importance, and often of great difficulty. It is a work in which both parents must take a part, and co-operate to sustain each other's influence and authority. After the mother's tuition has been in progress for some time, the child comes under the sterner authority and severer influence of the father. The mother's tenderness and exquisite sensibility are necessary in the earlier stages of improvement; but, at a later period, the more vigorous modes of paternal discipline are equally requisite to a proper formation of character. The mother operates earliest, and continues her kind and sympathizing attentions to the last. The Father commences his appropriate influences after a certain degree of progress has been attained, and contributes to give manliness and energy to the character. - LEE,Elements of Theology, pp.391, 392 The true conception of the design of parental authority sets in their true light the loose views of some of the most popular of the would-be moral and religious teachers of

the present day. The most certain way to undermine all morality, to corrupt the family, the society, the state, and the race, and to bring in the reign of vice and crime and godlessness, is to lower the public estimate of the sacred character of parental authority, by holding up to ridicule the strictness of the parental training to which these very teachers owe everything they are that is not base and contemptible, and which was moreover in accordance with God's Word. - Gregory,Christian Ethics, p. 214.]

Duties of Masters and Servants.The terms master and servant in the broad sense apply to the various forms of voluntary labor performed for a consideration. In the Old Testament, hired servants were regarded as a part of the household; and in the time when St. Paul wrote slavery existed in the Roman empire. This accounts for his reference to the bond and the free. The terms employer and employee as used in modern times express the same scriptural idea. Due to the various forms of specialized labor, and the growth of large capitalistic corporations, this relation has in modern times become exceedingly complex and difficult. For our purpose, however, it is sufficient to mention only the underlying principles given us in the Scriptures; which if properly observed would doubtless do much toward solving some of the more acute problems of the present time. To the servants or employees, St. Paul gives the following instructions:Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of you? heart, as unto Christ; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart: with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free(Eph. 6:5-8). Christianity thus considers even the most humble Service as worthy 0# reward, if it be performed cheerfully and faithfully as unto the Lord. Concerning masters or employers, he says,And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him(Eph. 6:9). Here the duty of exercising control in the spirit of brotherly kindness is made imperative. The Christian spirit forbids harshness or cruelty, whether brutal or refined, all tyrannical measures or unjust demands, all threatening or reprisals. On the contrary, it demands that employees be given their just rights and prerogatives, proper and wholesome environment for working conditions, and fair wages proportioned to the skill of the laborer and the cost of living (II) THE STATE; OR CIVIL GOVERNMENT The chief design of the state is to furnish man a wider sphere of social activity. Since man's moral nature is in disorder, his unregulated development must of necessity lead to unjust interference with the rights of other men. Civil government, therefore, is intended to protect its citizens from all violence, and to secure to each individual the peaceable enjoyment of all his rights, to the best of its ability. The state must in the very nature of the case, exercise authority in regulating public conduct; and this it does by laws based upon the immutable law of right. Penalty must be used in the enforcement of the law if need be; guilt must be made dangerous, and crime must become serious even to the criminal. It is important to note, however, that the sovereignty of civil authority lies in the state itself, and not in any king or ruler whatever. This is established by the fact that the state exists before all rulers, and by the additional fact, that rulers are at the most, but its instruments. With the development of civilization, civil government has become complex and embraces the fields of political science, economics, constitutional and industrial history, law, education and sociology in all its ramifications. It is sufficient for our purpose, therefore, as in the preceding section, to briefly state the underlying Christian principles concerning civil government. We mention the following: (1) Prayer for rulers. I

exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty (I Tim. 2:1). (2) Obedience to those in authority.Put them in mind to be subject to principalities, and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men(Titus 3:1, 2). (3) Government is ordained of God. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation(Rom. 13:1, 2). (4) Rulers must enforce the penalties of the law.For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil(Rom. 13:3, 4). (5) Christians must be subject to government for conscience' sake. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake(Rom. 13:5). (6) Government must be supported.For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour(Rom. 13:6, 7). St. Paul, therefore, applies the principle of love to the affairs of state in the same manner that he does to those of domestic and social life. He sums up the whole matter in these words,Owe noman any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law (Rom. 13:8) The relation of divine authority to human government is a question of vital importance,especially in times like the present, when the very foundations of human government are being restudied and reappraised. Two statements are found in theological science which may well be regarded as classical. The first is that of Dr. Charles Hodge (1797-1878) entitled, Obedience Due to Civil Magistrates; the second is that of Dr. William Burton Pope (1822-1903)entitled Political Ethics.Both of these are given in the appended notes - the first in greatly abbreviated form. They are worthy of careful study as representing the scriptural teaching on this important subject [OBEDIENCE DUE TO CIVIL MAGISTRATES The whole theory of civil government and the duty of citizens to their rulers, are comprehensively stated by the apostle in Romans 13:1-5. It is there taught: (1) That all authority is of God. 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, 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

Second, 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

Third, 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 and 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

Fourth, 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 praetorian guard chose to depose one emperor and install another

Fifth, 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 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 6f 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 The magistrate cannot enter our families and assume parental authority, or our churches and teach as a minister. Out of his legitimate sphere a magistrate ceases to be a magistrate. A second limitation is no less plain. No human authority can ake it obligatory on a man to disobey God. If all power is from God, it cannot be legitimate when used against God. The apostles when forbidden to preach the gospel, refused to obey. When the three Hebrew children 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 not only be 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

Sixth, 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, Meshach, 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 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. - HODGE, Systematic Theology, III, pp. 357-360 POLITICAL ETHICS

Divine revelation has from the beginning been bound up with government, and the social and political affairs of the world. Its history shows the sanctification of every form of developing rule among men; from the primitive household and family, its simplest and typical form, to the most violent form of imperial despotism. We have now to do with the final teaching of the New Testament, about which there is little room for doubt. Its general principles are very plain, both as to the rulers and as to the ruled

I. The institution of government is divine: not founded on any compact or agreement among men, as the modern figment is. The more carefully we examine the basis of tribal and national distinctions among men - in other words what goes to constitute a distinct peopl the more clearly shall we perceive that it is conditioned by a certain relation to God whose worship was the original bond of unity to every race, and whose representative the earthiy ruler was. Government was made for man and man was also made for it. The form of that government is not prescribed rigidly and definitely: certainly not in the Christian legislation. Every form of valid authority is sanctified in the Old Testament. The New Testament introduces a universal monarchy in the spiritual economy of things: and only in a very subordinate way deals with the kingdoms of this world. But the foundations of civil and political society for earth were laid in heaven: "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). Human magistrates represent the Supreme Judge: being in the state His deputies. "He is the minister of God to thee for good" (Rom. 13:4); for the protection and peace of the law-abiding, He is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath; for the administration of divine justice on transgressors. These principles are indisputable. The same term is used concerning the representation of ecclesiastical authority in the church and in the world: they are both diavkonoi and leitourgoiv, or ministers

II. Obedience to magistrates and the government of the land is made part of the Christian law: expressly included in His ethics by our Lord on the broad ground of the duty to render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, though the Caesar of that day held the land in bondage. St. Paul recognized in his own person, and commands all men to recognize, what was at best a despotic and cruel authority

1. The duty of submission is, first, in a certain sense, passive. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation (Rom. 13:2). This forbids, negatively, personal insurrection and resistance. How far submission is to be carried, at what point resistance is permitted - not to the individual as such, but to a people - is a question which our present ethics do not contemplate.Inter arma leges silent. The obligation comes in, however, before the arms are taken up. No individual Christian may resist without betraying his trust, and losing the meekness of his wisdom. When the question is concerning the law of God (Dan. 6:5), the servant of Jehovah must resist, but not until submission has had its

perfect work

2. Positively, obedience to the government requires that diligence be given to uphold the honor of the law at all points, and that for conscience' sake (Rom. 13:5-7). Much emphasis is laid both by our Lord and by His apostles on paying tribute to whom tribute is due: a principle which involves very important issues. "For this cause pay ye tribute also." Lot it be observed that St. Paul's ethics of submission to government follow andare, as it were, incorporated with his sublimest and most comprehensive doctrine of Christian morality

3. The Bible, from beginning to end, inculcates and honors patriotism. It has been sometimes said that neither the sentiment of love to country nor that of personal friendship finds a place in Christian ethics. It is true that the supreme devotion to a kingdom which is not of this world (John 18:36) everywhere has the pre-eminence; and that the individual sympathies of friendship are merged in brotherly love. But both these sentiments are really inculcated and encouraged. There is no profane history that surpasses or equals its annals in examples of both, and Christianity must have the benefits of the old religion of which it is in a certain sense a continuation. - POPE,Compendium of Christian Theology, III, pp.251-253.]

30. Chapter 31 - THE CHURCH: ITS ORGANIZATION AND MINISTRY

Chapter 31 - THE CHURCH: ITS ORGANIZATION AND MINISTRY The work of the Holy Spirit necessarily demands an objective economy. This new economy is the Church, or the mystical body of Christ. It represents a new order of spiritual life on earth, was created by the advent of Christ, and is preserved by the perpetual indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The wordchurchas found in the New Testament, is from the Greek wordecclesia(ekklhsia), and in its simplest connotation, means an assembly or body of called out ones. The English word church comes from another Greek term, that ofkuriakos(kuriakov") or the Lord's house. The church, therefore, may be regarded as at once the sphere of the Spirit's operations, and the organ of Christ's administration of redemption. As a corporate body, it was founded by our Lord Jesus Christ, and is invested with certain notes and attributes which are representative of His agency among men. It is (1) theecclesia, or assembly of called out ones, and is made up of the divinely adopted sons of God. It is not, therefore, merely a human organization. Christ is its Head. From Him it receives its life through the indwelling Spirit, and as such, discharges a twofold function - as an institute of worship, and as a depository of the faith. It is (2) theBody of Christ, as constituting a mystical extension of the nature of Christ, and consequently is composed of those who have been made partakers of that nature. The relation between Christ and the Church is organic. As such, it embodies and affords on earth, the conditions under which, and by means of which; the Holy Spirit supernaturally extends to men, the redemptive work of Christ. In it and from it, Christ communicates to the membership of this body, the quickening and sanctifying offices of the Holy Spirit, for the extension of His work among men THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH The Christian Church is linked historically with the Jewish - sometimes known as the "church in the wilderness" (Acts 7:38). When our Lord at the opening of His ministry, proclaimed that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, He by this means, related His own work to the Jewish theocracy as to its inner spirit, though not as to its outward form. In order to the establishment of the church, there was of necessity a gradual preparation for it, previous to, and during the earthly ministry of our Lord. This preparation is based upon the presupposition of a fundamental human society, or what Dr. Gerhart calls "the law of social integration," which he says, "demands and begets religious organization, an organization corresponding to the plane on which the religious life moves, whether lower or higher. Christianity recognizes and conserves every original law. Hence Christian life becomes organized life; Christian activity becomes organized activity; and, we may add, if human nature were not an organism, if it did not by virtue of the social principle spontaneously develop into some form of social organization, Christian life would not develop in the form of the 'kingdom of heaven'" (GERHART, Institutes of the Christian Religion,II, p. 455). In the development of this organization, we may note three distinct stages: (1) The Positive Preparation in the Old Testament; (2) The Intermediate Community during the earthly life of Christ; and (3) The Immediate Formation of the Church at Pentecost

[Dr. Dorner includes the following subjects in his discussion of the church: (1) the genesis of the church, through the new birth of the Spirit, or Regeneration; (2) the growth and persistence of the

church through the continuous operation of the Spirit in the means of grace, or Ecclesiology proper, as others call it; (3) the completion of the church, or Eschatology.] The Positive Preparation in the Old Testament. The church of the Old Testament was the first representative of the ecclesia or called out ones. The Hebrew word kahal which is derived from the verb meaning to call together, signifies an assembly, or a congregation convened for any purpose, but especially for religious worship. The wordkahalis translated ecclesia seventy times in the Septuagint. While presupposing the natural law of social integration, the Old Testament church must nevertheless be distinguished (1) from all natural human organizations, such as the family and the State; and (2) from all pagan religions, by the fact that it was built upon the protevangelium or primeval promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. This promise took definite form in the Abrahamic covenant. The law which was added four hundred and thirty years after the confirmation of the covenant, St. Paul regarded as a pedagogic institution - a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ (Gal. 3:16, 17, 24, 25). The Old Testament church was, therefore, a community of the Spirit; and while manifesting itself through natural and social laws, was nevertheless a supernatural organization. As such, it made a direct and positive contribution to the Christian Church, first, in that it cultivated and matured the religion which should finally issue in the kingdom of God; secondly, and chiefly, because it was the community that gave Christ to the world. Who are the Israelites, inquires St. Paul in a rhetorical question which he answers by saying, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever (Rom. 9:4,5) The Intermediate Community.The second step in preparation for the church, was the formation of the "little flock" by our Lord himself. This must be regarded as an intermediate community, in that it stood midway between the Mosaic economy and Pentecost. We may distinguish two stages in its formation, as recorded in the Gospels. (1) The first comprised the group of disciples which clustered about John the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus. In John, the old economy drew to a close. Hence the words, He must increase, but I must decrease (John 3:30) The one who said of himself, I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, must give place to Him of whom it was said, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire (Matt. 3:11). (2) The second comprised the group which clustered about Jesus himself, being bound to Him by a common sympathy and devotion. In this latter group, three classes may be mentioned, (a) the Twelve Apostles; (b) the Seventy; and (c) an indefinite number of devout Jews - about five hundred. These were animated by a common belief that Jesus was the Christ, and were fused into an informal organization by their love for the Master and their faith in His words. Thus they were spiritually qualified to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, and became thereby, the true nucleus of the Christian Church. During this period of earthly instruction, two things are noticeable in the development of the intermediate community. (1) A new meaning is injected into the teaching concerning the kingdom. It was revealed to the disciples, that the kingdom of God was to be Messiah's kingdom also, but only in the sense of the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom on earth must await His Second Coming. It was in this sense that Jesus interpreted the kingdom when He said, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation (Luke 17:20); the kingdom of God is within you (Luke 17:21); and My kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36). He taught, however, that there was to be in the consummation of all things, a kingdom of both heaven and earth, and therefore taught His disciples to pray specifically, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven (Matt.

6:10). (2) To the institution embodying the kingdom in this limited sense, our Lord gave the new name "My church" (Matt. 16:18). This statement, introduced as it is in the midst of St. Matthew's collection of parables on the kingdom, is significant, not only as indicating the name which should apply to it during the present age, but as indicating also, the relation which the church should bear to the kingdom. Twice only, does Jesus use the term church, in speaking of it as "founded upon this rock," which seems to be a reference to the "house of prayer for all nations" (Matt. 16:18; cf. Mark ii 17); and as a visible assembly of people, gathered in one place for the administration of its laws (Matt. 18:17). Here is a reference to both the visible and invisible church. In the last discourses, including the high priestly prayer, Jesus gives us further insight into His teachings concerning the church. This is especially true concerning the provision made for the sacraments, one as an initiatory rite, and the other as a memorial of perpetuity. In the high priestly prayer, the church was formally dedicated to God, in what Dr. Pope significantly calls "the first prayer in His own house." Always, even in this prayer, Jesus regards the church as yet to come. He laid the foundations Himself, and left a body of instruction, but this must await the Day of Pentecost, and the coming of the Comforter, before it could be disclosed in the fullness of its meaning The Formation of the Church at Pentecost.Pentecost was the birthday of the Christian Church. The prepared disciples in obedience to the command of their Lord, were assembled with one accord in Jerusalem, when suddenly the Holy Spirit fell upon them, making the intermediate community, in the truest sense of that term, "the new temple of the Triune God." As under the older economy, Pentecost was marked by the presentation of the fruits of the harvest, so in the new dispensation it marks the ushering in of the fullness of the Spirit. Furthermore, though not by divine enactment, Pentecost celebrated the giving of the law at Sinai; so also, it now represents the fullness of the New Covenant, in which the law of God is written upon the . heart by the Spirit. Pentecost placed the Christian community under the jurisdiction of the Holy Spirit, who represents the invisible Head of a body now visible THE SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH The Church is the creation of the Holy Spirit. Referring again to our discussion of the office of the Holy Spirit in relation to the church (Chapter XXVI), we indicated there, that the Holy Spirit administering the life of Christ is said to make us members of His spiritual body; and that ministering in His own proper personality as the Third Person of the Trinity, He is said to dwell in the holy temple thus constructed. The church, therefore, is not merely an independent creation of the spirit, but an enlargement of the incarnate life of Christ. The two most prominent symbols of the church then, are those of the body and the temple. The first represents the active side, or the church as an institute of evangelism; the second represents the passive side, or the church as an institute of worship The Church as the Body of Christ.Under this aspect of the church, there are three leading features to be considered - its unity, its growth and the sources of its ascendency. (1) The unity here mentioned is "the unity of the Spirit." It is something more than merely natural ties, whether of family, nation or race. No tie of outward relationship is capable of expressing this inward unity of the members of the church, or their entire oneness of life, and hence our Lord made His own Oneness with the Father an illustration of it. He prayed that theyall may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us(John 17:21). Thus our Lord found no union short of that in the divine life, by which to express His thought. They were to be one through the Spirit. The Holy Spirit being the bond of union in the Godhead, becomes likewise, the source of union in the Church, uniting the members to one another, to their exalted Head, and to Himself. St. Paul uses three symbols of unity in a gradually deepening significance, to express this spiritual

relationship. (a) Filial unity, or that of a common parentage or origin. Christ is the first born among many brethren - the Only Begotten being infinite, those made in His likeness, finite. (b) Conjugal unity as expressed by the marriage relationship, because of its closeness of union, its fruitfulness, its indissoluble character, and its complete interchange of goods. (c) Organic unity, or that of the head and the body, both of which are permeated by a common life. But St. Paul's most perfect illustration is like that of his Master, patterned after the Trinity. He gives us a trinity of trinities - one body, one Spirit, one hope; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. (Eph. 4:4-8.) In all as a life-giving and sanctifying Spirit; through all as a charismatic or gift-bestowing Spirit; above all, as an anointing or empowering Spirit. (2) Growth is the second factor of this organism. This growth is through the truth as ministered by the Spirit. Hence St. Paul says, But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is 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 (Eph. 4:15, 16). Here it is indicated that the growth of the individual spiritually, is to be interpreted, not by an increasing independency of action, but by a deeper and more joyful co-operation with other members of the body. And it is to be further noted that the growth of the body is through the individual contributions of its members. (3) The elements of ascendency are likewise given us by the same apostle. He tells us that the great gift of the ascended Christ to the Church is that of the ministry in its various types apostles and prophets as the foundational ministry; evangelists, pastors and teachers as the proclaiming or instructional ministry. The purpose of these officers he further states, is the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; and the goal of attainment is, Till we 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. 4:12, 13). This phase of the spiritual nature of the Church will be the foundation for further treatment, as embracing (I) The Organization of the Church; and (II) The Church and Its Ministry

[Dr. Hutchings points out the following interesting points of cornparison between the mystery of the incarnation and the mystery of Pentecost

1. In each of these there is a personal coming, (a) in Nazareth, Mary in a hidden life is prepared for the marvel that was to be wrought in her; (b) in Jerusalem, the disciples with prayer and supplication, in secret withdrawal await the promised Comforter

2. In Nazareth, the eternal Word descends from the bosom of the Father, to take into union with Himself, our nature in order to redeem it. In Jerusalem, the Third Person of the Trinity descends to dwell in our nature in order to sanctify it. As the creation of the body of Jesus was by the Holy Spirit, so He creates the Church as the visible organism of His Presence. (It behoveth the Holy Ghost to come among us in a bodily manner, as the Son had conversed with us in a body. - Gregory Nazianzen.)

3. In both unions, the same love is the moving cause; but in the second, love takes on a new degree of prominence and intensity. It is the second divine gift, and that after the first had been abused. It is the gift now, not of personal wisdom, but of personal love; and it is the gift which makes love and not fear, the ruling motive of obedience

4. In both mysteries, the fellowship with created life is so close that divine actions are imputed to man, and human properties ascribed to God; in both, heaven vouchsafes a divine Person, and earth contributes a vessel for His presence. (Cf. Hutchings,Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, p. 127.)] The Church as the Temple of the Holy Spirit.The second aspect of the spiritual church is represented by the symbol of a temple. While St. Paul's "great metaphor" is that of the body, he refers to the Church also as a temple - In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph. 2:21, 22). As referring to individuals, he uses both figures in a single chapter: Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ (I Cor. 6:15); and Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost (I Cor. 6:19). St. Peter, however, uses this figure in a more elaborate manner. He says, Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ (I Peter 2:5). The apostles understood clearly that the Lord Jesus Christ was Himself the Head of the Church, and not the Spirit. In instructing them concerning the corning of the Comforter, He had reserved His own dignity as One who should never be absent from them. He had said, I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you (John 14:18). Hence they saw by faith, that the great High Priest was interceding within the veil for them, and that the Spirit was present by no direct communication, but only through the mediatorship of Christ. As He was the temple of the Spirit, who dwelled in Him without measure, so the Church as His body is the temple of the Spirit communicated to it through its living Head. And further, as Christ was the image of the invisible God, so the church is to be the image of the invisible Christ; and when it is glorified, its members shall be like Him, for they shall see Him as He is This aspect of the Church will be given further consideration as an "Institute of Worship" and will include in its scope, (1) The Worship of the Church; (2) The Means of Grace; and (3) The Sacraments NOTES AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE CHURCH

Having considered the spiritual nature of the Church in its active aspect asthe Body of Christ, or the organ of His manifestation in the world; and in its passive aspect asthe Temple of the Holy Spirit, or sphere of .worship, we must now give attention to those attributes which combine both in their unity. By the term "attributes" we mean those characteristics of the Church which are set forth in the Scriptures; while the "Notes" are those attributes transformed into tests by which the true Church is supposed to be known. In the earlier creeds, such as the Apostles' and Nicene, four of these notes are mentioned - one, holy, catholic and apostolic. Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621), in an effort to defend the Roman Church, set up fifteen notes, and excluded every Christian society from all claim to the character of a church, which lacked any one of these as follows: "Catholicity, antiquity, duration, amplitude, episcopal succession, apostolic agreement, unity, sanctity of doctrine, efficacy of doctrine, holiness of life, miracles, prophecy, admission of adversaries, unhappy end of enemies, and temporal felicity." Over against these have been set up other notes and attributes which express more truly the Protestant idea of the Church. Dr. Pope mentions seven, and treats them in contrast with their opposites, as follows: (1) One and manifold; (2) sanctity and imperfection; (3) visible and invisible; (4) catholic and local; (5) apostolic and confessional; (6) indefectible and mutable; and (7) militant and triumphant. Dr. Summers is more controversial in his approach. He follows in general, the outline of Bellarmine, but opposes his positions, seeking to set forth the Protestant view on these important points. Our discussion must be brief, and we shall present only the four notes of the creeds, with their opposites, including in

these some of the more important subdivisions

1. Unity and Diversity. Unity is properly a note of the Church. There is one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. But this unity is one of manifoldness. The Scriptures nowhere speak of an outward or visible unity. There is no intimation of uniformity. The Scriptures never speak of the church of a province, but always of the churches. It is true that the churches were under a common bond of joint superintendency by the apostles, but there is even then, no evidence of a primacy among them. The unity is that of the Spirit; and the diversity includes anything that is not out of harmony with that spiritual unity

2. Holiness and Imperfection. The term hagia (agia) or sancta is applied both to the body of Christ and to the members which compose that body. In either instance, it signifies to be set apart from the world and devoted to God. In the case of the individual person, there must of necessity be a preliminary work of spiritual cleansing in order to this full devotement. The Organization itself is regarded as holy on account of the purpose and end for which it exists. This implies an absolute and a relative holiness. The former applies to the membership of the Church having entered into the fullness of the new covenant privileges, and therefore holy through the blood of Christ. The latter applies to the organization as such, which though holy in purpose and end, may yet include those who have not individually been made holy. This is evident from the apostolic epistles, which though addressed to "saints" contain much in rebuke of that which is unholy. The same is true of our Lord’s own epistles to the churches, which He holds in His hands, and yet finds much which needs amendment

3. Catholic and Local. The word catholic is not found in the earlier creeds. In the symbols of Jerome, Tertullian and other western creeds, the statement is simply the "holy church." It appears first in the early creeds of the east, especially those of Jerusalem and of Alexandria, but soon came to be incorporated in the Latin creeds also. The word was added to the Apostles’ Creed about the close of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. The idea of catholicity at first included merely the universality of the Church in design and destiny, and was used in opposition to the Jewish conception of the church as local and national. But the term was never used in the sense of excluding the local churches, and hence we read of the church in Jerusalem, the churches of Galatia, and the seven churches of Asia (Cf. Acts 2:47; Gal. 1:2; Rev. 1:4). The varying emphasis upon these two notes has given rise to widely different conceptions of church organization. About the middle of the second century, the term catholic began to he used in a sense more ecclesiastical than scriptural, as referring to the body of the Church in opposition to the numerous smaller sects which arose at that time. The latter came to be known as schismatics and heretics, and hence were not regarded as a part of the catholic body. When the eastern and western churches divided, Rome assumed the name of catholic, and regarded all dissentients from the see of St. Peter, even the eastern church itself, as being outside the one only catholic church. The eastern church did not assume the use of the termcatholic, preferring to be known asorthodoxandapostolic

[Bishop Pearson gives this definition of catholicity. "This catholicism of the Church consisteth generally In universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kinds of obedience as curing all diseases, and planting all graces in the

souls of men." - Pearson, On the Creed

"The term schism (scivsma) means division viewed as to the corporate body, the term heresy (aiJvresi") makes prominent the private judgment which leads to it. But the history of Christianity shows that the words must be applied with discrimination: they have been more abused than almost any others." - Pope, Higher Catechism, p. 328.]

Included in the note of catholicity, we may mention also the church asvisibleandinvisible. By the invisible Church, is meant the mystical body of Christ as animated by His spirit. This mystical fellowship is therefore, in its deepest and most profound character, a spiritual and unseen reality. The term catholic may be applied to either the invisible or the visible church. As applying to the former, it is simply the universal b6dy of believers. Thus in the creed we have a statement concerning the general Church as follows: "The Church of God is composed of all spiritually regenerate persons, whose names are written in heaven" (Creed, Part II, Art. I). However, the invisible Church is frequently regarded as including, not only those now living, but those of every age - past, present and future. As applying to the latter, it includes within the visible church, all those particular constituencies which make up the total body of professed believers in Jesus Christ. The particular errors which attach to these notes are due to the overemphasis upon one to the minimizing or exclusion of the other. Roman Catholicism while believing technically in an invisible Church, so exalts the visible aspect as to suppress almost entirely, its invisible character. Hence it makes exclusiveness a note of the visible instead of the invisible church, and, therefore, holds that there can be no salvation outside of it. The opposite error is found in those smaller bodies which emphasize the invisible church, to the minimizing or exclusion of all external organization. Nothing is clearer in the Scriptures, however, than its teachings concerning external organization, and this in itself is a sufficient refutation of this error. Another question in this connection has been the source of much controversy. "What constitutes a visible church?" The position of Protestantism as found in the various creeds is essentially this, "The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that are of necessity requisite to the same" (Wesley's revision of Anglican Creed) . "The churches severally," we say, "are composed of such regenerate persons as by providential permission, and by the leadings of the Holy Spirit, become associated together for holy fellowship and ministries" (Creed, Part II, Art. 11)

[To obtain an accurate conception of the Christian Church, it is necessary that we distinguish properly between the ideal and the reality, between the inner nature and the external manifested form of the subject - in a word, between church and congregation. Conceived as a moral religious society, the Church embraces, without exception, all who are called by the name of Christ; viewed as a spiritual body, the congregation is the union of those who by a living faith are personally united to Christ, whether they belong to the Church militant on earth, or to the Church triumphant in heaven. The distinction between the visible and invisible Church is therefore correct in principle, and must be firmly held, as a matter of deep importance. where it is arbitrarily drawn out into irreconcilable antithesis, sectarianism at once appears, which divides and weakens the Church, without being able to supply its place for a continuance. - Van Oosterzee,Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 702.]

Another aspect of catholicity is that which regards the church asmilitantandtriumphant. The church militant is the one body waging war with principalities and powers; and the church triumphant is the one body of believers, who having passed through death are now in Paradise with Christ, awaiting that more perfect state which the church shall enter at the end of the age. The simple, spiritual relation existing between the church militant and triumphant, which proved a source of courage and inspiration to the early martyrs, was soon corrupted. From the time of Origin, there was a tendency to interpose an intermediate state between the two, known as purgatory, which was neither wholly militant nor yet triumphant. With the widening of this gap, there developed a false position as to the offices of prayer - intercession for the dead on the part of those still living; intercession on the part of the saints in heaven for both those on earth, and those believed to be still in purgatory. This teaching is not only unscriptural, but anti-scriptural

[The marks of a true church according to the Methodist Article (XIII) as given above is a revision of the Anglican Creed (Article XIX). Mr. Wesley adopted the first part of the article but rejected the second paragraph. The Anglican article is supposed to be derived from Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. Both of these articles are given below

ARTICLE XIX of the Anglican Creed. The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinances, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith

Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. "They likewise teach there will always be one holy Church. The Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church nothing more is required than agreement concerning the doctrines of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions - that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men - should be everywhere observed. As Paul says, ’One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in you all.’]

4. Apostolic and Confessional. The church is apostolic in the sense that itis built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone(Eph. 2:20). It is confessional in that it requires for membership, a confession of faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord.For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation(Rom. 10:10). The errors which gradually arose m the church concerning these notes are marked, (1) by the theory which merged the apostolic authority of the Twelve into that of St. Peter; and (2) by the development of the so called apostolic succession which resulted in the papacy. There are other churches, however, apart from Rome, which hold to an apostolic succession and profess to trace their orders through episcopal hands to the apostles. At the opposite extreme is the error, which holds that the church has had the apostolate restored to it, with the miraculous gifts and endowments which pertained to the original apostles. Both St. John and St. Paul seem to indicate, however, that the apostolate would be withdrawn from the church. Protestantism in general, has substituted belief in the Scriptures for living apostolic authority. "Hence we may lay down our dogma" says Dr. Pope, that "the Church is apostolic, as being still ruled by the apostolical authority living in the writings of the apostles, that authority being

the standard of appeal in all the confessions that hold the head" (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 285) THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH The organization of the church, in the strictest sense, belongs to the study of church polity. Here we can give only a brief survey of the several factors which enter into and constitute the church, a visible organization. We shall discuss (1) The Preliminary Forms of Organization; (2) Organization of the Christian Church; (3) Types of Organization; (4) The Churches as Local and Voluntary Organizations; (5) Conditions of Membership, and (6) The Function of the church

Preliminary Forms of Church Organization.The visible forms which the invisible Church has assumed from age to age, have been the consequence largely, of the historical struggles, and the various circumstances under which it has been forced to maintain itself. We may note the following: (1) The Patriarchal Form; and (2) The Theocratic Form

1. The Patriarchal form of the church dates from the beginning of time. Before the fall, it was unsullied and perfect. What the form of organization would have been, had this state continued, we need not inquire. But after the fall, imperfection characterized the church, and will continue to do so, until the consummation of all things, when it shall again be presented faultless before the throne with exceeding joy. In its earliest form, the creed was simple - the protevangelium or redemptive promise being the sole condition of membership. The only official was a priest. Apparently the priesthood was not limited to the head of the family, for both Cain and Abel offered sacrifices. The church was individualistic in the extreme. With the call of Abraham, the individualistic form of organization gave way to that of the family, and the patriarchal form of government in its truest sense began. Abraham was the priest of his own family, and was succeeded in turn by Isaac and Jacob

2. The Theocratic form of government began with Moses, who reorganized the church at Sinai, giving it an elaborate constitution, both civil and ecclesiastical. It was not designed, however, to be a state fulfilling churchly offices, but a church assuming the functions of the state. The religious idea permeated the whole social structure. Theoretically, this must ever be the true ideal for the church - not indeed the identification of church and state, but such a coalescence of the two as shall bring both to their highest efficiency. Such an ideal, however, can never be realized, until He who is Prophet and Priest shall also become King. Then He shall be not only the Lord of the church but the Ruler of the nations - He shall be King of kings, and Lord of lords (Rev. 11:15) Organization of the Christian Church.Nothing is more clearly taught than the fact of an external organization of the church. This is shown from (1) the stated times of meeting (Acts 20:7), and the exhortation to not forsake the assembling of themselves together (Heb. 10:25); (2) a regularly constituted ministry known as bishops (ejpivskopoi), elders or presbyters (presbuvteroi) and deacons (diavkonoi) (Phil. 1:1; Acts 20:17, 28), with standards of eligibility (I Tim. 3:1-13); (3) formal elections (Acts 1:23-26; 6:5, 6); (4) a financial system for the local support 6f the ministry (I Tim. 5:17), and for the more general interests of charity (I Cor. 16:i, 2); (5) disciplinary authority on the part of ministers and churches (I Tim. 5:17; I Peter 5:2; Matt. 18:17, I Cor. 5:4, 5, 13); (6) common customs (I Cor. ii 16) and ordinances (Acts 2:41, 42; I Cor. ii 23-26); (7) qualifications for membership (Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:47); (8) register of widows (I Tim. 5:9); (9) official letters of commendation (Acts 18:27; II Cor. 3:1); and (10) the common work of all the churches (Phil. 2:30)

There are three general views concerning church organization. The first holds that the church is exclusively a spiritual body and, therefore, needs no external organization. This position is illogical and is held by only a few of the minor sects. It should be observed that a simple form of government does not necessarily imply a written creed; it may exist in oral form. Such an organization may exist also without written records, lists of members, or formal choice of officers. After all, these things must be regarded as aids and not essentials. The second theory is at the other extreme, and maintains that the Scriptures give us a formal plan of organization for the church. But even with those who hold this position, there is much controversy as to the form of government prescribed. It is held by both those who advocate the episcopal form of government on the one hand, and pure congregationalism on the other. There is a third and mediating theory, which holds that the New Testament lays down general principles of organization, but prescribes no specific form of church government. This is the position generally taken by the Protestant churches. Mr. Watson adopting the language of Bishop Tomline, says, "As it hath not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to free agents." Dr. Bangs takes the same position. "No specific form of church government," he says, is prescribed in the Scriptures and it is, therefore, left to the discretion of the church to regulate these matters as the exigencies, of time, place and circumstance shall dictate to be most expedient, always avoiding anything that God has prohibited." Dr. Miley holds that "the question of chief importance, is the adaptation of the polity to the attainment of the spiritual end for which the church is constituted. This should always be the determining principle. The principle means that the constitution of a polity is left to the discretion of the church; but it also means that the construction must be made in the light of her mission, and with a view to its very best accomplishment. The discretionary power of the church appears in the light of three facts: (1) the church must have a polity; (2) there is no divinely ordered polity; and (3) consequently it is left to the church and to each church rightfully existing as such, to determine her own polity" (MILEY,Syst. Th., II, pp. 416, 417)

[Mr. Wesley who was always a firm believer in the episcopal form of government, makes this admission. "As to my own judgment, I still believe the episcopal form of church government to be scriptural. and apostolic. I mean well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe."

Dr. Thornwall states the distinguishing features of Presbytorianism as follows: (1) That the church is governed by representative assemblies. (2) Those assemblies constitute two houses, or two elements, the preaching and ruling elder. (3) The parity of eldership, all elders, preaching and ruling, appearing in our church courts with the same credentials, and having the same rights. (4) The unity of the church, as realized in the representative principle. (5) The ministerial and declarative power of the representative Presbyteries, Synods and Assemblies, as against mandatory power. - Thornswall,Writings, IV, p. 234

"Thus a further confirmation is furnished of the view that has been taken: namely, that it was the plan of the sacred writers to lay down clearly the principles on which Christian Churches were to be formed and governed, leaving the mode of application of those principles undetermined and discretionary." - Whately, The Kingdom of Christ,p. 98.]

Types of Church Organization.In general, we may say that there are five leading types of organization, or forms of church government, held by professed Christians. These are concerned primarily, with the rightful authority of the visible church. (1) The Roman Catholic Church holds that the supreme and final authority is with the pope and is, therefore, a papacy. (2) At the other extreme, the Congregational Churches hold that the authority is vested in the separate congregations, and hence are known as independents. Between these extremes are the mediating positions. (3) The Episcopalians hold that the authority is vested in a superior order of the ministry; (4) The Presbyterians hold that it rests with the ministry and laity jointly; and (5) the Methodists hold that it is vested mainly in the elders of the church. These types may be reduced to three - the Episcopal, in which the authority is vested in the ministry ; the Congregational in which it is vested in the congregation ; and the Presbyterian, in which it is vested in both ministry and laity. "It is our opinion," says Bishop Weaver, "that the form of government in the New Testament was not exclusively Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational, but a combination of certain elements of all...From a careful review of the whole question, we conclude that it is nearest in harmony with the practice and writings of the apostles to say that the authority in the visible church is vested in the ministry and laity taken together." Emphasis upon the extremes mentioned above, has given rise to sharply divergent views of the nature of Christianity itself. (1) According to the one, the Church is constituted by a divinely commissioned clerical order, who through apostolical succession, is alone authorized to transmit the blessings of the Christian religion through the sacraments. According to this view, the church depends wholly upon the ministry, and where there is no apostolic ministry, there is no church. (2) According to the other view, the church is constituted by the acceptance, on the part of individuals, of Christ as Saviour and Lord. These individuals through voluntary association, form the churches, which in turn appoint their own ''ministers'' or ''servants,'' for the more effective discharge of its functions. In this view, the ministry depends upon the church. Both views are equally unscriptural The Churches as Local and Voluntary Organizations.We have seen that there are two widely different views of church organization - views so extreme as to affect even the concept of Christianity itself. These are (1) the papacy which regards the church as the one and entire visible organization throughout the world, and as such, ruled by one visible head the pope. According to this theory, the local bodies are not churches in truest sense of the word, but only parts of the one church. (2) At the other extreme is congregationalism, or independency, which holds strictly to the autonomy of the local church, and denies the title to any superimposed organizations. According to this view, the local body only is the church; and the universal church is merely a general term to express the totality of the churches, each perfect in itself and entirely independent

[The question of philosophical theory enters largely into the matter of organization, whether of church or state. Philosophy deals with such questions as the absolute and the individual, the general and the particular, unity and plurality. As applied to the State, we have absolute monarchy and pure democracy, and between these extremes, all shades and degrees of political organization. As applied to the church, we have the extremes of episcopacy and congregationalism, or more properly, the papacy and independency. Church organization always tends toward one of these extremes, but the church that insists upon the one to the exclusion of the other has at most only a half truth. Provision must be made for the freedom of the individual, but this can be done only by providing for a proper relation to others

It is generally conceded to be impractical to aim at oneness in the visible church save in the fundamentals of faith, worship and discipline. It must be obvious to every dispassionate mind that there never has been since the times of the apostles any other unity than that which God alone can discern The Congregational theory which admits only of voluntary aggregation of churches, and neither has nor desires any guaranty for more than that, goes to an extreme but in a right direction - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p.273

Dr. A. A. Hodge has this interesting statement concerning the importance of variety in the church. "I do believe that God's purpose, on the contrary, has been to differentiate His church without end. You know that the very highest form of beauty of which you can conceive, the very highest form of order, is multiplicity in unity and unity in multiplicity..Now what has God been doing? He has broken humanity up into infinite varieties.. . . through all time . . . . simply to build up variety, which constitutes beauty in unity, to build up the rich, inexhaustible variety, which constitutes the beauty in unity of this great, infinite church of the first-born..We do desire comprehensively to work together toward unity, but mongrelism is not the way to get it. It is not by the uniting of types, but by the unity of the Spirit; it is not by the working from without, but from within outward." - A. A. HODGE,Popular Lectures,pp. 212ff

Mr. Wesley says, "Originally every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others." Dr. Adam Clarke takes the same position. "In the proper use of this word," he says, "there can be no such thing as the church exclusively; there may be a church, or the churches." So also Mr. Watson says, "Through the greater part of the second century the Christian churches were independent of each other."

"We are agreed on the necessity of a superintendency, which shall foster and care for churches already established, and whose duty it shall be to organize and encourage the organizing of churches everywhere." "We are agreed that authority given to superintendents shall not interfere with the independent action of a fully organized church, each church enjoying the right of selecting its own pastor, subject to such approval as the General Assembly shall find wise to institute; the election of delegates to the various assemblies; the management of their own finances; and of all other things pertaining to their local life and work." - Basis of Union,Manual, p. 18.] The apostolic churches were voluntary associations. Those who joined themselves to them, did so freely and of their own accord. In this is to be found the outward expression of that inner life and freedom which characterizes the Church of Christ. The apostles made no provision for any visible head of the one supposedly visible church. There appears to have been no primate even in the apostolic college, although St. James presided over the Jerusalem council. On the contrary, the apostles provided for the government of the churches which they founded, in a totally different manner, that is, by raising up within the churches themselves, those whom they ordained as ministers. The only unity of which the apostles speak is the unity of the whole church in Christ its invisible Head. This unity is that of faith and fervent charity through the indwelling Spirit. Furthermore, the best ecclesiastical historians .are agreed that during the greater part of the second century, the churches were independent bodies, and only toward the close of this century were the larger associations formed. But this independency of the early Christian churches must not be regarded as identical with that of the churches which in modern times are called independent. It is evident from the Scriptures that the churches were founded by the apostles and evangelists, who during their lifetime, exercised control over them. This proves that the first churches were not marked by a complete

independency. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus make it clear, also, that St. Paul committed to others, the authority to ordain elders in the churches, and to exercise a general supervision over their affairs. From this it appears that the type of organization established by the apostles, was a form of connectionalism, in which the local churches retained largely, the control of their own affairs, but were subject nevertheless in a general manner to a common government. This alone, seems to conform to the scripture teachings and historical facts concerning the organization of the early churches

[It may be allowed that some of the smaller and more insulated churches might, after the death of the apostles and evangelists, have retained this form for some considerable time; but the large churches in the chief cities, and those planted in populous neighborhoods, had many presbyters, and as the members multiplied they had several separate assemblies or congregations, yet all under the same common government. And when churches were raised up in the neighborhood of cities, the appointment of "chorepiscopi" or country bishops, and of visiting presbyters, both acting under the' presbytery of the city, with its bishop at its head, is sufficiently in proof that the ancient churches, especially the larger and more prosperous of them, existed in that form which in modem times we should call a religious connection, subject to a common government - WAKEFIELD,Christian Theology, p. 544

Mosheim, a Lutheran, in a statement concerning the churches in first century, says, "All the churches, . those primitive times, were independent bodies, or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the apostles frequently had the honor shown them to be consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no such judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is clear as the noonday, that all Christian churches had equal rights, and were, in all respects, on a footing of equality."]

Conditions of Membership."The churches severally are to be composed of such regenerate persons as by providential permission, and by the leadings of the Holy Spirit, become associated together for holy fellowship and ministries" (Creed, Part II, Art. 11). While regarding the church as a voluntary and visible organization, we nevertheless insist upon the divine and invisible element also and, therefore, make regeneration the basic condition of membership. Since the church is the fellowship and communion of believers, a confession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, becomes the one essential requirement for admission to the visible organization. This confession Protestantism has interpreted to mean a "conscious Christian experience and life." The various denominations have generally some form of a covenant, including agreed statements of belief and practice, to which the applicant must be willing to conform. It is the duty of every Christian, not only openly to profess his faith in Christ, but to enter into fellowship with the body of believers in his community, and to take upon himself the responsibilities of church membership

[Morris in hisEcclesiology, p. 93, reduces saving belief to its several elements, and thus discovers four essential qualifications for membership. These qualifications are (1) a spiritual knowledge of God, especially as revealed in the gospel, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (2) Repentance for sin as committed against God, and trust in the divine mercy, especially as that mercy is manifested in and through Christ as a Redeemer. (3) Obedience to God and cordial devotion to His interests and kingdom, culminating under the Christian dispensation in personal conformity with Christ and loyal consecration to His service. (4) A public declaration of such faith and devotion and a holy covenant

with God to he His servant, followed and confirmed by voluntary communion with His people, and under the gospel, with some branch of the Christian church

Church members are those who compose or belong to the visible church. As to the real church, the true members of it are such as come out from the world (I Cor. 6:17); are born again (I Peter 1:23) or made new creatures (II Cor. 5:17); whose faith works by love to God and all mankind (Gal. 5:6; James 2:14, 26); who walk in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. None but such are members of the true Church; nor should any he admitted into any particular church without some evidence of their earnestly seeking this state of salvation - Watson,Dictionary, Art. Church.]

It is evident that the same difficulties which we discovered in our discussion of the visible and invisible church, attach also to the conditions of membership. Several leading errors may be mentioned. (1) Where the church is regarded solely as a visible organization, membership will be conditioned merely by subscription to outward forms of admission. In some Protestant churches, the partaking of the sacraments alone, is regarded as sufficient for church membership. (2) Where a confession of faith is required, another error has at times been dominant in the church. It is held that since men do not know the hearts of those who profess faith in Christ, no one has a right to make inquiry or question the profession of another. This is a mistaken principle, and where it has obtained, the church has been spiritually impoverished by a membership knowing nothing of a conscious Christian experience and life. For this reason, spiritual churches have guarded their membership by requiring that all candidates for admission be required to show evidence of salvation from their sins by a godly walk and vital piety. (Cf. General Rules V) . (3) at the other extreme is to be found the error of those who look for and expect to find, the purity of the invisible church, in the visible organization. This was the error of the early Donatists, who endeavored by rigid discipline to secure an absolutely pure ecclesiastical organization, refusing fellowship with all whose practice was more tolerant. Thus to maintain the outward semblance of purity, the inward sanctity of spiritual freedom was broken down, and in its stead, there developed a narrow, uncharitable and sectarian spirit. (4) Closely related to this is the error of attempting to carry on the operations of the invisible church in the world, without a visible organization. Finding it impossible to maintain an outwardly pure church, some have resorted to the expedient of denying the necessity of external organization. This error has been previously mentioned, and can exist only because of a mistaken view of the nature of organization itself

[About 313 another schism broke out in Africa, owing to a dispute about the character of a bishop, and the validity of an ordination performed by him. The dissidents, called Donatists, from their leader, Donatus, inherited many of the opinions of the Montanists, the local remnant of which set they seemed to have absorbed. They strongly insisted on the absolute purity of the Church, accounting it sinful to exercise any forbearance toward unworthy members. They did not, however, like the Montanists and Novatians, refuse readmission to penitents. Their specialty was a belief that ministerial acts were invalid if performed by a person who either was, or deserved to be, excommunicated; and as a consequence, they claimed that valid sacraments were the exclusive possession of their own pure Church. The schism lasted through several generations, and before its extinction, ran into the wildest fanaticism. - Crippen,Hist. Chr. Doct., pp. 181, 182.] The Function of the Church.The function of the church, considered as the body of Christ, is that of a missionary institute, or more properly an "Institute of Evangelism." As Christ assumed a body and came into this world, to reveal God and redeem men, so the Church as His body exists in the

world for the spread of the gospel. It is the sphere of the Spirit’s operation, and finds its highest expression in the great commission, given to the church by our Lord himself.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. Amen(Matt. 28:19, 20). A word must be said also, as to the relation of the church to the kingdom. The kingdom is not to be narrowed down to the church, nor is the church to be broadened out to include the kingdom. "To do the first," says Dr. Taylor, "is to set up a monstrous ecclesiasticism; to do the second is to destroy the organism through which the kingdom manifests itself and does its work in the world." As the new dispensation began with the preaching of the kingdom, so it is the final form in which all the churches shall be absorbed at the end of the age. Only at the coming of the Lord, will the kingdom which had its preparatory stage in Israel, and its New Testament fulfillment in both Israel and the Gentiles, find its glorious consummation. Then shall the prophecy be fulfilled, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever (Rev. 11:15) THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY The Christian ministry may be said to discharge a twofold function, according as the church is viewed under the aspect of the Body of Christ, or as a Temple of the Spirit. In the first, as an institute of evangelism, the ministerial function is that of preaching the gospel and administering the affairs of the church; in the second, as an institute of worship, it has reference to the conduct of public worship and the administration of the sacraments. Before considering this subject more in detail, it is necessary to give some attention to the different conceptions of the office as held by Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The former holds to a priestly or sacerdotal ministry ; the latter to a prophetic or preaching ministry. The principle adopted by the Reformers, is that of "the universal priesthood of believers." The Universal Priesthood of Believers. In the early church, the ministers were known indifferently as bishops, presbyters or elders. The Old Testament conception of a priesthood, exercised at first, but little influence upon the churchly idea of the office. The sacrifices were abolished, and there could be no priest without a sacrifice. Consequently the whole congregation regarded itself as a body of priests to offer up spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ, its one great High Priest. Gradually, however, there grew up an unscriptural distinction between the clergy and the laity, the former being known as sacerdotes, to whom pertained a priestly function. With this distinction established, it was impossible to prevent the Old Testament conception of the priesthood from having its influence upon the Christian ministry. Since in the temple service, the priests offered up sacrifices for the people, and thereby became mediators between them and God; so in the church, the sacrifice soon came to be offered for the people instead of by the people. As long as the faithful themselves offered up the spiritual sacrifices through the one high priest, there was no need for a sacerdotal order. Consequently the idea of a universal priesthood was dominant in the church. With the gradual change in the idea of the ministry and its functions, there came a changed conception of the eucharist, from a simple memorial feast to the sacrifice of the mass. This in turn strengthened the belief in the priestly character of the ministry; and thus, as Peter Lombard indicates in his Sentences, the priestly character of the higher clergy, and the sacrificial character of the mass, were transmitted to the medieval church and accepted as axiomatic. With the coming of the Reformation, h6wever, the idea of the universal priesthood of believers was again brought to the front, and has been the dominant characteristic of Protestantism since that time. As such, it teaches the essential equality of all true believers, and their direct relation to

Christ through the Spirit, and thus preserves the true dignity of the individual Christian and the sanctity of corporate worship. It has at times unwisely been used against belief in a distinct ministerial order and, therefore, needs to be properly guarded The Divinely Constituted Ministry. Since the church is a divinely appointed institution, that is, it is the will of God that men organize themselves into societies for mutual edification and divine worship, so it is the will of God that individual persons be appointed to perform the duties and administer the sacraments of the church. In order to the more effective administration of the office, those who devote themselves exclusively to religious work are required to separate themselves from the ordinary vocations of secular life. This duty the Scriptures teach both directly and indirectly. In the Mosaic dispensation, Aaron and Levi were separated to do the work of the priesthood by divine commandment. The prophets were called of God, and spoke by divine commission (Ezek. 3:17). The divine order of the ministry is set forth even more clearly in the New Testament. The apostles were directly called and ordained by our Lord himself.And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles(Luke 6:13); And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach (Mark 3:14). The Seventy were likewise appointed and sent forth. (Luke 10:1). St. Paul was specifically called to the ministry -a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel(Acts 9:15; cf. 27:16-18). It is recorded in the Acts also, that the apostles ordained elders in every church (Acts 14:23) In this connection, it is well to point out that the ministry is a vocation or calling and not merely a profession. As it is the will of God that churches be formed) so it is His will also that particular persons be called to serve as ministers of these churches. As to what constitutes a divine call, nothing is better than the test of "gifts, grace and usefulness" which served the early fathers so well in their choice of candidates for the ministry The Distinctive Offices of the Church.St. Paul enumerates the following classes in the New Testament ministry, as given to the church by our ascended Lord.And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers(Eph. 4:11). From a further study of his epistles we learn also, of bishops, elders or presbyters, and deacons. Some of these terms, however, pertain to the same person, that is, the person may be designated sometimes by one, and sometimes by another of these official terms. The five offices mentioned by St. Paul, may be arranged in two main divisions, (1) The Extraordinary and Transitional Ministry, and (2) The Regular and Permanent Ministry

1. The Extraordinary and Transitional Ministry includes the apostles, the prophets and the evangelists. The church was founded by a specially chosen and qualified body of men. Their ministry was transitional, continuing as it did, the extraordinary ministrations of the Holy Spirit under the old economy, and bringing them to their full consummation in the service of the new order. (1) Theapostleswere those who had been commissioned by our Lord in person, and were chosen to bear witness of His miracles and His resurrection. Their mission was to lay the broad foundations of the church in doctrine and practice, and to this end they were endowed with the gift of inspiration, and given the credentials or miracle working power

[The apostles were ambassadors to the world; their credentials were a direct mission from the Lord in person, confirmed by miraculous powers. Their office was to preach the gospel to all men, in the name of the risen Lord, whose resurrection they proclaimed; and everywhere to lay the foundation of churches, or to sanction the foundation laid by others, to be the models for all the

future. As the Spirit was the invisible representative of the Lord, so the apostles were the visible. Their absolute authority is indicated in two ways: first, as teachers of Christianity, by word and writing, they had the gift of inspiration; and, second, as founders of the Church, they had the power of the keys, of binding and loosing, that is, of uttering the unchangeable decrees of ecclesiastical government. Their sway everywhere is seen to be uncontrolled, and from their word there is no appeal. They had, and could have, no successors: they form a body of men chosen to lay the foundation of the universal Church built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20), and to commit to it the final documents of Scripture. A succession of such men would not have been in harmony with the will of Christ, which we may interpret as purposing to leave a fellowship with a settled organization, and a finished doctrine, and a natural development under the supreme guidance of the Holy Ghost. But being dead they yet speak in their writings, which are the only representatives of the apostolical company in the visible community. It is from St. Paul, the one apostle of the Gentiles that we gather our fullest information concerning the apostolical prerogative. - POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 338, 339

(2) Theprophetsincluded those who in some instances foretold the future (Acts 11:28; 21:10, 11), but the term generally refers to that body of extraordinary teachers who were raised up for the purpose of establishing the churches in the truth, until such time as they should be under qualified and permanent instructors. Like the apostles, they spoke under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit; and while uttering truth immediately revealed to them for the instruction of the church, their revelations in only a few instances are preserved. It was to this class that the pentecostal promise pertained, And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy (Acts 2:18). This promise was abundantly fulfilled, and consequently we find references to numerous prophets in the Acts and Epistles. From the Epistle to the Corinthians, it is evident that the gift was exercised by both men and women, that it was occasional, and that it was frequently exercised in the congregation. (Cf. Acts 21:9; I Cor. 14:24, 25, 2933, 37). St. Paul defines the office of the prophets as speaking unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort (I Cor. 14:3); and assigns a high prerogative to the order by asserting that the church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20 cf. 3:5). It is in the sense of a foundational ministry only, that the order was transitory, as a proclamation of the truth, it abides in the church in the form of the regular ministry. (3) The evangelists were the assistants of the apostles, and performed the apostolic offices of preaching and founding churches. Their power was delegated to them by the apostles, to whom they were amenable, and under whose supervision their duties were performed. Timothy and Titus are representatives of this class. They were given the power to ordain bishops or elders in the churches, but since they had no authority to ordain their successors, the office must be regarded as temporary. It passed away with the apostolate upon which it depended. The evangelists had the gift of prophecy, as is shown by St. Paul’s statement of Timothy’s ordination, in which he speaks ofthe prophecies which went before on thee(I Tim. i 18); and exhorts himto Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy(I Tim. 4:14). The office was not only linked, therefore, to that of the prophets above it, but formed the transition to that of the regular ministry below it; and this in a twofold sense, as embracing both the administrative and instructional functions, which became permanent in the order of pastors and teachers. Eusebius seems to have been the first to apply the term evangelist to the writers of the Gospels. As used generally in later church history, evangelists represent that irregular ministry which is gifted in proclaiming the gospel to the unchurched, whether in new

fields, or in reaching the unsaved through the means of established churches

[With the passing away of the apostles, the passing of the evangelist as an assistant of the apostle, also passed away; but as an irregular and proclaiming ministry of the church it continued, and must continue, if the church is to extend her borders. Eusebius, the learned bishop of Caesarea, gives us an account of the evangelists who lived and labored during the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117). "Leaving their own country,,, he says, "they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not heard the faith; whilst with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundations of the faith in foreign parts as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those who had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and cooperation of God. The Holy Spirit also wrought many wonders as yet through them; so that as soon as the gospel was heard, men voluntarily in crowds, and eagerly embraced the true faith with their whole minds" (Eusebius,Eccl. Hist., III, p. 36).]

2. The regular and permanent ministry was appointed to care for the church after the apostolic supervision should be withdrawn. Two classes of office are mentioned - thepastorate, pertaining especially to the spiritual oversight of the church; and thediaconate, to the management of its temporal affairs. Those who served in the first office, were known as elders or presbyters (presbuvteroi), and bishops (ejpivskopoi) ; those in the second, as deacons (diavkonoi)

[There is therefore no office of eldership as such, but there is of course an ejpiskophv..It is remarkable, however, that no episcopate is alluded to, in the' sense of a collective body of bishops; but once we read of a Christian Presbytery, as having ordained Timothy, after the pattern of the Jewish The elders of Judaism were seniors in age, chosen as assessors in the Sanhedrin with high priests and scribes. The elders of Christianity formed a body, generally but not always seniors in age, who presided over the Christian community as the only directing and governing authority. The term presbytery, therefore, runs up to the most reverend antiquity, and is invested with a dignity quite unique. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 343.] The office of the pastorate has a twofold function - administrative and instructional; hence those chosen to fill this position were known as "pastors and teachers." Since the term pastor implies the duties of both instruction and government; and since elders or bishops were ordained in the various churches by the apostles or evangelists, it is evident that these are the pastors to which St. Paul refers in his Epistle to the Ephesians. The term elder was taken from Judaism, and had reference to age or dignity; that of bishop came from the Greeks, and had reference to office. We are to understand by the use of the term elder, not so much an office, as an order in the ministry. Hence we read of the ordination of Timothy, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery (I Tim. 4:14). In apostolic times, it appears that the larger churches had several presbyters or elders, as in the church at Jerusalem (Acts 15:4); the church at Ephesus (Acts 20:17); and the prophets and teachers mentioned by name in Acts 13:1. When these elders met together for consultation or devotion, they would of necessity elect someone as moderator or presiding officer. Such an officer, we know from church history, was common during the second century, and was known as the proestwd or president of the church. It is not unlikely that it was to this that our Saviour referred when He addressed His epistles to the "angels" of the churches. This supposition is made more probable by the fact that in Judaism, the elder who officiated in the public prayers, was known as "the angel of the

congregation." Whether the terms bishop and presbyter referred to the same office, or whether they express two distinct and sacred orders in the ministry has been the subject of much controversy in the church. It cannot be doubted that the distinction between the terms arose at an early period, but "This," says Mr. Watson, "gives not the least sanction to the notion that bishops are a superior order of ministers to presbyters, invested in virtue of that order, and by divine right, with powers to govern both presbyters and people, and with exclusive authority to ordain to the sacred offices of the church" (Wakefield,Chr. Th.,p. 542)

[Mr. Watson states that "the argument which is drawn from the promiscuous use of these terms in the New Testament, to prove that the same order of ministers is expressed by them, appears incontrovertible. When St. Paul, for instance, sends for the 'elders' or presbyters, of the church of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, he thus charges them, 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost bath made you overseers,' or bishops. That here the elders or presbyters are called 'bishops' cannot be denied, and the very office assigned to them, to 'feed the church of God,' and the injunction, to 'take heed to the flock,' show that the office of elder or presbyter is the same as that of 'pastor' in the passage just quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians. St. Paul directs Titus to 'ordain elders (presbyters) in every city,' and then adds, as a directory of ordination, 'a bishop must be blameless' plainly marking the same office by these two convertible appellations. 'Bishops and deacons' are the only classes of - ministers addressed in the Epistle to the Philippians; and if the presbyters were not understood to be included under the term 'bishops,' the omission of any notice of this order of ministers is not to be accounted for." Watson,Institutes, II, pp. 575, 576.]

[The manner in which the distinction between bishop and presbyter came into the church is pretty fully explained by Jerome, in his commentary on Titus 1:6: "A presbyter is the same as a bishop; and before there were, by the instigation of the devil, parties in religion, the churches were governed by joint councils of presbyters. But afterward it was decreed throughout the whole world that one chosen from among the presbyters should be put over the rest, and that the whole care of the church should be committed to him." Jerome proceeds to support his opinion, as to the original equality of presbyters and bishops, by commenting on Phil. 1:1, and on the interview of Paul with the Ephesian elders, and then adds, "Our design in these remarks is to show that among the ancients presbyter and bishop were the very same. But by degrees, that the plants of dissension might be plucked up, the whole concern was devolved upon an individual. As the presbyters, therefore, know that they are subjected, by the custom of the church, to him who is set over them, so let the bishops know that they are greater than presbyters more by custom than by any real appointment of Christ." In his Epistles to Evangelus and Occanus, Jerome assumes and maintains the same positions as in the foregoing passage. - POND,Christian Theology, p. 657.] The office of the diaconate was concerned with the administration of the temporal affairs of the church. The appointment of the first deacons in the Christian church is distinctly recorded (Acts 6:1-16). The term deacon is derived from the Greek word diakonos which donates a "servant who attends his master, waits on him at table, and is always near his person to obey his orders." It was considered a more creditable form of service, than that implied in the term dou'lo" or slave. Our Lord used both terms in Matt. 20:26, 27, although these are somewhat veiled in the English translation. The qualifications of deacons and their wives are given by st. Paul in I Tim. 3:8-13. Christian women were invested with this office also, of whom Phoebe of Cenchrea, was one of the number (Rom.

16:1). The wordwives(I Tim. 3:11) is sometimes translateddeaconesses. It is probable, also, that St. Paul was speaking of the deaconesses when he describes the ministering widows (I Tim. 5:5-10). According to Calmet, "they served the church in those offices which the deacons could not themselves exercise, visiting those of their own sex in sickness, or when imprisoned for the faith. They were persons of advanced age, when chosen; and appointed to the office by imposition of hands." The word diakonia is a comprehensive term for ministry, and is once applied by our Lord to Himself (Matt. 20:28). In modern times, the word minister" which is equivalent to "deacon" has come into common use as a substitute for the word elder or presbyter. For this reason, the deacon, in some churches is merely a presbyter on trial - a first step toward ordination as an elder

[In the time of the apostles, who were endowed with special gifts, the concurrence of the people in the appointment of men to the sacred office was not, perhaps, always formally taken; but the directions to Timothy and Titus imply a reference to the judgment of the members of the church, because from them only it could be learned whether the party fixed upon for ordination possessed those qualifications without which ordination was prohibited. when churches assumed a more regular form, it was usual for the people to be present at ordinations and to ratify the action by their approbation. Sometimes also they nominated persons by suffrages, and thus proposed them for ordination. The mode in which the people shall be made a concurrent party is a matter of prudential regulation; but they had an early, and certainly a reasonable right to a voice in the appointment of their ministers, though the power of ordination was vested in ministers alone, to be exercised on their responsibility to Christ - Wakefield, Chr. Th.,p. 546.]

Ordination of Ministers.The Scriptures clearly teach that the early church ordained elders or presbyters, by a formal setting apart to the office and work of the ministry. While it may be true that no particular form is prescribed, it seems evident from numerous references that the elders were set apart by the imposition of hands. Furthermore, it is evident from the Scriptures that the power of ordination rested in the eldership itself; and that all candidates were to be adjudged as worthy or unworthy of the office only by those who had been themselves ordained. Ordination, therefore, is to be regarded as in some sense, a divinely authorized and prescribed form of investiture or inauguration to a particular order. But ordination does not make the elder an officer in a particular church. This can be done only as he is elected by the church, and freely accepts this election. Thus, the eldership is an order of the ministry, from which only pastors can be elected, but until so elected they are not pastors of particular churches. This does not prevent a licensed minister from serving in the capacity of a pastor, but until ordained as an elder, he is not invested with all the rights and privileges of the ministry, and therefore cannot in the fullest sense meet the requirements of the office. What is true of the pastorate, is true also of other and various offices of the church. We may safely maintain, therefore, that there is one order in the ministry, but many and various offices. The qualifications for bishops or elders, and deacons are fully stated by St. Paul in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus (I Tim. 3:1-13; Titus 1:5-9)

Administrative and Disciplinary Functions. The church through its ministers exercises three forms of administrative power. (1) There is what the older theologians called the potestas ordinans, or diatactith: by which is meant the power of the church in relation to the laws of order and government. The fact that the church is an institution made up of human beings, implies that it must have laws, and that these must be properly administered. These laws must be scriptural, that is, they must be drawn immediately from the Scriptures, or indirectly by inference; "so that

whatsoever is not contained therein is not to be enjoined as an article of faith." They must be spiritual. The church has no voice in civil and secular matters, and, therefore, has no right to dictate to its members only in so far as moral and religious questions are involved. Again, these laws must be purely ministerial. Those through whom the government of the church is administered, are not the lords over God's heritage, but ensamples to the flock. (2) There is the potestas dogmatica, or the didactic functions of the church. Since the church is the depository of the Scriptures, its ministers are required to defend them as a precious heritage. It is further required of them to preach the Word, and to use every possible means for its promulgation. This includes the instruction of the youth, the use of the Scriptures, psalms, hymns and spiritual songs in the public services, and the conserving of sound doctrine in the church. (3) there is thepotestasdiakritikhv, or disciplinary function of the church. Ministers are not only required to teach, but to exercise proper discipline in the congregation. Neither the church nor its ministers, however, have power to use civil authority in even the severest cases of discipline. They have no right to inflict pain, to imprison individuals, or to confiscate property. Their power is limited to censure, suspension, or excommunication. Failure to observe this, has sometimes led to extravagant lengths in dealing with offenders against the church

[The authority of the church in matters of doctrine is thus summarized by Mr. Watson: (1) To declare the sense in which it interprets the language of Scripture on all the leading doctrines of Christianity; . . . . (2) To require from all its members, with whom the right of private judgment is by all Protestant churches left inviolate, to examine such declarations of faith, with modesty and respect to those grave and learned assemblies in which all these points have been weighed with deliberation; receiving them as guides to truth, not implicitly, it is true, but still docility and humility; (3) To silence within its own pale the preaching of all doctrines contrary to its received standards. Nor is there anything in the exercise of this authority contrary to Christian liberty; because the members of any communion, and especially the ministers, know beforehand the terms of fellowship with the churches whose confessions of faith are thus made public; and because also, where conscience is unfettered by public law, they are neither prevented from enjoying their own opinions in peace, nor from propagating them in other assemblies. - Watson,Institutes, II, p. 598

Generally speaking, nothing is more unreasonable than the view that the state, the most comprehensive of all earthly institutions, and the one which so decidedly plays a chief part in the world's history, should be withdrawn from the influences of Christianity, and thus excluded from that transformation of things temporal which Christianity is designed to effect. The necessity for the Christian character of states is mainly founded on the fact that the state does not exist for the sake of this or that subordinate aim, but for the sake of human nature itself; that its vocation is to furnish and work out those external conditions which are indispensable to human culture and prosperity. It is for this very reason that there can he no constitution or government worthy of the name, which is not pervaded by a thorough understanding of the nature and destination of man, of the history of the race, and the ultimate object of human history. This ultimate object is above the state, nay, reaches beyond the sphere of the state. But the state must, nevertheless, regard itself as subservient thereto, and should in all its institutions keep it in view as a last resort. The object of the state will ever he erroneously viewed, so long as it is not consciously placed in relation with the object and aim of the race, - Martensen,Christian Ethics, II, pp. 98, 99.]

31. Chapter 32 - THE CHURCH: ITS WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS

Chapter 32 - THE CHURCH: ITS WORSHIP AND SACRAMENTS

Having considered the organization and ministry of the church, we must now turn our attention to its worship and ordinances. Here we have a changed aspect - not now the Church as the body of Christ, or an institute of evangelism; but as the temple of the Spirit, and hence an institute of worship. So, also, there is a changed aspect of the ministry, which is not now regarded as the focal point of the church's contact with the world, but with God - not as a priestly substitution, but as a prophetic leadership. The subject matter embraces not only the nature and forms of worship, but a consideration also of (1) the Sabbath; (2) the Means of Grace; and (3) the Sacraments, with a special consideration of (4) Baptism; and (5) the Lord's Supper

[The subject of worship, as to its order and form, belongs properly to practical rather than systematic theology. It is, however, vitally related to biblical theology which gives it the concept of God upon which all true worship must rest. Christian worship, we may say, is a conscious act based upon a conviction of God as revealed through Jesus Christ For this reason the subject demands some discussion in any balanced system of dogmatics The ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Sacraments "these two," says Thomas á Kempis, "may be called the two tables set on either side in the spiritual treasury of the holy church. The one is the table of the holy altar, having this holy bread, that is the precious body of Christ. The other is the table of the laws of God, containing the holy doctrine, instructing man in right faith, and leading him into the inward secrecies that are called sancta sanctorum, where the inward secrets of scripture be hid and contained (Bk. IV, chapter 11)

Robert Will points out that there are two currents of life in the phenomena of worship, one proceeding from the transcendent reality, the other flowing from the religious life of the subject. The descending current includes all forms of revelation, the ascending, all forms of prayer. Nor does the mutual action of the two currents exclude the primacy of the divine action, for this is manifest, not only in the descending current of the Word and the Sacraments, but in the immanent action within the life of souls.] The Worship of the Primitive Church. The worship of the early church was patterned in a general way, after the forms used in the Jewish synagogues. In the time of our Lord, this service included, (1) the Shema, preceded and followed by benedictions; (2) prayers, probably not set forms at this time ; and (3) lessons from the law and the prophets. Here the service originally ended; but as Hebrew ceased to be the spoken language, there was added later, (4) a translation or paraphrase of the readings into the vernacular; and (5) an exposition, not necessarily a sermon, which was frequently delivered in a sitting posture. In the Christian Church, previous to A.D. 100, the service consisted of the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, preceded by the agape or love feast, and followed by what Duchesne calls "the liturgy of the Holy Spirit." It seems probable, that at first the agape was a real meal, which the people ate until they were satisfied; and that following this, certain portions of the bread and wine having been set apart, were eaten solemnly as the Eucharist. Thus in the Didache, there is this statement, "After ye are filled, then

give thanks." Early abuses, however, soon attached to this part of the service (Cf. I Cor. ii 20-22), and it seems to have been finally merged into the Eucharist. It is for this reason that the early worship is commonly stated to be twofold - the eucharist service, and the free worship. (1) The first part of the service included the reading of the Scriptures and prayer, as well as the consecration and distribution of the elements. The sermon also formed a part of the service, as did the singing of psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. The letters of the apostles were read, during the agape, or just before the communion service. (2) The second part, or so-called "free worship" held a very large place in the Christian service, as it is represented to us by the most ancient documents. After the Eucharist, inspired persons began to speak before the assembly, and to manifest the presence of the Spirit which inspired them. The exercise of the prophetic gift seems to have been most in evidence. Duchesne in his Origines says, "There is as it were a liturgy of the Holy Spirit, a real liturgy, with real presence and real communion. The inspiration can be felt; it thrills the organs of some privileged persons; but the whole congregation is moved, edified, and even ravished to a greater or less extent, and transported, in the divine spheres of the Paraclete." It is to this evidently, that St. Paul refers (I Cor. 14:23); and abuses leading to disorder having crept in, he seeks to correct these by further instruction (I Cor. 14:26-33)

[The earliest account of Christian worship after the close of the canon, is from the letters of Pliny, who was proconsul of Bithynia about AD 110. He states that the Christians were accustomed to meet together on a set day, before dawn, and sing responsive hymns to Christ as their God, and to pledge themselves in a sacrament to abstain from every form of evil, to commit no theft, rapine, or adultery, to falsify no word, and betray no trust. At a later period in the day they met together again, and joined in a harmless supper. - Pliny to Trajan, Letter 95

Justin Martyr in his first Apology, says "On the day called Sunday, all the Christians of a neighborhood meet together in one place, and listen to the reading of the gospels and the prophets. The presiding bishop preaches a sermon, exhorting them to holy living. All stand up, and pray. Bread is then brought in, with wine and water, the sacramental wine being invariably diluted. After further prayers, to which the people respond with audible "Ainens," the body and blood of Christ are distributed. Portions are sent to the sick, and a collection is taken for the poor.]

Corporate and Individual Worship. Christian worship is both individual and social. Worship in its very nature is profoundly personal, but it is also the act of a person who is essentially social. The first words of the "Lord’s Prayer" remind each individual worshiper of these social relationships. It is as "our" Father, not my" Father, that he comes into the divine presence. However lonely the individual worshiper may appear to be, he yet stands as a member of the whole family of God. Corporate worship emphasizes the unity of the church. It exalts the body of Christ, rather than the free exercise of its many members. It checks religious egotism, breaks down devotional barriers, and confers the supporting and disciplinary benefits of life in a family. For this reason, corporate worship is exceedingly important, whatever may be its outward form or manner of expression. On the other hand, individual worship is basic. There is a true secret of worship which belongs to every child of God. Advocates of corporate religion have sometimes revealed a tendency to regard these hidden and personal lives of prayer, as lacking in social value, or as being spiritually selfish. But this is a superficial view of the matter, for it is the character of the personal life that gives strength to corporate worship. The value of the prophetic or charismatic aspect of worship, lies in the fact that it stresses the spiritual exercises of the individual, and gives a strong ethical basis to

Christian character. It is one of the tragedies of church history, that the balanced form of worship as found in the apostolic church, was so soon lost. Separated from one another, the corporate or sacramental form of worship, tended toward ritualism - a cultus, with cathedral, altar and priest; while the prophetic, or free individual worship, improperly governed, frequently resulted in the wildest forms of fanaticism. Thus from the simple, but twofold character of primitive worship with its balanced elements of the corporate and the free, a dualism arose, which through the centuries has developed into the two general types of Christianity which we now know as the catholic and the evangelical. The simplicity of worship as found in the apostolic church, had in it, both the sacramental phase with its emphasis upon unity, and the prophetic, with its freedom, its enthusiasm, its personal spontaneity, and its intense ethical demands. It will be seen then, that emphasis upon individual experience, must be carefully guarded and conserved, by a corresponding emphasis upon corporate worship. The warning, "not to forsake the assembling of yourselves together," has a philosophical as well as a religious basis

[Evangelical worship as re-established by the Reformers, was not intended to be an innovation, but a restoration of the ancient balance between the word and the Sacraments, and thus bring back the soul into a direct and immediate spiritual relation with God. The free churches have certain ideas of worship in common: (1) the higher the type of worship, the less importance is attached to external matters; (2) that an overemphasis upon the means of worship detracts from the highest communion with God; and (3) that the worthiest worship is that which is richest in ethical content. But as we have shown, this soon falls into the formal and commonplace without the balancing influence of corporate worship

Evelyn Underhill in her book entitled "Worship" points out that the prophetic element, although hidden in the corporate life, never dies out, but reappears in every "revival" as a protest against the supposed formality and unreality of the lethargic routine; reasserting the freedom and direct action of the Spirit, the priesthood of the individual, the prophetic office of "preachers of the Word," and the call to personal consecration. Wherever the institutional life becomes standardized, there is always a reaction toward the primitive group enthusiasm and the prophetic ministry described in the New Testament.] The Order and Forms of Worship. The order of divine worship has reference to the principles, according to which it must be conducted. These principles are fully set forth in the Holy Scriptures. (1) Worship must be offered to the Triune God. This is a fundamental principle. Whatever of worship is paid to one member of the Trinity, must be offered to all - or must be offered to the One in the unity of the other Two. (2) Worship must be mediatorial-spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. It is only through these mediatorial offices that we have the boldness (or liberty) to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus (Heb. 10:19); and it is "through him" that we have access by one Spirit unto the Father (Eph. 2:18). (3) Worship must be spiritual - that is, it must be inspired by the Spirit to be acceptable unto God. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24). It is the touch of God upon the soul that is the source of all true worship. The forms of worship are also left to the discretionary powers of the church, in so far as they conform to the Scriptures (1) The time of worship is to be set by the church, but public worship must not be allowed to interfere with, or infringe upon, the rights of the family and the individual. The church may appoint special seasons for prayer and fasting, for preaching, and for thanksgiving. (2) The law of decency and order requires that public services be regulated. Spontaneity flowing from the presence of the Spirit in

fresh anointing, is to be commended, but all mere caprice is to be put away as out of harmony with the dignity which should attach to divine service. (3) Simplicity must characterize the various forms of public service. An elaborate ritual which distracts the soul from its one true function of spiritual worship is detrimental; but a careless and indifferent spirit is death to any form of spiritual worship THE SABBATH The institution of the Sabbath is regarded as one of the permanent and divine ordinances of the church. It is, for this reason, sometimes treated by theologians in connection with the means of grace. Introduced as it was, at the time of man's creation, the Sabbath belongs to the race generally and in perpetuity. Its original design was a rest from physical labor, and with it a spiritual design, that man, thus ceasing from other occupations, might hold communion with his Creator. A right understanding of the Sabbath as an institution, therefore, must regard it as a period of rest after six days of labor. It consists of two parts, the holy rest, and the day on which this rest is observed. The first part belongs to the moral law, the second is purely positive. Thus as Dr. Wakefield indicates, God "did not bless and hallow the day as the seventh, but only as being the day on which the Sabbath, or holy rest, was to be kept. While, therefore, the Sabbath itself is a perpetual institution, morally binding upon all men, the law which determines the time of its observance is purely positive, and consequently may be changed. But though the day might be altered, without altering the substance of the institution, yet it could be altered only by divine authority. The same authority which instituted the Sabbath, appointed also the day on which it was to be observed; and no other authority is competent to change either the one or the other." Two considerations then, demand our attention, (1) The Sabbath as a universal and perpetual obligation ; (2) the change of the day as divinely authorized. To these must be added (3) the manner in which the Sabbath is to be observed

[Dr. Pond says that "neither the original institution of the Sabbath, nor the command in the decalogue, confines or fixes its observance to the seventh day of our week. God made the world in six days, and sanctified and blessed the seventh; but there is no certainty that this day corresponds to our seventh day, or Saturday, or that it corresponded to the seventh day of the ancient Jews. The command in the decalogue, also, requires us to labor six days, and to keep the seventh; but, as it does not fix upon any precise day from which the reckoning shall commence, it is impossible to determine, merely from this command, what particular day is to be observed. - Pond, Chr. Th., p.632. The institution of the Sabbath obviously consists of two parts; first, the appointing of one day in seven to be kept holy to the Lord; and, secondly, the fixing of a particular day to be observed. It is the first of these points which is settled in the original institution, and in the Fourth Commandment. The second has been settled, from time to time by other intimidation of the divine will. The Sabbath began on the seventh day from the commencement of the creation, or on the first day after the .creation of man. In the time of Moses it was observed on the seventh day of the Jewish week. Under the present dispensation, the Sabbath is fixed..on the first day of our Christian week. - POND, Chr. Th., pp. 632, 633.] The Sabbath as a Universal and Perpetual Obligation. When our Lord said, "The Sabbath was made for man," He referred to its original institution as a universal law, and not merely to the Jewish Sabbath as an enactment of the law of Moses. It belongs to all mankind, forms a part of the moral law as expressed in the Ten Commandments, and was never abrogated. It is sometimes stated that the law under the Mosaic dispensation was formulated into nine moral precepts, with a Sabbath commandment added, making ten in all. But there is no reason to suppose that the statement concerning the Sabbath is not so much a moral commandment as the other nine. The setting apart of a seventh of man's

time to physical rest is essential to his well-being, if not his existence; and the devotement of this time to God, is a perpetual memorial of his spiritual mission, without which the social order would have no meaning. That the Sabbath is a moral obligation is seen from the argument of St. Paul concerning the relation of the law to faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law (Rom. 3:31). It is evident that St. Paul is not referring to the civil or ceremonial law of the Jews, but to the fundamental law as expressed in the Ten Commandments. Thus in Romans 7:7 he 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. The law which is mentioned here is that of the Decalogue, and it is this which Christianity establishes. If so, then the law of the Sabbath being a part of the Decalogue, is as binding upon Christians as formerly it was upon the Jews. We may say then with conviction that whoever denies the obligation of the Sabbath, denies the whole Decalogue, Christians observe the Sabbath as truly as did the Jews, but they celebrate it on another day. That this day was changed by our Lord, is our next question for consideration The Change of the Day as Divinely Authorized. When Jesus declared that "the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath," He doubtless intended them to understand that He had power to change the day on which the holy rest should be observed. The Scriptures clearly indicate that the Sabbath has been celebrated on different days, and this subject now demands our consideration The primitive and patriarchal Sabbath. The first notice of the Sabbath is found in Genesis 2:3, And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made..And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made (Gen. 2:2, 3). Here, in the institution of the Sabbath, it is distinctly declared to be a day of holy rest after six days of labor; and further, it is stated in this instance, to be a memorial of creation. Now it is evident that God’s seventh day would not be man’s seventh day. "The seventh day which God blessed in Eden," says Dr. Whitelaw, "was the first day of human life, and not the seventh day; and it is certain that God did not rest from His labors on man’s seventh day, but on man’s first." Hence Adam’s first day, and each succeeding eighth day, would be his Sabbath - a reference strikingly similar to our Lord’s appearances on the first and eighth days

[Man is the last of the geological series, such as fish, reptiles and mammalia, and is the crown and consummation of God’s creative work. His existence, then, began at or near the close of the sixth creative day, so that God’s Sabbath rest was man’s first full day. If he began the calculation of the week from that time, then the first day of the week, and not the seventh, was the primitive and patriarchal Sabbath. "The holy rest day was the seventh from the first, in the count of God’s works for man; but it was the first day in his created history. He appeared before his Maker on that day, in possession of all good, and in the probationary prospect of a confirmation of it forever. The day was therefore blessed and sanctified to man, as containing in its present and promised good his everlasting inheritance. No bloody rites and typical shadows had conducted him to the enjoyment of that glorious day; it arose to him as the rest of God. All was very good, and all was very satisfactory, to both God and man. But from this lofty probation he fell by transgressian under the curse of the whole law. All good was lost, and all threatened evil was incurred, and we must now keep our eye fixed upon this day of the Lord, till its lost blessing shall be recovered through His mediation" (Akers, Biblical Chronology. Cf. Potts, Faith Made Easy).]

2. The Jewish Sabbath. The next mention of the Sabbath is in connection with the giving of the manna (Ex. 16:14-31). Here the manna is stated to have fallen for six days, that is, from the

sixteenth to the twenty-first day of the second month; and that the day following, or the twenty-second, was the first seventh day Sabbath celebrated in the Wilderness of Sin. See, said Moses, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days..So the people rested on the seventh day (Exod. 16:29, 30). That the Sabbath as a holy rest was re-established at this time, there can be no doubt; that it was celebrated on the same day as that of the patriarchal Sabbath, has been a matter of controversy. Thus if the twenty-second was a Sabbath day, the fifteenth should have been a Sabbath also. That it was not, seems to be indicated by the fact that they marched on that day (Exod. 16:1). Dr. W. H. Rogers holds that "the only change of the Sabbath by God's authority is for the Jews between the giving of the manna and the resurrection of Christ. The first day of the week, but always the seventh after six working days, was the day of the holy rest from Adam to Moses. The Sabbatism was separated from idolatry by changing it from Sunday to Saturday among the chosen people 'throughout their generations,' fifteen hundred years (Cf. Exod. 31:13, 14; Ezek. 20:12). At Christ's resurrection expired by statute limitation this peculiarity of exceptional change, leaving the divine rule for all mankind, requiring first-day Sabbath keeping, as had been the case for the first twenty-five hundred years of human history." It should be noted also that to the memorial of creation which the Sabbath represented, there was added also during this period, a secondary memorial - that is, a remembrance of their deliverance from the land of Egypt. This memorial was to last only "through their generations," and as indicated above expired by the statute of limitations. With the coming of "the last Adam" the Sabbath was restored to the original day on which it was celebrated by the first Adam

3. The Christian Sabbath or "Lord's Day." That the Christian Sabbath was restored, or at least changed to the first day, has been the teaching of the church since apostolic times. As such it came early to be known as the "Lord's Day" to distinguish it from the Jewish Sabbath. That this change was divinely authorized is shown (1) by the example of Jesus; (2) by the authority of the apostles; and (3) by the practices of the early church. To this may be added (4) the testimony of the early apostolic fathers

(1) Jesus placed approval upon the first day of the week, by meeting with His disciples on this day. The resurrection took place on the morning of the first day of the week. The four accounts of the evangelists agree that the Saviour arose early "the first day of the week" (John 20:1). His first meeting with the body of His disciples was on the evening of the resurrection day (John 20:19); and the second on the evening of the eighth day, which would of course, be the following first day of the next week. There were three more "first days" before the ascension, but it is not said whether Jesus met with His disciples on any or all of them. There were, however, three more appearances - to the five hundred brethren, to James, and to the apostles (I Cor. 15:1-4). (2) The apostles authorized the change, doubtless due to the unrecorded instructions of Jesus during the forty days (Cf. Acts 1:2). Twenty-five years later St. Paul preached at Troas, upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread (Acts 20:7), which indicates his appr9val of the day of worship. About one year later, he wrote to the Corinthians saying, As I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come (I Cor. 16:1, 2). This clearly indicates that the apostle sanctioned the first day as the Christian Sabbath. (3) The practices of the early churches are further proof of worship on the first day of the

week. This is shown by the passages just cited, and also by St. John’s reference to the Sabbath as the "Lord’s day" (Rev. 1:10). Since he uses the phrase without any reference to the first day, it is evidence that when the Apocalypse was written, the "first day" was generally known as the "Lord’s day" in contradistinction to the Jewish seventh day

[Concerning the instructions given by Jesus to the apostles during the forty days, Justin Martyr in giving his reasons for keeping the first -day, says, "Because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour, on the same day arose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before Saturn (Saturday) ; and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." This shows clearly that the belief was current among the early fathers who associated with the apostles, that they had been given the authority to celebrate the Sabbath on the first day of the week, as a memorial not only of the first creation, but of the new creation by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead

Ignatius, a disciple of St. John who wrote about 100 A.D. and therefore only about ten years or less after the death of St. John says this, "If those who were concerned with old things have come to newness of hope, no longer keeping (Jewish) Sabbaths, but living according to the Lord’s Day, in which our life has arisen again through Him and His death."]

[We can give only a few of the references to the fathers. Irenaeus says, "On the Lord’s day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath; meditating in the law, and rejoicing in the works of God." Justin Martyr states that "on the day called Sunday there is a gathering in one place of all who reside either in the cities or country places, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." The Didache has this direction for the saints, "But on the Lord’s day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may he pure." Clement of Alexandria says that "a true Christian, according to the commands of the gospel, observes the Lord’s day by casting out all bad thoughts, and cherishing all goodness, honoring the resurrection of the Lord, which took place on that day." Tertullian says, "Sundays we give to joy," "to observe the day of the Lord’s resurrection." Origen wrote that the Lord’s day was placed above the Jewish Sabbath. Eusebius has this decisive passage, "The Word (Christ) by the new covenant translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest the saving Lord’s day - the first (day) of light in which the Saviour obtained the victory over death. On this day, which is the first of the light, and of the true Son, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate the holy and spiritual Sabbath; even all nations redeemed by Him throughout the world, assemble and do those things according to the spiritual law which was decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath (that is the Jewish Sabbath) these we have transferred to the Lord’s day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence, and is the first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath."]

(4) Since some of the early apostolic fathers were associated with the apostles, their writings from the historical standpoint, furnish conclusive evidence as to the current thought of that time. Here we may mention Ignatius, Polycarp, Ireneus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Theodoret, Eusebius, Origen, the Didache or "Teachings of the Twelve" and many other authorities. All of these indicate that the first day of the week was the Lord’s day, and that it was

set apart and distinguished from other days in that it was the day of the resurrection. It was, therefore, a holy day, or a holy Sabbath The Manner in Which the Sabbath Is to Be Observed. Since the Sabbath as a holy rest day is enjoined upon the church as a perpetual obligation, the manner of its observance should be given brief consideration. The original commandment is Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. To this, both in the Exodus account, and in that found in Deuteronomy, there is the added explanation which forms the basis of the memorial aspect of the day. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it (Exodus 20:9-11; cf. Deut. 5:12-15 where deliverance from Egypt is made a secondary memorial for the Jewish dispensation.) We are to understand from this that the day is to be set apart for the worship of God and devoted to the spiritual interests of mankind. For this reason, all secular work is prohibited, except that which is commonly known as a work of necessity or mercy. This truth is brought out clearly by Isaiah also, as follows: 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, honorable; and 8halt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words (Isa. 58:13). Thus the Old Testament fixes the Sabbath day as a time of worship and communion with God. It is a cessation of labor, whether of the body or the mind, in order to permit time for spiritual things. Our Lord gives us in the New Testament, two principles also, which parallel the twofold aspect of the Sabbath as found in the Old Testament. The first has reference to the holiness of the day, God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24). Here the true inwardness of the Sabbath is seen - a spiritual rest of the soul, from which flows that worship which is in Spirit and in truth. The second, concerns man’s interests, And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath (Mark 2:27, 28). Here it is clearly taught, that those things which pertain to man’s highest welfare, that is, his spiritual interests, are to be permitted on the sabbath day; and this is a true and sure test as to the kind and extent of secular labor on the Sabbath day THE MEANS OF GRACE The means of grace, or the media gratiae of the theologians, are the divinely appointed channels through which the influences of the Holy Spirit are communicated to the souls of men. They are sometimes defined as "the ordinances and institutions appointed of God for the establishment and spread of the kingdom of grace among men" (MACPHERSON) ; or "the motives or means by which holy and gracious affections are awakened in the soul" (POND) . The Protestant doctrine stands midway between the exaggerated supernaturalism of the Roman Catholic church, which holds that the ordinances have power in themselves to confer grace; and the abstract position of the mystics who seek to do away with all external means. In a general sense, therefore, it is proper to regard all spiritual helps as means of grace, but theology has usually stated these as (1) the Word of God; and (2) Prayer - these being known as the universal means of grace. Following this is (3) the fellowship of the saints ; and (4) the sacraments - these being known as the economic means of grace

[A church consciousness which does not seek by means of preaching to submit itself to the testing of God’s word, and by its fullness to be edified, will very soon find itself reduced to an indistinct, powerless spiritualism, which knows no difference between the sayings of men and the

saving doctrine of Christ. And the preacher who makes himself only "the mouth of the congregation," and who does not prepare himself, if need be alone fortifying himself with Holy Scripture and the ecumenical testimony - to speak against the erring consciousness of the congregation, infected as it is with the spirit of the day, will soon become the servant of the church in such a sense, that he can no longer be the Lord's servant. The preacher, therefore, is rightly called "the minister of the Word"; and it is also in harmony with the word of God, that the church shall test and prove that which they hear, according to the pattern of the apostolic church. "Lot the prophets," says St Paul, "speak two or three, and let the others judge" (I Cor. 14:29). - Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 414.] The Word of God as the Universal Means of Grace. The Scriptures claim to be the universal channel of grace. Their sufficiency is everywhere declared, both in the Old and the New Testaments. The Word of God is the sword of the Spirit - the instrument by which He operates in converting and sanctifying the souls of men. Christians are said to have been begotten through the gospel (I Cor. 4:15); to have been born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever (I Peter 1:23); and to sanctify them through thy truth (John 17:17). St. Paul makes the word a means of grace by linking it directly to faith - faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God (Rom. 10:17). Resting securely on the basis of God's Word, faith opens the door of access to God, and lays hold of the purchased blessings. Here the importance of the ministry is seen in a new light. It is through the preached word that grace is administered to the hearers - not primarily now, to win men to God, but to deepen their love to Christ. The goal which St. Paul sets is that they being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and the length, and the depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth all knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God (Eph. 3:17-19). It is of course highly important to bear in mind the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Word. The preaching of the Word is to be in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (I Cor. 2:4). Apart from the Spirit's operation upon the hearts of men, the Word has no power. It derives its efficacy as a means of grace, only as it becomes the instrument of the Spirit. This truth taught with such accuracy by the theologians of the Reformation, must not be neglected or set aside. Again, the Word must be preached in all its offices, or spiritual growth will be retarded. The Scripture is given for doctrine, or instruction in the truths of the gospel; for reproof, of neglect or failure; for correction, of wrong tendencies, and for instruction in righteousness, or the art of holy living (II Tim. 3:16). Not only are the Scriptures to be read and studied privately, but they are to be read in the family (Deut. 6:6, 7; cf. II Tim. 1:5; 3:15); and also in the public services of the church (Deut. 31:12; Joshua 8:34, 35; Luke 4:16-18 furnishes examples of this practice. It is expressly enjoined I Tim. 4:13)

[There has never been wanting a tendency to make the Scriptures sufficient of themselves, without any supernatural accompanying influence, to effect the salvation of men. The ancient Pelagians and semiPelagians regarded the Word of God as the intellectual and moral discipline which best suits the spiritual nature of man, its honest use leading sincere inquirers to perfection. As human nature retains its original elements unimpaired, its natural powers are supposed to be sufficient under the influence of truth to guide to salvation. Modern rationalism has the same general estimate of the Word of God: not regarding it as in any specific sense the means of grace, but only as one among many instruments of moral discipline. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III p. 297.]

Prayer or Communion with God. Prayer as combined with the Word is also a universal means of grace. When the promises of the Word are pleaded in prayer, they become effective in the spiritual life of the Christian; and when the sacraments are received in faith, they become likewise, channels of blessing. Thus prayer appears to be the concomitant of all other means of grace. Prayer is defined by Mr. Watson as "the offering of our desires to God through the mediation of Jesus Christ, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and with suitable dispositions, for things agreeable to His will." Thus to be acceptable to God prayer must be offered through the mediation of Christ; it must be offered in faith and in a spirit of humility; and it must be according to the will of God. The elements of a well-ordered prayer are usually classified as (1) adoration, which ascribes to God the perfections which belong to His nature, and which should be uttered in deep devotion, reverence, confidence and affection; (2) thanksgiving, or the pouring forth of the soul in gratitude; (3) confession, or deep penitence, submission and humility; (4) supplication, or a prolonged and earnest looking to God in dependence, for needed blessings; and (5) intercession, or a pleading for our fellowmen, with sincere desires for their spiritual welfare. Four of these elements are mentioned by St. Paul in a single verse (I Tim. 2:1). As in the case of the Word as a means of grace, prayer is classified as (1) private prayer; (2) family prayer ; (3) public prayer; to which is added another (4) ejaculatory prayer. By this is meant those short, occasional expressions of prayer or praise, flowing from a devotional frame of mind, or what is commonly known as a "spirit of prayer." Prayer is an obligation - a duty devolving upon all men. If it be neglected or omitted, there can be no advance in spiritual things

[Devotion is the first step in raising up the soul to God, a relation of intercourse, of contemplation, a union with God, in edifying thought. But worship is an act; and the exercise of contemplation must lead on to a practical surrender of the will, in the offering of the heart. This, as a definite act of worship, takes place in prayer. Prayer, therefore, demands a deeper and more weighty inwardness than devotion, and .many may be devotional who are not yet really prayerful. For in devotion man’s relation to God is for the most part only an edifying reflection; a relation in which God is certainly present, and in which the soul certainly feels God’s nearness, but in which withal, God is present, so to speak, in the third person only; in prayer, on the other hand, God is immediately present in the second Person, as a personal Thou, corresponding to the human 1. In devotion, the man’s relation to God is of a general kind, as the God of creation and of the whole church; in prayer that general relation is narrowed into one purely individual and direct between the man and God. In prayer, I hold communion with the God of all creation and of the church universal, as my God, the God of the individual man. This immediate relation between God and the soul, when the soul breathes forth its longings for the light of God’s countenance, and calls upon Him, and when God himself gives His Holy Spirit to the suppliant, this union, "unio mystica," is the essence of all true prayer. But the distinctive thing about Christian prayer is that it is prayer in the name of Jesus" (John 16:23, 24). - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 415

"Prayer," says Dr. Ryland, "has divided seas, rolled up flowing rivers, made flinty rocks gush into fountains, quenched flames of fire, .muzzled lions, disarmed vipers and poisons, marshaled the stars against the wicked, stopped the course of the moon, arrested the sun in his rapid race, burst open iron gates, recalled souls from eternity, conquered the strongest devils, commanded legions of angels down from heaven. Prayer has bridled and chained the raging passions of man, and routed and destroyed vast armies of proud, daring, blustering atheists

Prayer has brought one man from the bottom of the sea, and carried another in a chariot of fire to heaven. What has prayer not done?"]

Christian Fellowship. The Christian community is everywhere represented as a means of grace, both in the creeds and in the Scriptures. "The privileges and blessings which we have in association together in the Church of Jesus Christ are very sacred and precious. There is in it such hallowed fellowship as cannot otherwise be known. There is such helpfulness with brotherly watchcare and counsel as can be found only in the church. There is the godly care of pastors, with the teachings of the Word, and the helpful inspiration of social worship. And there is co-operation in service, accomplishing that which cannot otherwise be done." (Covenant, Manual, pp.214, 215). The scriptures command us to exhort one another daily . . . . lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin (Heb. 3:13); and to obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you (Heb. 13:17). St. Paul exhorts the church to assist those who are tempted. He says, Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted (Gal. 6:1)

[Christian fellowship is a privilege of church membership, and one of large spiritual profit. we are constituted for society, and are accordingly endowed with social affections. Life would be utterly dreary without its social element. But in no sphere is there deeper need of this element than in the religious. The Christian life would be lonely and lacking in spiritual vigor without the fellowship of kindred minds. On the other hand, the communion of souls alive in Christ is a fruition of grace. Here is a means of much spiritual profit. - Miley, Syst. Th., II, p.389.] The Sacraments. In this connection we shall treat the sacraments in a general way as the economic means of grace, reserving other important questions concerning them for later consideration. In some sense, the sacraments are similar to all other means of grace, but in another, there are marked differences. These differences are due to the fact that they are not only individual but federal transactions; that is, they are signs and seals of a covenant. It is for this reason that they are known as the economic means of grace. Since a covenant implies the condescension of God in entering into relations with His people, the signs and seals must be mutual. By them, both the divine and human fidelity are pledged in sacred agreement. It is for this reason that a peculiar sacredness has always attached to these ordinances. Their efficacy, however, like that of the other means of grace, depends upon the Holy Spirit working in and through the faith of the believer THE SACRAMENTS The term sacraments as used in theology, signifies an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. This is the definition of the Methodist Catechism. According to the Westminster Larger Catechism, "A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in His Church, to signify a seal, and exhibit unto whose that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of His mediation ; to strengthen and increase their faith, and all other graces, to oblige them to obedience." The term sacramentum was originally applied to the money deposited in a sacred place by parties to a suit at law. Later it came to apply to any civil suit, and then to the oath taken by newly enlisted soldiers in the Roman army. From this it was carried over to the sacred or ordinances of the church. Tertullian uses it in the twofold sense - first as applying to the army oath, and then to the Christian sacraments. As understood by the early Christians, the ordinances were

religious rites which carried with them the most sacred obligation of loyalty to the church and to Christ. In the Greek church, the term mystery (musthrion) was used instead of sacrament, not, however, in the Pauline sense of a hidden truth revealed, but purely as an emblem. In ecclesiastical Latin, the term sacrament came to signify anything consecrated, while musthrion was used as a symbol or sign of a consecrated or sacred thing. Baptism, however, was held to represent more of the sacramental character as an oath of allegiance, while the Eucharist contained more of the mystery The Marks of a Sacrament. Since the Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches hold that there are seven sacraments, and the Protestant churches reduce the number to two, it is essential to understand what constitutes a sacrament. Dr. A. A. Hodge in his commentary on the Presbyterian Confession of Faith gives us the following marks. (1) A Sacrament is an ordinance immediately instituted by Christ. (2) A sacrament always consists of two elements: (a) an outward visible sign, and (b) an inward spiritual grace thereby signified. (3) The sign in every sacrament is sacramentally united to the grace which it signifies; and out of this union the scriptural usage has arisen of ascribing to the sign whatever is true of that which the sign signifies. (4) The sacraments were designated to represent, seal, and apply the benefits of Christ and the new covenant to believers. (5) They were designed to be pledges of our fidelity to Christ, binding us to his service, and at the same time badges of our profession, visibly marking the body of professors and distinguishing them from the world. Perhaps it is safe to say, that a rite in order to be properly termed a sacrament, must net only exhibit a general resemblance between the sign and the thing signified, but that there must be also the words of institution, and the promise which binds them together

[Dr. Pond gives the following marks of a sacrament. (1) It must be one of divine institution, it must he an ordinance of Christ. (2) It must be characterized .by significance and appropriateness. It must not be an idle ceremony. It must have meaning - an important meaning. (3) It must hold intimate and vital connection with the church. It must be included in the covenant of the church, and be a rite of the church. (4) It must be of universal and perpetual obligation

"Sacraments, ordained of Christ, are not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s professions, but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God’s good-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." This is the first paragraph of Article XVI of Methodism, as revised by John Wesley. It is the same as Article XXV of the Anglican creed with the omission of the words "sure witnesses and effectual." These words were added to the creed originally, in order to counteract the teaching of Zwingli, and especially the Socinians, but the word "effectual" had to be used to support the ex opere operatum of the sacramental churches, and to this Mr. Wesley objected.] The Nature of a Sacrament. There are widely divergent opinions in the church, as to the manner in which divine power is attached to the outward and visible sign of the sacrament. (1) There is the sacramentarian view, according to which the sacraments contain the grace they signify; and when administered, convey this grace exopere operato, that is, of necessity, apart from and independent of the faith of the communicant. (2) At the other extreme is the rationalistic view, which holds that the sacraments are purely symbolical, and that any power which attaches to them is to be found in the moral influence upon the mind, arising from meditation upon the events which they commemorate. This view is widely prevalent in the church. (3) There is a third or mediating view, which regards the sacraments as both signs and seals, signs as representing in action and by symbols, the blessings of the

covenant; seals, as pledges of God’s fidelity in bestowing them. This is the position generally held by the Protestant churches

[There should he a clear understanding of the formulas that distinguish the different positions concerning the sacraments "To produce grace ex opere operato, says Bailly, "is to confer it by the power of the external act instituted by Christ, provided there is no hindrance. But to produce grace ex opere operantis is to confer it on account of the merits and dispositions of the receiver or minister."

Augustine held that the sacraments were "verba visibilia" or "visible words"; while Chrysostom said of them "one thing we see, another we believe." These statements have been received by the church generally as rightly indicating the meaning of the emblems The sacramentarian churches make a distinction between the matter and the form in the administration of the sacraments. The matter, refers to the physical elements and actions; the form, to the formula used in the consecration of the elements. The "res sacramenti" refers to the holy eucharist alone, and means the invisible substance present in the sacrament and constituting it the real vehicle of grace. The virtas secraimenti is applied to the efficacy of the sacrament, ex opere operate when validly performed.]

Signs and Seals. There has been little difference of opinion in the church concerning the sacraments as signs, but widespread controversy concerning their character as seals. Overemphasis upon the former, as we have seen, led to the rationalistic view of the sacraments as mere symbols; undue emphasis upon the latter, to the sacramentarian view of the seals as reservoirs of grace. During the middle ages, two views were held as to the communication of this grace. Thomas Aquinas held to what is commonly known as the ex opere operato, or the view that the sacraments are channels of grace apart from any faith on the part of the communicant. Duns Scotus on the other hand, held to the ex opere operante, which does not regard the sacraments as having power in themselves, except by a certain concomitance, the power accompanying them producing the sacramental effect through faith on the part of the communicant. The former developed into the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church as elaborated by the Council of Trent ; the latter is essentially that held by the Protestant churches. Perhaps the simplest and most thorough explanation of the signs and seals, is the classic passage in Watson’s Institutes, generally cited as an authoritative statement by Protestant theologians of the Arminian type. He says (1) "They are the signs of divine grace. As such they are visible and symbolical expositions of the benefits of redemption. In other words, they exhibit to the senses, under appropriate emblems, the same benefits that are exhibited in another form in the doctrine and promises of the Word of God." (2) "They are also seals. A seal is a confirming sign, or, according to theological language, there is in a sacrament a signum significans, and a signum confirmans; the former of which it is said, significare, to notify or declare; the latter, obsignare, to set one’s seal to, to witness. As .therefore, the sacraments, when considered, as signs, contain a declaration of the same doctrines and promises which the written Word of God exhibits, but addressed by a significant emblem to the senses; so also as seals, or pledges, they confirm the same promises which are assured to us by God’s own truth and faithfulness in His Word (which is the main ground of all affiance in His .mercy), and by His indwelling Spirit by which we are ’sealed,’ and have in our hearts ’the earnest’ of our heavenly inheritance. This is done by an external and visible institution ; so that. God has added these ordinances to the promises of His Word, not only to bring His

merciful purpose toward us in Christ to mind, but constantly to assure us that those who believe in Him shall be and are made partakers of His grace." (WATSON, Institutes, II, pp. 611, 612. Cf. WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 555.) The true Protestant doctrine, therefore, avoids the excesses of Roman Catholicism on the one hand, and the deficiencies of rationalism on the other, embodying in its doctrine of the signs and seals, all the truth that is contained in other views of the sacraments

[The importance attached to the ex opere operato by the Roman Catholic church is shown in Canons VI, VII, and VIII of the Tridentine Decrees. "Whoever shall affirm that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace they signify, or that they do not confer the grace on those who place no obstacle in its way, as if they were only external signs of grace or righteousness received by faith, and marks of Christian profession, whereby the faithful are distinguished from unbelievers; let him he accursed." "Whoever shall say that grace is not always given by these sacraments, and upon all persons, as far as God is concerned, if they he rightly received, but that it is only bestowed sometimes and on some persons: let him he accursed." "Whoever shall say that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the new' law, by their own proper ex opere opereto, but that faith in the divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be accursed."]

[The sacraments are the seal of the covenant of grace, both on the part of God and on the part of men. They are seals on the part of God by which He declares His gracious intention of bestowing His favors .upon us, and by which He binds Himself to fulfill His covenant engagements. While we look upon these symbols we feel our minds impressed with His condescension and love, our faith in His promises is confirmed, and the most devout affections toward Him are excited. On our part also they are seals by which we enter into the most solemn obligations with Him, according to the term of the covenant which He proposes to our acceptance. While, by the reception of these visible tokens, we profess to "lay hold upon the hope set before us," we seal the solemn contract, as with our own signature, that we will dedicate to God ourselves and our all - that he will be His alone and His forever." - WAKEFIELD, Chr. Th., p. 555

Dr. Pope harmonizes the signs and seals as follows: "As signs, they represent in action and by symbols, the great blessings of the covenant; as seals they are standing pledges of the divine fidelity in bestowing them on certain conditions, being the Spirit's instrument in aiding and strengthening the faith which they require, and in assuring to that faith the present bestowment of its object. - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III.]

Additions to the Sacraments. Protestantism admits but two sacraments - baptism and the Lord's Supper. All additions to these are regarded as pseudo-sacraments. In the early church, the term sacrament, translated as it was from the Greek word musthvrion, came to be applied to all things where the word mystery was used. The Greek church early adopted the seven mysteries, and the Roman church at a later time, the seven sacraments, but these are not identical. During the middle ages, the school men were divided as to the exact number, but the matter was finally settled by Peter Lombard, who fixed the number as seven, and states them in this order - baptism, the Lord's Supper, confirmation (of catechumens), ordination, extreme unction, auricular confession (penance), and wedlock. These were not established, however, as a dogma until the Council of Florence (A.D. 1442), and were later confirmed by the Council of Trent (A.D. 1547). The additional

five so-called sacraments were rejected by the Protestant churches, either on the ground that they were not appointed such by our Lord, or that they were not true symbols of inner grace

It is remarkable that the Greek and Roman communions, differing in so much besides, agree in accepting seven sacraments. Both base their acceptance on the authority of the church as interpreting the will of Christ, and vindicate them as enfolding and hedging round and sanctifying the whole of life at its several stages: Baptism is the sanctification of birth, confirmation of adult life, penance of the life of daily sin, the Eucharist of life itself, orders of legitimate authority, matrimony of the church's law of continuance and increase, and unction of the departure hence . . . .They were variously illustrated and defended by the scholastics. It was supposed that each was symbolized by or symbolized one of the seven cardinal virtues, faith, love, hope, wisdom, temperance, courage, righteousness; they were explained by the analogy of the spiritual life with the physical, as birth, growth into adult age, nourishment, healing, reproduction, instruction, death . . . . baptism, confirmation, and orders, were held to have an indelible character, never effaceable, and never to be repeated. - POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 305, 306 The creed of Pope Pius IV regards the Seven Sacraments as binding upon every member of the Roman Catholic church. It reads as follows: "I profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for everyone, to wit, baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of those, baptism, confirmation, and orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege."

BAPTISM

"We believe that Christian baptism is a sacrament signifying acceptance of the benefits of the atonement of Jesus Christ, to be administered to believers, as declarative of their faith in Jesus Christ as their Saviour, and full purpose of obedience in holiness and righteousness. "Baptism being the symbol of the New Testament, young children may be baptized, upon request of parents or guardians who shall give assurance for them of necessary Christian training

"Baptism may be administered by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, according to the choice of the applilcant" (Manual, ¶ 18)

Definitions of Baptism. The above statements from the Creed do not of course, give us a formal definition of baptism, for this is presupposed. Webster, however, defines baptism as "the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible Church of Christ." Dr. Summers defines it as "an ordinance instituted by Christ, consisting in the application of water by a Christian minister to suitable persons, for their initiation into the visible Church, and consecration to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Dr. Miley says that "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth." Dr. Pope defines it as "the rite ordained by our Lord to be the sign of admission into the Church, and the seal of union with himself and participation in the blessings of the Christian covenant."

[Dr. Dale points out that there "is one baptism - a thorough change of spiritual condition, assimilating the soul to the characteristic quality of the divine baptizer. (1) The baptism which John

preached was this one baptism in swelling bud; the Holy Ghost and Lamb of God within it, not yet unfolded. (2) The baptism which John administered was this one baptism in symbol, making manifest, Jesus the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin' of the world. (3) The baptism of Christianity is John's baptism unfolded, revealing the Lamb of God slain and the Holy Ghost sent. (4) The symbol baptism of Christianity is the perpetuation of the symbolism of the baptism John preached, and of the one baptism of inspiration.] The Institution of Christian Baptism. The practice of water baptism as a sacred ordinance was not first introduced by Christ, but was long familiar to the Jews as a religious rite. The precise time when it came into use is not known; but it was one of the rites by which proselytes were inducted into the Jewish religion, and thereby became partakers of the benefits of the covenant. The second step in the development of the ordinance was the baptism of John, which differed both from the proselyte baptism which preceded, and the Christian baptism which followed it. John's baptism was not merely a rite by which proselytes were brought into the Jewish religion, but was "unto repentance" as a preparation for Christ and the New Covenant. The third step in its development was Christian baptism, which differed from that of John in that it does not look forward to the coming of the Messiah, but confesses that Jesus as the Messiah has come, and also the Holy Spirit in whose dispensation it is to be administered. Christ was born under the Old Testament, and by His identification with a sinful race, was brought under its condemnation. And while He knew no sin, He nevertheless declared that it was necessary to be baptized with John's baptism in order to fulfill all righteousness. Christian baptism was instituted by our Lord in a direct injunction - baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. 28:19); an injunction which at once instituted the ordinance and prescribed the formula by which it was to be administered

Following the Day of Pentecost, the rite of baptism was observed in connection with conversion as an indispensable ordinance, there being no recorded instance of conversion with which it is not connected. The full formula does not always occur, however, although it may be said to be implied even where it is not directly stated. In Acts 2:38 St. Peter in his pentecostal sermon exhorts the believers to be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ, and they that gladly received his word were baptized (Acts 2:41); in Acts 8:16 it is stated that the Samaritans were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; while in Acts 10:48, St. Peter commands the household of Cornelius to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Likewise, also, the Ephesian disciples were baptized under the ministry of St. Paul (Acts 19:4-6). It will be noticed, also, that once the disciples were baptized, and later received the gift of the Holy Ghost after the imposition of hands; and once, at the house of Cornelius, the disciples received the Holy Ghost and were later baptized with water. In the later apostolic times baptism was regarded as having superseded the Jewish rite of circumcision. As a national custom it continued to exist, but to the church this was a matter of indifference for the rite was interpreted spiritually. Thus St. Paul says, In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead (Col. 2:11,12)

Development of the Doctrine in the Church. Great importance was very early attached to the rite of baptism - not as a sign and seal of all Christian blessings, but in that it was regarded as the means of conveyance, by which those blessings were imparted. In the later Ante-Nicene age, it may be said that baptism was universally regarded as the rite of admission to the church; and since it was

held that there could be no salvation apart from the church, baptism came to be associated with regeneration. At first it was looked upon solely as the completing act in the appropriation of Christianity the seal of positive adoption into the family 6f God. By the middle of the second century, however, it was regarded as procuring full remission of all past sins, and consequently we find it spoken of as "the instrument of .regeneration and illumination." The Fathers taught this doctrine, not in the modern sense of a grace bestowed, or a change wrought by means of regeneration, but that baptism was itself regeneration. Pseudo-Barnabas (100: 120) refers ~o "that baptism which leads to the remission of sins"; and adds, "we descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart." So also Hermas (100: 140) says, "They descend into the water dead, they arise alive." There were, however, some limitations which attached to the doctrine as it was held by such writers as Justin Martyr, Clement, Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian. They held to the earlier belief that baptism was efficacious only in connection with a right inner disposition and purpose on the part of the candidate. Origen says, "He who has ceased from his sins receives remission in baptism. But if anyone comes to the fount still harboring sin, he obtains no remission of his sins" (In. Luc. Hom. XXI). They held also, that baptism was not absolutely essential to the initiation of the new life in regeneration, but only as a completing process, as previously mentioned. Tertullian in speaking of baptism says, "The washing is a sealing of faith, which faith is begun and is commended by the faith of repentance. We are not washed in order that we may cease sinning, but because we have ceased, since in the heart we have been bathed already" (De. Poenit. VI)

[Too early, however, we see with respect to the administration, as well as to the conception of holy baptism, the commencement of a sad declension from the genuine simplicity of the Apostolic Age. Baptism is already in the first few centuries exalted in a manner which is sufficiently intelligible, but which must inevitably give rise to dogmatic misunderstanding. Baptism is regarded by Justin Martyr as supernatural illumination, and by a much-loved allusion the Christian Church is compared to fishes which are born in the water, and now swimming after their great fish are saved in and by that water (Tertullian, de Bapt 100:i.) . Cyprian asserts that the Holy Ghost was united in a supernatural manner with the water of baptism, even as at the creation He moved life-giving over the waters. Baptism was thus considered absolutely necessary to salvation; since it not only secured, but directly brought about, the remission of previous sins, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the pledge of a blessed immortality. Since sins committed after baptism were considered unpardonable, this holy act was by many postponed as; long as possible; while, when it was administered, it was illustrated by a number of emblematical ceremonies. Among these were, since the fourth century, the abjuration of the devil; the anointing with the mystical oil; the churchly consecration of the baptismal water; and after baptism a new anointing, the laying on of hands, the kiss of peace, the clothing in white robes, the carrying of burning candles, the administration of milk and honey, the change of name and such like. where should we end if we would name everything which in former or later days has been practiced with respect to sponsors, seasons for baptism, the baptism of bells, altars and so forth? Of much more importance is it that the entire idea of baptism, in connection with these different things, departed more and more from that of the apostles. By Augustine in particular, and since his time, infant baptism was brought into direct connection with the dogma of original sin, and considered as the means for purifying from it the child to be baptized; so that unbaptized children could not possibly be saved . . . . Thus here was gradually formed, after the later scholastic development of doctrine, the conception which the

Romish Church now recognizes as her own. To her baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, by means of water in the word, by which the grace of God is imparted in a supranatural manner to the person baptized for the forgiveness of all (inherited and actual) guilt, and for the sanctification of the life, and thus its administration is absolutely necessary. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, pp. 750, 751.] The Nicene and Post-Nicene periods witnessed a further crystallization of the earlier positions, and hence the idea universally prevailed that the divine life dwelt in the corporate body of the church, and could be transmitted to its members only through the instrumentality of the sacraments. Baptism, therefore, as the rite of initiation took on added importance, and came to be regarded as essential to salvation. Ambrose (100: 397) understood John 3:5 to mean that "None can ascend into the kingdom of heaven except by the sacrament of baptism; indeed, it excepts none, neither infant nor him that is prevented by any necessity." Augustine's position, like many other of his doctrines, was of a twofold character. From his earlier viewpoint, baptism was regarded as symbolical. It was the external rite of entrance into the church, but the inner spiritual union was effected only by the Spirit through faith. He held also, that in infant baptism, the sponsors merely assumed the responsibility for the Christian education of the child, their confession being before God, the confession of the child. His later viewpoint was widely different. He maintained that baptism carried with it not only the forgiveness of actual sins, but of original sin also. While he held that concupiscence still remained in the heart, he maintained that its complexion was changed. In the unbaptized it was sin; but in the baptized, it was a sickness, the perfect cure of which could be wrought only in heaven. His views concerning infant baptism also underwent a marked change. He held that the church furnished a substitutive faith, and the Holy Spirit implanted in the unconscious babe the germ of a new life; so that regeneration was wrought in the heart before the conscious conversion of the child. It was this idea of passive receptivity advanced by Augustine, which later became in the Roman Catholic Church, the basis of the opus operatum, against which Protestantism so violently reacted. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider the later development of this doctrine in (1) The Roman Catholic Church;

(2) The Lutheran Church; and (3) The Reformed Church

1. The Roman Catholic Doctrine. Since baptism was regarded as operating solely for the remission of past sins, there grew up very early a system of penance for sins committed after baptism. Later this became a separate ordinance or sacrament. Likewise, also, it had been a custom from earliest times to accompany baptism with the laying on of hands in imitation of the apostles (Cf. Acts 8:17; 19:6), and also to anoint with oil as a symbol of the anointing from the Holy One (I John 2:20-27). This came to be known as "Confirmation" and in the fourth century was universally recognized as a separate sacrament. Later it was insisted that the validity of the rite depended upon the consecrating of the oil by a bishop; and gradually in the West, the whole ceremony came to be regarded as the peculiar function of the bishop. The schoolmen of the Middle Ages did little more than to elaborate the positions advanced by Augustine. They distinguished between the material and the form of baptism - the material being the water, and the form being the formula by which it was administered. St. Thomas especially followed Augustine in maintaining that baptism impressed an indelible character upon the soul through regeneration. On the negative side, baptism was held to cleanse from all sin, actual and original; and on the positive side to incorporate the recipient with Christ, and bestow all the gifts and graces of the new life. On the question of infant baptism also, he held with Augustine that babes do not believe through their

own act, but through the faith of the church in which they are baptized. This faith comes from the Holy Spirit as the inner unity of the church, who makes equal distribution of her spiritual life, so that infants share in it potentially, though not then in the exertion of its spiritual power. Confirmation also was believed to confer "an indelible character," which, however, presupposed that imparted in baptism. The doctrinal decisions and ritualistic prac tices which had long been current in the Roman Catholic Church, were confirmed by the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (1545-1563)

[The effect of the baptism proper was affirmed (as by Augustine) to consist in absolution from the guilt of all foregoing sin, original and actual, and in such an impartation of grace as modifies, but does not wholly eradicate, the corruption or concupiscence in the moral nature. . . . . As regards the grace which ameliorates the inward corruption, and works a renewal in the heart, it was apprehended by different writers that this might be experienced in virtue of repentance and faith anterior to baptism. It was maintained, however, that in such case there was still ample occasion for baptism, since there was left a certain obligation to punishment, and baptism could remove this as well as confer an increase of positive grace. - Sheldon, History of Christian Doctrine, I, p.392

Bellarmine summarizes the teachings of the church on baptism as follows: (1) Infants have no actual faith; (2) Nor spiritual manifestations; (3) They are justified absolutely without faith; (4) The habitus of faith, love and hope, is imparted to them; (5) They practically believe, partly because baptism itself is an actual confession of faith, and partly because of the vicarious faith of others. Habitus is defined as the condition which includes in itself at the same time a power to act. It may be infused, and then it is the condition of all corresponding activity; or acquired, and then it is the result of actions already performed (Cf. Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia, Art. Baptism).]

[In the middle of the eighth century, an ignorant priest in Bavaria was accustomed in place of the regular baptismal formula which he intended to use, to utter a jargon of Latin words without intelligible meaning. Pope Zachary, to whom the case was referred, acknowledged the validity of these baptisms on the ground of the priest’s intention. from this decision two startling conclusions were drawn by some later Roman Catholic divines: That, as the validity of a sacrament depends on the intention of the administrator, that is no sacrament, however ritually correct, in which the intention is lacking; and that, inasmuch as sectaries and heretics intend to baptize into the true church, the Roman Church, which is the only true church, has rightful jurisdiction over all persons so baptized. - CRIPPEN, History of Christian Doctrine, pp. 190, 191

Baptism, together with the other two sacraments incapable of repetition, namely, confirmation and holy orders, was regarded as giving a certain indelible signature, or character to the recipient. "In these (three sacraments)," says Bonaventura "a triple character is impressed, which is not obliterated. In accordance with the first arises the distinction of believers from unbelievers m accordance with the second the distinction of the strong from the infirm and the weak; and in accordance with the third, the distinction of the clergy from the laity." - SHELDON, History of Christian Doctrine, I, p. 393 In the third century heretical baptism was a matter of earnest controversy. Cyprian denied its validity, on ecclesiastical principles, but the authority of the Church at Rome prevailed resting its plea on the ground of the objective value of the rite, by whosoever performed in the name of the Holy Trinity. - POPE, Comp. Chr. Th., III, p. 319

St. Boniface (755), "The apostle of Germany," introduced the practice of baptizing conditionally those whose former baptism was doubtful." - Crippen, History of Christian Doctrine, p. 191

2. The Lutheran Doctrine. The Protestant teaching, both Lutheran and Reformed, had for its starting point a valid objection to the ex opere operato of the Roman Catholic Church, or the doctrine that the mere administration of baptism saved the baptized person. The Reformers also contended that the "concupiscence remained after original sin had been pardoned in baptism, was really sin." They insisted that faith was necessary on the part of the recipient in order to make the ceremony a means of grace. Luther's teaching on this subject is usually traced through three stages: (1) Following Augustine's earlier position, he distinguished between the sign and the thing signified, and between them put faith as the means by which men realized the meaning of the sign. The sign is the outward baptism with water, the seal is the new birth, and faith makes real this spiritual baptism. (2) In the second stage, Luther considered baptism as a sign and a seal, to which God added His Word as a promise of divine strength and comfort. The chief thing, however, is the promise, and those who believe it and are baptized will be saved. (3) In the third stage, he more closely identified the water and the Word, teaching that to the sign and the Word, were added the command and ordinance of God; and that the former were given together in such a manner that the water of baptism is converted into the divine element. This position, however, does not appear in the Confessions except in the German original of the Schmalkald Articles. The Augsburg Confession represents Melanchthon's position, that baptism is a perpetual witness that the forgiveness of sins and the renewing of the Holy Ghost belong especially to the baptized the operating cause of this condition being faith. For these reasons Lutheranism has always held a high theory of the sacraments, and ordinarily regards baptism as essential to salvation, since through it by divine appointment, the blessings of remission and regeneration are conveyed by means of faith and the Word

[The Augsburg Confession (1530) Article ix Is as follows: "Baptism is necessary to salvation, by (it) the grace of God is offered; and children are to he baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor."]

3. The Reformed Doctrine. The Reformed Churches started with the idea that salvation is not conditioned upon any external work or ceremony, and therefore saved themselves from much confusion in the development of their doctrine. To them, baptism was but the initiatory sign which marks one as the follower of Christ. Zwingli attributed no sanctifying power to bap tism per se, but only to faith. Thus he did away entirely with the mystery, and viewed the sacraments partly as acts of confession, and partly as commemorative signs. Calvin adopted the principles of Zwingli, but in his development of them, more nearly approached the Lutheran conception. To him, they were not merely memorials, but also pledges of grace that is, they were accompanied with an invisible gift of grace. Since Lutheranism, especially the school of Melanchthon, also regarded the sacraments as pledges of grace, a point of union was formed between Calvin and Luther. Bishop Martensen who takes his stand upon the point of agreement between Luther and Calvin, makes it clear that there is after all an essential difference between them arising out of the different conceptions of predestination. "According to Calvin's doctrine," he says, "there is no real connection between predestination and baptism. The twofold election has been settled from eternity; and baptism, therefore, can be of no avail to those who have not been elected in the hidden decrees of God. Lutheran predestination, on the other hand, obtains its true expression in baptism. For baptism,

according to Luther, is the revelation of the consoling decree that 'God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.' We do not need in agony to inquire after a hidden decree, according to which we are either elected or rejected; for every one may read in his baptism his election to blessedness" (MARTENSEN, Christian Dogmatics, p.424). We may say then, that in general, less stress was laid upon the necessity of baptism in the Reformed Church than in the Lutheran; and that the Reformed position, through the medium of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church, became essentially the teaching of Methodism

[The Reformed position is expressed in the Second Helvetic Confession (1566) as follows: "Baptism is instituted by Christ. There is only one baptism in the church: it lasts for life, and is a perpetual seal of our adoption. To be baptized in the name of Christ Is to be enrolled, initiated, and received into the covenant, into the family and the inheritance of the sons of God, that, cleansed from our sins by the blood of Christ, we may lead a new and innocent life. we are internally regenerated by the Holy Ghost; but we receive publicly the seal of these blessings by baptism, in which the grace of God inwardly and invisibly cleanses the soul, and we confess our faith, and pledge obedience to God. Children of believers should be baptized; for to children belongs the kingdom of God: why, then, should not the sign of the covenant be given to them?" The Belgic Confession (1561 was revised and approved by the Synod of Dort (1619). The statement Is as follows: "Baptism is the substitute for circumcision: by it we are received into the Church of God. As water washeth away the fiith of the body when poured upon it, as Is seen on the body of the baptized when sprinkled upon him, so doth the blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, internally sprinkle the soul, cleanse it from its sins, and regenerate us from children of wrath unto children of God. Not that this Is effected by the external water, but by the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son of God. Baptism avails us through the whole course of our life. Infants of believers ought to be baptized, and sealed with the sign of the covenant. Christ shed His blood no less for the washing of the children of the faithful than for adult persons; and therefore they ought to receive the sign and sacrament of that which Christ hath done for them. Moreover, what circumcision was to the Jews, that baptism Is to our children. And for this reason Paul calls baptism the circumcision of Christ.]

4. Later Doctrinal Developments. (1) The Anglican doctrine as expressed in the Thirty-Nine Articles is a combination of the Lutheran and Reformed creeds. There are, however, two views as to the interpretation of the formularies - those who are more Lutheran and sacramentarian, and therefore suppose that the soul is renewed by an infusion of life; and those who more nearly approach the Reformed position of a change in . relations only. (2) The Baptist doctrine differs from Christianity at large on two points - it maintains that baptism as a rite, belongs solely to adults as an expression of their faith ; and that the only valid mode of baptism is immersion in water. (3) The Methodists hold to a mediating position. On the one hand, they repudiate the Socinian view that baptism is merely a sign or badge of a Christian profession; and on the other, they reject the rite as an impressive ritualistic emblem of the washing away of sin. They hold that baptism is both a sign and a seal, and therefore is not without its accompanying grace to the recipient who complies with the conditions of the covenant. This position will be given further consideration in our discussion of the meaning, mode and subjects of baptism

[The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), Cap. XXVIII is as follows: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party

baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, or regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life. By the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age, or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time."

Dr. Charles Hodge sums up the Reformed doctrine in three points: (1) 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 the 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: 1. An unmerited gift, such as the remission of sin. 2. The supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit. 3. The subjective effects of that influence on the soul. Faith, hope, and charity, for example, are graces. (2) The second point in the Reformed doctrine on the sacraments concerning 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 the 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, nor in the office of the person by whom they are administered . . . . nor on the character of the administrator in the sight of God; nor upon his intention; that is, his purpose to render them effectual 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 . . . . 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. (3) 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. - Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, pp. 499, 500.] The Nature and Design of Christian Baptism. From the history of baptism, and the scriptural statements concerning it, we are able to arrive at the nature and design of the ordinance. It is a solemn sacrament 'signifying the acceptance of the benefits of the atonement of Jesus Christ" ; and it is a pledge with "full purpose of obedience in holiness and righteousness." From the divine standpoint, it is also a pledge of the bestowal of grace. Dr. Wakefield defines baptism and indicates its four essential elements as follows: "Baptism, as a Christian ordinance, may be defined to be the application of pure water to a proper subject, by a lawful administrator, in the name of the sacred Trinity. (1) It is the application of pure water, as the language of the apostle clearly indicates, Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water (Heb. 10:22). (2) The water must be applied to a proper subject; not to an inanimate object, but to a human being under certain circumstances. (3) The ordinance must be performed by a lawful administrator; and as the commission to baptize was given to ministers of the gospel alone, no others have a right to perform this office. And, (4) It must be administered in the name of the sacred Trinity, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. 28:19, 20). "Two things concerning baptism stand out clearly here (1) Its universal and

perpetual obligation; and (2) Its sacramental import

[The Heidelberg Catechism defines the sacraments as follows: "They are holy, visible signs and seals, ordained by God for this end, that He may more fully declare and seal by them the promise of His gospel unto us: to wit, that not only unto all believers in general, but unto each of them in particular, He freely giveth remission of sins and life eternal, upon the account of that only sacrifice of Christ, which He accomplished upon the cross." The Church of England in Article xxv has this expression: "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be 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." The Protestant Episcopal Church, Article XXVII is as follows: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." The Methodist Episcopal Church, Article XVII has this statement concerning baptism: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church."]

["What is the Lutheran doctrine on this subject? The Lutherans agreed with the Reformed churches in repudiating the Romish doctrine of the magical efficacy of this sacrament as an OPUS operatum. But they went much farther than the Reformed in maintaining the sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified. Luther in his Smaller Catechism says baptism "worketh forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe"; . . . . that "it is not the water indeed which produces these effects, but the Word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith, which relies on the Word of God connected with the water. For the water without the Word is simply water and no baptism. But when connected with the Word of God, it is a baptism, that is, a gracious water of life, and a washing of regeneration

"What was the Zwinglian doctrine on this subject?" That the outward rite is a mere sign, an objective representation, having no efficacy whatever beyond that due to the truth represented

"What is the doctrine of the Reformed churches . . . . on this subject?" They all agree (1) that the zwinglian view is incomplete. (2) That besides being a sign, baptism is also the seal of grace, and, therefore, a present and sensible conveyance and confirmation of grace to the believer who has the witness in himself, and to all the elect a seal of the benefits of the covenant of grace, to be sooner or later conveyed in God's good time. (3) That this conveyance is effected, not by the bare operation of the sacramental action, but by the Holy Ghost, which accompanies His own ordinance. (4) That in the adult the reception of the blessing depends upon faith. (5) That the benefits conveyed by baptism are not peculiar to it, but belong to the believer before or without baptism, and are often renewed to him afterward. - A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology, pp. 500, 501 That our Lord intended baptism to be the initiating ordinance into His visible Church is evident

from the fact that He connected it, by positive injunctions with that grand commission which He gave to His apostles to "preach the gospel to every creature." This initiatory character of baptism is alluded to by the apostle when he inquires of the Corinthians, "were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" (I Cor. 1:13). Here he evidently assumes the principle that if he had baptized any persons in his own name, he would thereby have represented himself as the head of a sect. But as they were baptized in the name of Christ, they were thereby united to His Church by this initiatory rite." - Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 560.]

1. The universal and perpetual obligation of baptism is indicated by two things - Our Lord's express command (Matt. 28:19, 20); and the apostolic practice (Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12). Baptism is a solemn ordinance which should be strictly observed. It is clearly evident from the above scriptures, that the apostles administered baptism immediately upon profession of faith; and if it was deemed necessary then, it can be no less so now. But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women (Acts 8:12). Baptism is an ordinance of perpetual obligation. Some have argued that because Christ baptizes with the Holy Ghost, water baptism is no longer necessary. That it superseded John's baptism, is doubtless true; but we have already indicated that there is a wide distinction between John's baptism with water as a preparatory rite, and Christ's baptism with water as a sign and seal of an inward work of grace. Nor does the text (Heb. 9:10) which refers to "divers washings, and carnal ordinances" present any argument against Christian baptism. The Christians rejected these Jewish rites, it must be admitted, but water baptism was administered by the apostles after the opening of the Christian dispensation, which clearly indicates that baptism was not included in the rites of which the apostle here speaks. Baptism being an initiatory rite is to be administered only once. It establishes a permanent covenant and is not therefore to be repeated. The baptized one may fall away, but the gracious promise of God still stands. It cannot be made of none effect. If he falls away, he needs to repent . and believe, and the Father stands ready to restore him, but he does not need to be rebaptized, As an initiatory rite also, baptism is the visible act by which members are admitted into the Church of Christ as a visible society. This has been the faith of the church from the beginning, and to deny it is to deny that the church has any initiatory ordinance [WATSON ON BAPTISM AS A SIGN AND A SEAL

Baptism as a sign of the new covenant, corresponds to circumcision. Like that, its administration is a constant exhibition of the placability of God to man; like that, it is the initiatory rite into, a covenant which promises pardon and salvation to a true faith, of which it is the outward profession; like that, it is the symbol of regeneration, the washing away of sin, and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost"; and like that, it is a sign of peculiar relation to God, Christians becoming, in consequence, "a chosen generation a peculiar people" - His Church on earth, as distinguished from "'the world." "For we," says the apostle, "are the circumcision," we are that peculiar people, and Church now, which was formerly distinguished by the sign of circumcision, "which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." But as a sign, baptism is more than circumcision; because the covenant, under its new dispensation, was not only to offer pardon upon believing, deliverance from the bondage of fleshly appetites, and a peculiar spiritual relation to God, all of which we find under the Old Testament; but also to bestow the Holy Spirit, in His fullness, upon all believers; and of this effusion of "the power from on high," baptism was made the visible sign; and perhaps for this, among some other obvious reasons, was substituted for

circumcision, because baptism by effusion or pouring, was the natural symbol of this heavenly gilt. The baptism of John had special reference to the Holy Spirit, which was not to be administered by bin', but by Christ, who could come after bin'. This gift honored John's baptism only once, in the extraordinary case of our Lord; but it constantly followed upon the baptism administered by the apostles of Christ, after His ascension, and the sending of the promise of the Father . . . For this reason Christianity is called "the ministration of the Spirit"; and so far is this from being confined to the miraculous gifts often bestowed in the first age of the Church, that is, it made the standing and prominent test of true Christianity to "be led by the Spirit" As a seal also, or confirming sign, baptism answers to circumcision. By the institution of the latter, a pledge was constantly given by the Almighty to bestow the spiritual blessings of which the rite was the sign, pardon and sanctification through faith in the future seed of Abraham; peculiar relation to Him as "his people" and the heavenly inheritance. Of the same blessings, baptism is also the pledge, along with that higher dispensation of the Holy Spirit which it especially represents in emblem. Thus in baptism there is on the part of God a visible assurance of His faithfulness to His covenant stipulations. But it is our seal also; it is that by which we make ourselves parties to the covenant, and thus "set to our seal, that God is true." In this respect it binds us, as, in the other, God mercifully binds Himself for the stronger assurance of our faith. We pledge ourselves to trust wholly in Christ for pardon and salvation, and to obey His laws; "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"; in that rite also we undergo a mystical death unto sin, a mystical separation from the world, which St. Paul calls "being buried with Christ in [or by] baptism"; and a mystical resurrection to newness of life, through Christ's resurrection from the dead If we bring all of these considerations together, we shall find it sufficiently established that baptism is the sign and seal of the covenant of grace under its perfected dispensation. - Watson, Theological Institutes, II, pp. 626-628.]

2. The sacramental import of baptism is to be found in the fact that it is a sign and seal of the covenant of grave. (1) As a sign, it represents spiritual purification. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you (Ezek. 36:25, 26). So also our Lord declares, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (John 3:5). Here, evidently, the sign is the outward baptism with water, and the thing signified is the inner work of the Spirit. St. Paul refers to the twofold work of the Spirit - the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Titus 3:5). As a sign, therefore, baptism not only symbolizes regeneration, but also the baptism with the Holy Spirit which is the peculiar event of this dispensation. Accordingly the pouring out of the "Spirit upon all flesh," as prophesied by Joel, is in the New Testament called a baptism. It is to this that John the Baptist referred when he said, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire (Matt. 3:11); and to which Jesus himself referred when He said to His disciples, Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence (Acts 1:5). (2) Baptism is also a seal. "It is," says Dr. Shedd, "like the official seal on a legal document. The presence of the seal inspires confidence in the genuineness of the title-deed ; the absence of the seal awakens doubt and fears. Nevertheless, it is the title-deed, not the seal, that conveys the title" (Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 574). On God's part, the seal is the visible assurance of faithfulness to His covenant - a perpetual ceremony to which His people may ever appeal. On man S part, the seal is that act by which he binds himself as a party to the covenant, and pledges himself to faithfulness in all things ; and it is also the sign of a completed transaction -

the ratification of a final agreement The Mode of Baptism. This subject has been one of long and serious controversy. From the days of the Anabaptists of Reformation times, and the Baptists of a later day, it has been asserted that immersion is the only valid mode of baptism; while others, the great body of the Church in all ages, have ever maintained that it may be administered by sprinkling or pouring, or to use a term which includes both, by effusion. The question is not, whether immersion is a valid baptism - this has never been denied, but whether it is the only form of baptism authorized by the Scriptures. Our position as a church is clear, "Baptism may be administered by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, according to the choice of the applicant." It is sufficient, therefore, to merely indicate briefly the arguments which are offered for and against immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. The arguments most frequently urged in favor of immersion are (1) The meaning of the word baptivzw, to baptize; (2) The circumstances which attended many of the recorded baptisms; and (3) the symbol of the burial. The church generally has regarded these propositions as insufficient to establish a belief in immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. Without any effort at controversy we may summarize the arguments as follows, referring the student for further study to the more elaborate treatises upon this subject

1. It is contended that the word baptivzw always means to dip or to plunge. It is a fact, however, beyond all controversy, that the majority of lexicographers give it a broader meaning; and that the classical writers use it to express a variety of ideas. Dr. Dale states that baptivzw is a derivative, modifying the meaning of its root baptw. The word means (1) to do a definite act, to dip; (2) to effect a definite change of condition, to dye; (3) to effect a thorough change of condition by assimilating quality or influence, without color, to temper, to steep, to imbue. The classical writers, Plutarch, Hippocrates and Aristotle frequently used the word to signify nothing more than to moisten, tinge and sprinkle. That the word employed to designate Christian baptism is used in the Scriptures other than in the sense of immersion is very evident. Except they [baptize] wash, they eat not (Mark 7:4); which as the previous verse indicates refers to the washing of the hands. The Pharisee (Luke 11:38) marveled that Jesus sat down to eat without first baptizing or washing, as was the custom of the Pharisees. St. Paul declares that the Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and the sea (I Cor. 10:i, 2), using the word baptize as referring to the passing between the waters, overshadowed by the cloud. That the word baptivzw is used in a broader meaning than that of to dip or to plunge, is a sufficient refutation of the claim that immersion is the only valid mode of baptism

[The primary word Bavptw occurs four times in the New Testament (Luke 16:24; John 13:26; Rev. 19:13), but never in connection with the subject of Christian baptism. Its classical meaning was, (1) to dip; (2) to dye. - A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology, p.483 The early document known as "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" which dates back to the early part of the second century, makes it clear that either immersion or pouring was regarded as valid baptism at that early date. "And touching baptism thus baptize: having flrst declared all of these things, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou have not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But If thou have neither, pour on the head water thrice in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit" (Section VII). In the spread of the gospel to colder climes, baptism by sprinkling or pouring naturally commended itself as more practicable. In tbe case of the sick, baptism by immersion in most cases would be impossible

Dr. Owen says that baptizw signifies to wash, as instances out of all authors may be given"; and also, "No one place can be given in the Scriptures wherein baptizw doth necessarily signify, either to dip or to plunge." "In this sense," he continues, "as it expresseth baptism, it denotes to wash only, and not to dip at all, for so it is expounded" (Titus 3:5ff) Owen, Works, Vol. XXI, p. 557.]

2. A study of the circumstances attending the recorded baptisms in the Scriptures, makes it clear also, that baptism does not always signify immersion. The cases usually cited in proof of immersion are the following: Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan (Matt. 3:5, 6); and Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water (Matt. 3:16); and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip (Acts 8:38, 39). Here the whole strength of the argument depends upon the meaning of the original Greek prepositions, en (en), eis (ei"), ek (ek), and apo (apo). It is well known that these prepositions are used in the Scriptures with different meanings, thus apo means from, far more frequently than it does out of; that ek also means from as well as out of; and that eis means to or unto as well as into. From the meaning of the original words, therefore it would be as faithful a translation as the present one to say that Jesus came up straightway from the water; and that Philip and the eunuch went down to the water, and came up from the water. Schleusner in his celebrated lexicon points out that en has thirty-six distinct meanings; eis, twenty-six; ek, twenty-four; and apo, twenty. It is evident, therefore, that a true interpretation can be found only in a study of the historical circumstances and usages, and not necessarily in a literal interpretation of the prepositions. Here we may refer briefly to such scriptures as the baptism of Saul, where it is stated that he arose and was baptized (an) literally, standing up he was baptized (Acts 9:18); the baptism of Cornelius and his friends, where it is evident that they were baptized in the house where the Holy Spirit had fallen upon them, and further, it is implied in the words, "Can any man forbid water," that is, forbid water to be brought in order to the baptism (Acts 10:47, 48); and lastly, the baptism of the jailer and his household at night, which must necessarily have taken place in the jail, and could not therefore with certainty be said to be immersion (Acts 16:31-33)

[Both Dr. Wakefield and Mr. Watson point out other scriptures which are sometimes used in an attempt to support a belief in immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. (1) "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing" (John 1:28). Here it is only necessary to remark that the persons whom John baptized in Bethabara could not have been baptized in Jordan, for Bethabara was beyond Jordan. This receives additional support from the text which states that Jesus "went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode" (John 10:40). It is impossible to escape the conclusion that John at first baptized in Bethabara beyond Jordan, and not in its waters. (2) Another passage cited is this: "And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there" (John 3:23). Here it is assumed that the "much water" spoken of was required only for baptism The meaning of the terms employed in the original is in accordance with those historical facts which show that there was no lake or other body of water near Aenon. "Aenon is derived from the Hebrew ayin, the eye, and signifies, according to Parkhurst and others, a well, a fountain, or a spring of water. In the Greek phrase hudata polla, which is rendered 'much water,' but 'many waters'; conveying the idea of many fountains or springs, rather than a great quantity of water.

Thus Matthew 13:3, "And he spake [polls, not much, but] many things unto them'; Mark 1:34, 'And cast out [polls] many devils'; John 8:26, 'I have [polls] many things to say'; Acts 2:43, 'And [polls] many wonders and signs were done'; Revelation 1:15, 'And his voice as the sound of [nudaton pollon] many waters'." We are therefore safe in the conclusion that Aenon did not contain a large quantity of water, and that it was insufficient for the numerous immersions which are supposed to have taken place in it - WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, pp. 579, 580.]

[Baptist interpreters insist that the Bible teaches that the outward sign in this sacrament, being the immersion of the whole body in water, is an emblem both of purification and of our death, burial and resurrection with Christ we object to this interpretation, (1) in neither of these passages (Rom. 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12) does Paul say that our baptism In water is an emblem of our burial with Christ. He is evidently speaking of that spiritual baptism of which water baptism is the emblem; by which spiritual baptism we are caused to die unto am, and live unto holiness, in which death and new life we are conformed unto the death and resurrection of Christ (2) To be baptized into his death is a phrase perfectly analogous to baptism unto repentance (Matt. 3:11), and for the remission of sins (Mark 1:4), and into one body (I Cor. 12:13), that is, In order that, or te the effect that we participate in the benefits of his death. (3) The Baptist interpretation involves an utter confusion in reference to the emblem. Do they mean that the outward sign of immersion is an emblem of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, or of the spiritual death, burial and resurrection of the believer? But the point of comparison in the passages themselves is plainly "not between our baptism and the burial and resurrection of Christ, but between our death to sin and rising to holiness, and the death and resurrection of the Redeemer." (4) Baptists agree with us that baptism with water Is an emblem of spiritual purification, that is, regeneration, but insist that it is also an emblem (in the mode of immersion) of the death of the believer to sin and his new life of holiness. But what is the distinction between regeneration and a death unto sin, and life in holiness? (5) Baptists agree with us that water baptism is an emblem of purification. But surely it is impossible that the same action should at the same time be an emblem of a washing, and of a burial and a resurrection. One idea may be associated with the other in consequence of their spiritual relations, but it is impossible that the same visible sign should be emblematical of both. (6) Our union with Christ through the Spirit, and the spiritual consequences thereof, are illustrated in Scripture by many various figures, for example, the substitution of a heart of flesh for a heart of stone (Ezek. 36:26); the building of a house (Eph. 2:22); the ingrafting of a limb into a vine (John 15:5); the putting off of filthy garments, and the putting on of clean (Eph. 4:22-24); as a spiritual death, burial and resurrection, and as being planted in the likeness of His death (Rom. 6:3-5); as the application of a cleansing element to the body (Ezek. 36:25). Now baptism with water represents all these, because it is an emblem of spiritual regeneration, of which all these are analogical illustrations. Yet it would be absurd to regard water baptism as a literal emblem of all these, and our Baptist brethren have no scriptural warrant for assuming that the outward sign in this sacrament is an emblem of the one analogy more than of the other. - A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology, pp. 482, 483.]

3. The symbolism of the burial has been a favorite argument with the immersionists, and is based upon such scriptures as, Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:4); and again, Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with

him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead (Col. 2:12). The argument for immersion rests entirely upon the words "buried with him 'by' or 'in' baptism"; and it is assumed that the apostle is here speaking of water baptism, and, therefore, defining the mode. That these texts have no reference either to water baptism or to its mode is ably and concisely stated by Dr. Wakefield, as follows: "We conclude, therefore, from a very careful examination of the whole subject, that in the passages under consideration the apostle has no allusion whatever either to water baptism itself or to its mode ; but that he is speaking of a spiritual death, burial, resurrection, and life. He inquires, Romans 6:2, How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? and in this question he gives us a key to the whole passage dead to sin. And, therefore, being thus dead to sin, we should not continue in sin. Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? that is, so many of us as were united to Jesus Christ by the baptism of the Holy Spirit were made partakers of the benefits of His death. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body (I Cor. 12:13). This moral change by which believers are united to Christ, and constituted living branches in 'the True Vine,' includes in it a death to sin, a burial of 'the old man,' and a resurrection from spiritual death to a new life of holy obedience. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that is, as Christ was buried in the grave, so we, by the baptism with the Spirit, are brought into this state of death to sin, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Indeed, the .whole argument of the apostle shows that he is speaking of the work of the Spirit, and not of water baptism. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall also be in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin (Rom. 6:5, 6). And again, Likewise reckon ye yourselves also to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Rom. 6:11). Can water baptism accomplish the moral change of which the apostle is here speaking? Surely no one will affirm this, unless he has adopted the wild notion that 'immersion is the regenerating act'" (Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 582)

[Mr. Watson in his "Institutes" gives the following argument against immersion as the only mode of baptism. "Although the manner In which the element of water is applied in baptism is but a circumstance of this sacrament, it will not be a matter of surprise to those who reflect upon the proneness of men to attach undue importance to comparative trifles, that it has produced so much controversy. The question as to the proper subjects of baptism is one which Is to be respected for its importance; that as to the mode has occupied more time, and excited greater feeling, than it is in any view entitled to. It cannot, however, be passed over, because the advocates for immersion are often very troublesome to their fellow Christians, unsettle weak minds, and sometimes, perhaps, from their zeal for a form, endanger their own spirituality. Against the doctrine that the only legitimate mode of baptizing is by immersion, we may observe that there are several strong presumptions. (1) It is not probable, that if immersion were the only allowable mode of baptism, it should not have been expressly enjoined. (2) It is not probable, that in a religion designed to be universal, a mode of administering this ordinance should be obligatory, the practice of which is ill adapted to so many climates, whether it would either be exceedingly harsh to immerse the candidates, male and female, strong and feeble, in water; or, in some places, as in the higher latitudes, for a greater part of the year, impossible. Even if immersion were in fact the original mode of baptizing in the name of Christ, these reasons make it improbable that no accommodation

of the form should take place, without vitiating the ordinance. (3) It is still more unlikely, that in a religion of mercy there should be no consideration of health and life in the administration of an ordinance of salvation, since it is certain that in countries where cold bathing is little practiced, great risk of both is often incurred, especially in the case of women and delicate persons of either sex, and fatal effects do sometimes occur. (4) It is also exceedingly improbable, that in such circumstances of climate the shivering, the sobbing, and bodily uneasiness produced, should distract the thoughts, and unfit the mind for a collected performance of a religious and solemn devotion. (5) It is highly improbable that the three thousand converts at Pentecost, who, let it be observed, were baptized on the same day, were all baptized by immersion; or that the jailer and 'all his' were baptized in the same manner in the night. Finally it is most of all improbable, that a religion like the Christian, so scrupulously delicate, should have enjoined the immersion of women by men, and in the presence of men. In an after age, when immersion came into fashion, baptistries, and rooms for women, and changes of garments, and other auxiliaries to this practices came into use, because they were found necessary to decency; but there could be no such conveniences in the first instance; and accordingly we read of none." - WATSON, Theological Institutes, II, pp. 647ff

Those who suppose the apostle to speak of water baptism as a burial, and consequently by immersion, must admit the following consequences: (1) That it is impossible for persons to be dipped or plunged "into Jesus Christ," or "into his death." (2) That St. Paul and those to whom he wrote were at that very time living in the watery grave; for he does not say, we were buried, but "we were buried with him by baptism." Is it possible for a person to be buried and exhumed at the same time? (3) That if the burial of which the apostle speaks is a baptism, then one baptism is made to perform another baptism; for "we are buried with him by baptism"; or in other words, and in Baptist language, we are immersed by an immersion. Thus, one immersion is made to perform the other. (4) That the term death is only another name for water; for the text says, "we are buried by baptism into death." Is there no difference between water and death? (5) That our Lord himself is immersed with each one of His disciples, and rises with Him from the watery grave; for "we are buried with him by baptism," and "are risen with him." And, (6) That those who are immersed rise from the water by an exercise of faith, and not by the arm of the administrator; for the apostle says, that in baptism we are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God." If these consequences are absurd and ridiculous, so is that theory of which they are the legitimate results. - Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 581

Two phrases of Scripture are regarded by the immersionist as quite conclusive of his theory: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death"; and "Buried with him by baptism." These phrases must be interpreted in the light of the passages to which they belong; for only in this manner can their true meaning be reached. In each passage the ruling idea is the moral change wrought in the attainment of salvation. This change is expressed as a death, a crucifixion, a burial, a resurrection. There is in these forms of expression, and for the purpose of illustration, a comparison with the crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. what then is the part of the baptism in the expression of this moral change? Simply that of a sign; nothing else. There is then no reference to the mode of baptism. Nor is there in either phrase, the slightest proof of immersion. Miley, SystematicTheology, II, p. 404.] The Subjects of Baptism. All who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and have been regenerated, are proper subjects for Christian baptism. This is

established by the direct statement of Jesus Christ, He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved (Mark 16: 16). The same fact is also taught by the apostle Peter, Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord (Acts 10: 47, 48). Dr. Wakefield points out that "this passage proves, in addition to the object for which it is here adduced, that men may receive the Holy Ghost, and, consequently, may be regenerated without being baptized. Therefore baptism cannot be the regenerating act, as is confidently affirmed by some" (WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 562). But in addition to adult believers the church has always held that the children of believers are, likewise, the proper subjects of baptism; nor does it deny baptism to the children of unbelievers. This position was called in question by the Anabaptists of the Reformation period, and their followers still object to it. We do not think the controversy demands any extended treatment, since our church in harmony with the orthodox belief of both ancient and modern times, definitely states its position in the creed. We shall consider briefly the following subjects: (1) The History of Infant Baptism; (2) Objections to Infant Baptism; (3) Arguments in favor of it from the Abrahamic Covenant

1. The history of infant baptism reveals the fact that the practice has existed in the church from the earliest times. Justin Martyr, who was born about the time of St. John’s death, states that "there were many of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made disciples of Christ in their infancy," doubtless referring to baptism. Origen (185-254) expressly declares that "the church hath received the tradition from the apostles, that baptism ought to be administered to infants." About the middle of the third century, Fidus, an African bishop, directed a question to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, as to whether or not the baptism of infants might take place before the eighth day. Cyprian placed this before the synod in 254 A.D., at which sixty-six bishops were present, and it was unanimously decided that it was not necessary to defer baptism until the eighth day. Augustine in the fourth century says that "the whole church practices infant baptism. It was not instituted by councils, but was always in use"; and again, "I do not remember to have read of any person, whether Catholic or heretic, who maintained that baptism ought to be denied to infants." It seems impossible to account for these historical statements unless the practice of infant baptism has come down to us from the days of the apostles

[Dr. Wall sums up the history as follows: "First, during the first four hundred years from the formation of the Christian Church Tertullian only urged the delay of baptism to infants, and that only in some cases; and Gregory only delayed it, perhaps, to his own children. But neither any society of men nor any individual, denied the lawfulness of baptizing infants. Secondly, in the next seven hundred years there was not a society nor an individual who even pleaded for this delay; much less any who denied the right or the duty of infant baptism. Thirdly, in the year eleven hundred and twenty, one sect of the Waldenses denied baptism to infants, because they supposed them to he incapable of salvation. But the main body of that people rejected the opinion as heretical, and the sect which held it soon came to nothing. Fourthly, the next appearance of this opinion was in the year fifteen hundred and twenty-two" (Cf. WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 573)

Pelagius, the opponent of Augustine, was reported to have rejected infant baptism, but he denied the charge in strong terms. He says, "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants. I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic who denied baptism to infants."]

2. The objections to infant baptism are usually made on the following grounds: (1) That the practice has no express warrant in the Scriptures; (2) That the Scriptures declare that belief must precede faith, and since infants cannot believe, therefore, they should not be baptized; (3) That infants cannot consent to the covenant of which baptism is the seal, and, therefore, should not be bound by this ordinance; and (4) that baptism can do infants no good, and, therefore, it is useless to baptize them. These objections will be answered in the positive argument which follows

3. Infant baptism is connected immediately with the Abrahamic covenant, and can be fully understood only in the light of the Old Testament teachings. (1) God has but one Church. It is built upon the protevangelium, and first took its visible form in the covenant with Abraham. Thus St. Paul declares that the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed (Gal. 3:8). The promise made to Abraham and his seed, not only included temporal blessings, but the Messiah himself, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed (Gen. 22:18). The temporal blessings were fulfilled in the human posterity of Abraham, but Christ as the divine seed is the source of the universal spiritual blessings. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed which is Christ (Gal. 3:16). And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise (Gal. 3:29). It was on .the basis of this promise that St. Peter in his sermon at Pentecost, made the universal offer of salvation, For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar o~ even as many as the Lord our God shall call (Acts 2:39). (2) The covenant made between Abraham and his seed was sealed by the rite of circumcision. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised (Gen. 17:10). The child which was not circumcised on the eighth day was to be cut off by a special judgment of God, as having broken the covenant. Hence the rite was the constant publication of the covenant of grace among the descendants of Abraham, and its repetition the constant confirmation of that covenant

[In order to perceive the bearing of this passage (Acts 2:39) upon the question before us, it is only necessary to consider the resemblance that there is between the declaration of Peter, "the promise is to you, and to your children," and the promise of God to Abraham. This resemblance is seen in two particulars: (1) Each stands connected with an ordinance by which persons were to be admitted into the visible church; in the one case by circumcision, in the other by baptism. (2) Both agree in phraseology. The one knows that seed and children are terms of the same import. It follows, therefore, from these two points of resemblance, that the subjects in both cases are the same; and as it is certain that in the promise of God to Abraham both parents and infant children were included, it must be equally certain that both are included in the announcement of Peter. Here, then, we have an express warrant for infant baptism. - Wakefield, Christian Theology p.571 That children were included in this covenant is too plain a fact to be questioned. They were initiated by the same rite whereby the promises of the covenant were sealed unto Abraham. Their Initiation was not made a matter of the divine sufferance, but a matter of the divine command. why then should they be denied the rite of baptism, which in the Christian Church occupies the place that circumcision occupied in the Abrahamic covenant? It will be no answer to ask in objection, what benefit can baptism render infants? because the same objection would work equally against their circumcision under the Abrahamic covenant. If the reply should be that the children are not in the spiritual state which baptism signifies, the answer is that the same objection would have

excluded them from the rite of circumcision. Again, if the reply should be that infants are incapable of the faith, on the condition of which the blessings of the gospel are offered, the answer is that they were equally incapable of the mental exercises which in the case of adults were conditional to the spiritual blessing of the Abrahamic covenant. Infant circumcision under that covenant warrants the right of infants to baptism under the Christian covenant which indeed, is not another, but the very same in its full development. On the ground of such facts only a divine order could annul the right of infants to Christian baptism; but no such order has been given. - Miley, Systematic Theology, II, pp. 406, 407.]

(3) The Christian Church is the continuation of the Abrahamic covenant in its universal unfoldings. The promise implicit in the covenant is unfolded in the rich fullness of the blessing of Christ. Hence we read that Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised (Rom. 4:11, 12). That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Gal. 3:14). Thus as we have indicated, the Abrahamic covenant is carried out to its highest degree in the gospel dispensation. (4) Baptism supersedes circumcision. The initiatory rite of circumcision passed away with the rites and ceremonies .peculiar to the Old Testament phase of the covenant, and baptism becomes in its place, the initiatory rite of the New Testament. That baptism carries with it the same federal and initiatory character is clear from the statement of St. Paul that ye are complete in him, which .is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God; who hath raised him from the dead (Col. 2:10-12). Here the rite of circumcision is brought into immediate connection with baptism as a New Testament ordinance, and this baptism is expressly stated to be "the circumcision of Christ." We may now sum up the arguments concerning the scriptural warrant for the practice of infant baptism, in the words of Dr. Wakefield. "We have shown that the Abrahamic covenant was the general covenant of grace; that children were embraced in that covenant, and were admitted into the visible church by circumcision; that Christianity is but a continuation, under a new form, of that covenant which God made with Abraham; and that baptism is now the sign and seal of the covenant of grace, as circumcision was under the former dispensation. From these premises it necessarily follows that as the infant children of believing parents, under the Old Testament, were proper subjects of circumcision, so the infant children of Christian believers are proper subjects of baptism" (WAKEFIELD; Christian Theology, pp. 569, 570)

[It is sometimes urged, by way of objection, that if infants are baptized they should also be admitted to the Lord’s Supper. To this our reply is, that as baptism is passively received, it may be administered to all infants; but to partake of the supper requires an agency of which many of them are physically incapable. Again, as the Lord’s Supper is to be a memorial to each participant, infants are intellectually incapable of receiving it according to its intention. To this we have an exact parallel in the Jewish Passover; and though all Jewish children were circumcised at eight

days old, yet they did not eat the Passover until they could comprehend its design. - WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 571.] To this may be added the fact that in three different instances, it is said that households were baptized - that of Lydia (Acts 16:15), the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:33), and that of Stephanus (I Cor. 1:16). While there is of course no positive proof, we may regard the above statements as at least presumptive evidence that there were children in the households of those who were baptized. Further still, we have from the lips of our Lord himself, the declaration that children belong to the kingdom of God (Mark 10:4); and if so, they are entitled to this recognition as a witness to the faith of the parents in the words of their Lord. We maintain, therefore, that there is a warrant for infant baptism, and that the arguments just given are a sufficient answer to the objections previously mentioned. If it still be maintained that only believers are to be baptized, and infants excluded, then we insist that the argument proves too much. If only those who believe and are baptized will be saved; and if children cannot believe and therefore cannot be baptized, then by force of the argument, the logical conclusion is that they cannot be saved. This we think no one will allow, for it is in direct opposition to the words of our Lord mentioned above (Mark 10:4). When Christ made the statement, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved (Mark 16:16), He was speaking of adult believers, to whom the disciples were sent with the gospel, and who were therefore capable of responding to their preaching. His words have no reference in this place, to the question of infant baptism

[St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins, or the obtaining a good conscience before God. This is further strengthened by his immediately adding, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ": a clause which our translators by the use of a parenthesis, connect with "baptism doth also now save us"; so that their meaning is, we are saved by baptism through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; and as he "was raised again for our justification," this sufficiently shows the true sense of the apostle, who, by our being "saved," clearly means our being justified by faith. The text, however, needs no parenthesis, and the true sense may be thus expressed: "The antitype to which the water of the flood, baptism, doth now save us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but that which intently seeks a good conscience toward God, through faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ." But however a particular word may be disposed of, the whole passage can only be consistently taken to teach us that baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into Gods covenant of mercy; and that when it is an act of true faith, it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of Noah, by which when moved with fear, he "prepared an ark to the saving of his house," and survived the destruction of an unbelieving world. - Watson, Theological Institutes, II, p. 625

Mr. Wesley was trained to believe in a possible regeneration of infants. In his sermon on "The New Birth" he says, "It is certain our church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again." "Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years." For himself he never distinctly defined this: "But whatever be the case with infants, it is sure all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again." His views of the preliminary grace signified by the new birth of infants have been more fully expressed by later expositors of Methodist doctrine. Mr. Watson’s summary may be accepted as

giving their meaning. "To the infant child it is a visible reception into the same covenant and church, a pledge of acceptance through Christ, the bestowment of a title to all the grace of the covenant as circumstances may require, and as the mind of the child may be capable, of receiving it." "It secures, too, the gift of the Holy Spirit in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected; and which are a seed of life in those who are Spared." - Pope, Compend. Chr., III, p.324.] THE LORD'S SUPPER

"We believe that the Memorial and Communion Supper instituted by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is essentially a New Testament sacrament, declarative of His sacrificial death, through the merits of which believers have life and salvation, and promise of all spiritual blessings in Christ. It is distinctively for those who are prepared for reverent appreciation of its significance, and by it they shew forth the Lord's death till He comes again. Being a Communion feast, only those who have faith in Christ and love for the saints should be called to participate therein" (Creed, Article XIV) The Institution of the Lord's Supper. The circumstances under which this sacrament was instituted, were solemn and impressive. It was the night of His betrayal, as Jesus and His disciples celebrated the Passover together. And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it [eujloghvsa"], and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said,, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks [eujcaristhvsa"], and gave it to them, saying,Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:26-28; Cf. Mark 14 22-24; Luke 22:19, 20). The preceding references are historical, and describe the events connected with the holy institution. The following verses set forth St. Paul's doctrinal interpretation of the institution. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread (I Cor. 10:16, 17). For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come (I Cor. 11:23-28)

[This sacrament is called the Lord's Supper because the Lord himself appointed it, and because it was first instituted in the evening, and at the close of the paschal supper. It is called the communion, as herein we hold communion with Christ and with His people. It is also called the eucharist, a thanksgiving, because Christ, in the institution of it, gave thanks; and because we, in participation of it' are required to be thankful. - Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 590.] As baptism was substituted for circumcision, so also, the Lord's Supper superseded the Passover. Under the old covenant, the Passover was the eminent type of our Lord's redemptive sacrifice, which from age to age had represented the faith and hope of the ancient people. And since Christ himself as the true Passover was about to fulfill the Old Testament symbol, a new rite was necessary to commemorate this spiritual deliverance and confirm its benefits. At the Feast of the Passover, the head of each family took the cup of thanksgiving, and with his family gave thanks to the God of Israel. So also, when Jesus had finished the usual paschal ceremony with His disciples, He proceeded to a new and distant action. He took bread [the bread from the paschal table], and gave

thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper [the paschal cup], saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed .for you (Luke 22:19, 20). Thus there exists a continuity of symbolism in the Old and New Testaments; and yet the old was brought to a sharp close, and the new .rite which superseded it had an equally distinct beginning. That this rite was intended to be permanent is evident from the fact that St. Paul received of the Lord .the word which enjoined upon him, the necessity of establishing it in all the churches which he founded (I Cor. 11:23)

[Mr. Watson in commenting on I Cor. 11:23-26 says, "From these words we learn, (1) That St. Paul received a special revelation as to this ordinance, which must have had a higher object than the mere commemoration of an historical fact, and must be supposed to have been made for the purpose of enjoining it upon him to establish this rite in the churches raised up by him, and of enabling him rightly to understand its authority and purport, where he found it already appointed by the first founders of the first churches. (2) That the command of Christ, 'This do in remembrance of me,' which was originally given to the disciples presented with Christ at the last Passover, is laid by St Paul upon the Corinthians. (3) That he regarded the Lord's Supper as a rite to be 'often' celebrated, and that in all future time until . the Lord himself should 'come' to judge the world. The perpetual obligation of this ordinance cannot therefore be reasonably disputed." Watson, Theological Institutes, II, pp. 661, 662.]

[The following is a summary of Dr. Pope's excellent discussion of the Lord's Supper in relation to the Passover: (1) Now the ancient rite was an annual commemoration of the typical redemption of the Hebrew people; and the Lord's Supper is the solemn act of the Church's commemoration of the redeeming death of the Saviour of the world. St. Paul adds "in remembrance of me" to the giving of the bread as well as the cup . . . . Our Saviour blessed the elements and gave thanks: offering the praise of His own atonement which His people continue forever. Hence the rite is the great expression of the Church's gratitude for the gift of Christ, and especially His atoning death. It is the feast of thanksgiving within the Christian assembly, and it is the feast of testimony before the world, "Showing forth" His death. (2) The ancient Passover was also the annual ratification of the covenant between God and His people . . . . When our Lord substituted His Supper, He used language that included all, and specially referred to the solemn covenant transaction in which Moses divided the blood of atonement into two parts: half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar, to denote the propitiation of God; with the remainder he sprinkled all the people, to signify to them the divine favor, and the book of the covenant also, to signify the ratification of the covenant of which that book was the record: "This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." These words of Moses our Lord connect with the new Passover of His new covenant: "Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." . . . . The Holy Spirit uses this sacramental ordinance for the assurance of faith: hence the meaning of the term Sacrament as applied to this solemnity. (3) But the ancient Passover was the rite that kept in annual remembrance the birth of the people as such and their community life in the bond of the covenant. when our Lord ordained His Supper, He distributed to each and laid emphasis on the All . . . . The Supper is the sacrament of union with Jesus the True Vine; and of union with one another in Him; hence it might seem that the elements represent not only the sacrificed body of Christ, but the spiritual body itself saved by that sacrifice and made a part of Himself. The real bond of union, however, is not the bread and the wine; it is the common participation of life in

Christ by the Spirit. But the sacramental eating and drinking together is the outward and visible sign of that union. The Supper therefore is the perfect badge of common discipleship: the mutual pledge of all the offices of brother love. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 326, 327.]

During the apostolic age there were a number of .terms used to express the meaning of the Lord's Supper, at least five of these words being found in the New Testament. (1) It was called the Eucharist (eujcarisrevw, to give thanks), referring to Christ's taking the cup and giving thanks. Sometimes also the eulogesas (from eujlogevw, to praise, or bless), as in the reference to Jesus' act in blessing the bread. The two words were often interchanged also. Thus St. Paul speaks of "the cup of blessing." On account of the appropriateness of the term "Eucharist" it has always been popular among English speaking people. As such it is a solemn thanksgiving for the blessings of redemption. (2) It was known also as the Communion. The Acts of the Apostles joins together "the breaking of bread" and "the fellowship" (Acts 2:42). The fellowship meal, however, was in itself regarded as a communion and was sealed by the kiss of peace. (Rom. 16:16; I Cor. 16:20; II Cor. 13:12; I Thess. 5:26; I Peter 5:14). St. Paul emphasizes this communion with one another as being inseparable from the communion with Christ. He notes that we are one body as we partake of the one loaf which is the body of Christ (I Cor. 10:16). Jesus emphasizes the same aspect of communion in His Parable of the Vine and the Branches (John 15:1-8). (3) It was regarded as a Memorial Feast, a commemoration of the death of Jesus. This phase was not greatly stressed at first, for to the early Christians, Christ was not a dead hero, but the One who was alive forevermore. The memorial aspect, therefore, was more closely associated with the redemptive death of Christ and the eschatological hope. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come (I Cor. ii 26). (4) It was looked upon as a Sacrifice (qusiva) . As such, it not only commemorated the sacrifice of Christ, but was itself regarded as a sacrifice. This distinction must be kept clearly in mind - the interpretation of the death of Jesus as a sacrifice, and the interpretation of the community meal as a sacrifice. Christ's sacrifice was since for all (Heb. 9:25, 26), and could not be repeated. It superseded all animal sacrifices, and was regarded as something new and final for men. The community meal was called a Sacrifice, in that it was itself a thank offering or a "sacrifice of praise" (Heb. 13:15. Cf. Phil. 2:17; 4:18); and also because it was attended by almsgiving for the poor. (5) Finally, it was called the Presence, or the Mystery (musthvrion) . The first carried with it the idea of Christ as a host at His table, and is drawn from the Emmaus account, where Christ's presence was made known in the breaking of Bread. The second emphasizes more especially, the sacred food as a channel of grace and power. St. John is the primary witness here. Christ is the "bread of life" (Cf. John 6:53). The apostle does not depart from spiritual conceptions, however, and we are not to conclude that lie held to any benefit from the flesh apart from the Word. There were other terms expressive of the Lord's Supper also, but the five mentioned above represent the principal phases of the sacrament as set forth in the Scriptures

[Apart from matters of doubtful interpretation, these passages plainly teach, First, that the Lord's Supper is a divine institution of perpetual obligation. Second, that the material elements to be used in the celebration, are bread and wine. Third, that the important constituent parts of the service are: (1) The consecration of the elements. (2) The breaking of the bread and pouring of the wine. (3) The distribution and the reception by the communicants of the bread and wine. Fourth, that the design of the ordinance is, (1) to commemorate the death of Christ. (2) To represent, to effect and

to avow our participation in the body and blood of Christ. (3) To represent, effect and avow the union of believers with Christ and with each other. And (4) to signify and seal our acceptance of the new covenant as ratified by the blood of Christ. Fifth, conditions for profitable communion are: (1) Knowledge to discern the Lord's body. (2) Faith to feed upon' Him. (3) Love to Christ and to His people. The main points of controversy concerning the ordinance are: (1) The sense in which the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. (2) The sense in which the communicant receives the body and blood of Christ in this ordinance. (3) The benefits which the sacrament confers, and the manner in which those benefits are conveyed. (4) The conditions on which the efficacy of the ordinance is suspended. - Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 612.] The Development of the Doctrine in the Church. Following the apostolic age, there began very early a tendency to depart from the symbolical interpretation of the elements and actions as set forth in the New Testament, and to substitute in its stead a realistic interpretation of the Lord's Supper. This trend was found especially in the Greek Fathers - Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Gregory of Nyssa. With their bent toward mysticism, their tendency was naturally toward the realistic view, according to which the bread became the actual body of Christ, and the wine His blood. The history of this doctrine may be best summed up by considering it in the following stages of development. (1) The Patristic Period; (2) The Nicene and Post-Nicene Periods; (3) The Medieval Period; and (4) The Reformation Period. Following this we shall consider the Nature of the Lord's Supper, and in the discussion we shall deal more fully with the Reformation theories and their later developments

[There are other terms by which the Lord's Supper was sometimes designated. It is called prosforav or "offering" because of the gifts and offerings made to the poor in connection with this service. It is called Suvnaxi" "the assembly" because the nature of the service implied an assembly of the believers. It is called the "missa" or Mass, probably from the words used in the dismissal of the congregation. The term "Mass," however, was used long before it took on the meaning which attaches to it in the Roman Catholic Church

Concerning the origin of the term "Mass" Dr. Charles Hodge gives us the following: "This word has been variously explained; but it is almost universally, at the present time, assumed to come from the words used in the dismission of the congregation. (Ita, missa est, 'Go, the congregation is dismissed.') First the unconverted hearers were dismissed, and then the catechumens, the baptized faithful only remaining for the communion service. Hence there was in the early church a missa infidelium, a missa catechumenorum, and finally a missa fidelium. There seems to have been a different service adapted to these several classes of hearers. Hence the word missa came to be used in the sense of the Greek word leitourgiva or service. As under the Old Testament the offering of sacrifice was the main part of the temple service, so in the Christian Church, when the Lord's Supper was regarded as an expiatory offering, it became the middle point in public worship and was called emphatically the service, or mass. Since the Reformation this has become universal as the designation of the eucharist as celebrated in the Church of Rome." - Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 614

1. The Patristic Period. This period marked the beginnings of doctrinal development along two lines which afterward were united: (1) the sacramental Presence in the Communion, which later developed into the doctrine of transubstantiation; and (2) the sacrificial offering in the Eucharist which later became the Mass. The earlier Fathers took but little cognizance of the distinctions

which later were regarded as important, and consequently their statements are often ambiguous. Both Ignatius and Irenaeus indicate a trend away from symbolism in such statements as "His body is reckoned to be in bread," and "He made it His own body by saying, ’’This is my body, that is, the figure of my body.’’ Clement of Alexandria (220) states that the wine is "a symbol of the blood." Cyprian often speaks of the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ, yet at other times apparently regards the elements as symbols or emblems

2. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Periods. The lines of development were more marked during these periods and may be indicated as follows: (1) Chrysostom and others began to speak of the Eucharist as a repetition of that great oblation of Christ. At first this was merely an oblation of gratitude for the gifts of God in nature and grace, but the resemblance was soon carried farther. It soon came to be identified with consubstantiation or a coexistence of the actual body and blood of Christ with the consecrated elements, which seems to have prevailed very early in both the East and the west. This is found in the writings of Hilary (368), Cyril (386), Gregory of Nyssa (395), Ambrose (397), and Chrysostom (407). Some of these lean far toward the doctrine of transubstantiation or a change in the substance of the elements. Eusebius (331), Athanasius (373), Gregory Nazianzen (391) and Nilus (457) make a more or less clear distinction between the sign and the thing signified. (2) The next step in the development of transubstantiation is found in Gregory the Great (604) who speaks of "the daily sacrifice." Thus the sacrifice which Cyprian mentioned as being "the Lord’s passion which we offer" came to be regarded as the "atoning sacrifice" which was to be repeated at every celebration. (3) In 818 A.D. Paschasius Radbertus formally propounded the doctrine that the material elements are by divine power through the prayer of consecration, literally changed into the very body that was born of Mary; and consequently after the prayer of consecration, the outward appearance of the bread and wine is a mere veil that deceives the senses. Rabanus Maurus (825) and Ratramus (832) opposed this position and Gerbert (1003) defended it - the matter finally resulting in one of the greatest controversies of the Western Church

3. The Middle Ages. During the Middle Ages the schoolmen gave much attention to the subject of the sacraments. (1) In 1030 A.D., Berengarius wrote a treatise affirming that the body 0# Christ is present in the Eucharist, though not in essence, only in power; that the elements are not changed in substance ; and to secure this power, there must not only be the prayer of consecration, but faith on the part of the recipient as well. He was opposed by Humbert (1059) and Lanfranc (1089), and later was compelled to retract his statements by Gregory VII. (2) The doctrine of Radbertus and Humbert was defined under the title of transubstantiation by Hildebert of Tours (1134) and was imposed as an article of faith by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 A.D. At the same time, the Mass was decreed as the bloodless repetition of the one sacrifice, and its efficacy to avail for the quick and the dead. (3) Thomas Aquinas (1274) popularized the doctrine of transubstantiation by means of four hymns. Together with other schoolmen, he held to a distinction between substance and accident, the substance being that which underlies all properties and accidents those properties which are discernible by the senses. (4) Peter Lombard (1164) taught that the substance of the bread was converted into Christ’s body, and the wine into His blood, but yet the whole Christ was present on the altar under each species. Along with the growth of this sentiment, which Thomas Aquinas afterward termed "concomitance," there grew up also a sentiment favoring communion in one kind. Robert Pulleyn (1144) first suggested withholding the cup from the laity on

the ground of sacrilege through the possible spilling of "the very blood of Christ." This was sanctioned by Alexander of Hales (1245), Bonaventura (1274) and Aquinas, and was confirmed by the Council of Constance in 1415 A.D. Thomas Aquinas also elaborated the doctrine of concomitance by teaching that the elements were converted in to the body and blood of Christ, and that His soul is united to the body, and His divinity to the soul. This prepared the way for the practice of Eucharistic adoration. As early as 1217, Pope Honorius III had instituted the "elevation of the host" or the lifting up of the sacramental elements as an act of reverence, but in 1264, the Adoration of the Host was established as a sacrifice. The Eastern Church differed from the Western in that it maintained communion in both kinds for the laity, used leavened instead of unleavened bread, and retained infant communion

[One of the numerous theories concerning the eucharist prevalent more or less in the early church, was that which is known In the history of doctrine as impanation. As in man the soul is united to the body imparting to it life and efficiency without itself becoming material, or rendering the body spirit; and as the Eternal Logos became flesh by taking to Himself a true body and a reasonable soul, without receiving anything human into His divine nature, or imparting divinity to His humanity; so the same Logos becomes united with a consecrated bread, without any substantial change in it or in Him. His relation to the bread, however, is analogous to that of the soul to the body in man and of the Logos to humanity in the person of our Lord. As the assumption of our nature by the Son of God is expressed by the word "incarnation," so His assumption and union with the bread in the Lord’s Supper is called "impanation." - Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 648.]

[The Roman Catholic Doctrine is given in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (1551). "In the Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ" - Canon I

"The whole substance of the bread (is converted) into the body," and "the whole substance of the wine into the blood." - Canon 2 "The whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated." - Canon 3.

"The principal fruit of the most holy Eucharist is the remission of sms." - Canon 5 "In the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored." - Canon 6 "All and each of Christ’s faithful are bound to communicate every year."~Canon 9

"Sacramental confession is to be made beforehand, by those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin." - Canon 11 The authoritative teaching of the Lutheran Church is to be found in the Augsburg Confession (1530) Article X. "The true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine, and are there communicated to and received by those that eat in the Lord’s Supper." Later, Melanchthon changed . this article, a departure which occasioned much controversy. This change is expressed in the Formula of Concord (1540) as follows: "we believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord’s Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine." The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (1562), Article XXVIII. "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, . the bread which we break is a (heavenly and spiritual)

partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ."]

4. The Reformation Period. The Reformers revolted against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass. Three lines of development may be distinctly traced: (1) that in Germany under Luther; (2) that in Switzerland under Zwingli; and (3) that under Calvin the Genevan reformer, also in Switzerland. The first issue was in the doctrine of consubstantiation as held by the Lutheran Church; the second, in the commemorative idea as held by the Reformed churches with a strong tendency toward Socinianism; and third, the more orthodox doctrine of the Reformed churches as expressed in the signs and seals. The Anglican formularies are a combination of the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines, both Zwinglian and Calvinistic. The Roman Catholic teaching is renounced. Article XXVIII states that "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a .sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in .the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped." Article XVIII of the Methodist Creed is identical with the above except that the word "it" is dropped in the first paragraph, as a comparison of the full text of the creeds will show. The Westminster Confession of the Presbyterian churches is substantially the same also. These views will be considered more fully in the following section The Nature of the Sacrament. The various views concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper, are determined largely by the construction put upon the words, This is my body, and This is my blood (Matt. 26:26-28). These varying interpretations give us (1) The Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation; (2) The Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation; (3) The Zwinglian doctrine of Commemoration; and (4) The Calvinistic doctrine of the Signs and Seals

[The Heidelberg Catechism (1563). "What is it to eat of the crucified body and 'drink the shed blood of Christ? It is not only to embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain the forgiveness of sins and life eternal, but moreover, also, to be so united more and more to His sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us, that although He is in heaven, and we are upon the earth, we are nevertheless flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, and live and are governed forever by one Spirit, as .members of the same body are by the one soul." The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) Article XXIX. "The Lord's Supper (is) to be observed for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of Himself in His death, the sealing of all benefitsthereof which true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, their further engagement in, and to all duties which they owe unto Him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with Him, and with each other, as members of His mystical body." "Worthy believers do inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually receive and feel upon Christ crucified, and all the benefits of His death."]

1. The doctrine of Transubstantiation is held by the Roman Catholic Church, and the steps in its historical development have already been indicated. Here the words This is my body and This is my blood, are taken in the most literal sense possible. It is believed that when our Lord pronounced these words, He changed the bread and wine upon the table into His own body and blood, and delivered it into the hands of the apostles. Since that time it is held that the priests

through apostolic succession, have the power of making a similar change by means of the prayer of consecration and the pronouncement of the same words. The accidents of the bread and wine remain, that is, the bread tastes like bread, and the wine like wine; but the substance underlying these accidents is regarded as being changed, so that the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Christ; and the wine is no longer wine, but the blood of Christ. Since the blood is included in the body, the laity receive only the bread, and the priest the wine. There are several important consequences which attach to this doctrine. (1) The bread and the wine, having been changed into the body and blood of Christ, are by the priest presented to God as a sacrifice. While this sacrifice differs from others as being without the shedding of blood, it is nevertheless regarded as a true propitiatory offering for the sins of both the living and the dead. (2) This body and blood contain within them the grace they signify, and therefore confer it ex opere operato, that is, they have intrinsic value in themselves and this grace is imparted to all through the mere partaking of the sacrament. No special disposition is necessary on the part of the recipient, not even faith, for the sacrament operates immediately upon all who do not obstruct it by mortal sin. (3) The bread having been changed into the body of Christ, any unused portion was sacredly kept as the "reserved host." (4) Since Christ's divinity was attached to His body, it was regarded as highly proper to worship them upon the altar; and further, to carry them about that they might receive the homage of all who met them, Against this unscriptural doctrine, Protestants not only objected, but revolted, and hence the Reformation doctrine is more simple and scriptural

[The only ground of such a doctrine lies in the assumption of a literal sense of the words "This is my body," "This is my blood," transubstantiation itself is a mere inference from this assumption. The bread and wine must be changed into the flesh and blood of Christ if they are really present in the supper, because there is no other way of accounting for their presence. This is the manner in which the doctrine is constructed. Without a literal sense of the words of institution it has not the slightest ground in Scripture. - Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 413.] [THE TRIDENTINE DOCTRINE In the first place the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the august sacrament of the holy eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant - that our Saviour himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that nevertheless He be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God: for thus all our forefathers, as many as were in the true Church of Christ, who have treated of this most holy sacrament, have most openly professed that our Redeemer instituted this so admirable a sacrament at the last supper when, alter the blessing of the bread and wine, He testified, in express and clear words which recorded by the holy evangelist, and afterward repeated by St. Paul, whereas they carry with them that proper and most manifest meaning in which they were understood by the Father - it is indeed a crime the most unworthy that they should be wrested, by certain contentious and wicked men, to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied, contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which as the pillar and ground of truth, has detested, as satanical, these inventions devised by impious men; she recognizing, with a mind ever grateful and unforgetting, the most excellent benefit of Christ. - Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, II, pp. 126, 127

Dr. Charles Hodge in his Systematic Theology (In, pp. 688ff) has an excellent discussion of the Protestant objections to the Roman Catholic position. We can only give a brief summary here. "Protestants reject the doctrine that the eucharist is a true propitiary sacrifice:

(1) Because it is not only destitute of all support from the Scriptures, but is directly contrary to the whole nature of the ordinance, as exihibited in its original institution and in the practice of the apostolic church. (2) Because it is founded on the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation. If the whole substance of the bread be not changed into the substance of Christ's body, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood, and if the whole Christ, body, soul, and divinity be not really and truly present under the form (or species) or appearance of the bread and wine, then the priest in the mass has nothing to offer. He in fact offers nothing, and the whole service is a deceit. (3) The Romish doctrine is that the apostles were priests, and were invested with authority and power to continue and perpetuate in .the Church the priestly office by ordination and the imposition of hands by which the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit are conveying All this is unscriptural and false. First, because a priest is a man appointed to be a mediator between God and other men. But there is no such office under the Christian dispensation, save in the person of Jesus Christ. Second, Christian ministers are never called priests in the New Testament. Third, Christ and the apostles uniformly assume that the way is open for the return of every sinner to God without human intervention. (4) The Romish doctrine is derogatory to the sacrifice of the cross. It opposes that the work of Christ in making satisfaction for the sins of men, needs to be constantly repeated. (5) The doctrine of the sacrificial character of the eucharist, is an integral part of the great system of error, which must stand or fall as a whole. Romanism is another gospel. Moehler, whose philosophical and mitigated Romanism, has called down upon him no little censure from his stricter brethren, represents the doctrine of the eucharist as the point in which all the differences between the Romanists and Protestants converge."

Dr. Joseph Stump insists that the Lutheran Church does not teach the doctrine of consubstantiation, although she is frequently accused of doing so. He holds that consubstantiation means the combining of the body and blood of Christ into a third substance, and this the Lutheran Church does not teach. He further insists that neither inspanation nor subpanation is taught by the Lutherans, the former holding that the body and Hood are locally included or inclosed in the bread and the wine, the latter that the are located under them. They teach rather, that the body and blood of Christ are not locally, but sacramentally connected with the bread and the wine; and that only during their actual use by the communicant, are the body and blood present. Hence there can be no reserved host, for before and after the actual administration, the elements are only bread and wine. - Stump, The Christian Faith, pp. 353, 354 The mind of Luther so powerful to throw off dogmas which had nothing but human authority to support them, was, as to the sacrament, held in the bonds of early association. He concluded that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper; but aware of the absurdities and self-contradictions of transubstantiation, he laid hold of a doctrine which some writers in the Romish church itself, had continued to prefer to the papal dogma above stated. This was designated by the term consubstantiation, which allows that the bread and wine remain the same after consecration as before. Thus he escapes the absurdity of contradicting the very senses of men. It was held, however, by Luther, that though the bread and wine remain unchanged, yet that, together with them, the body and blood of Christ are literally received by the communicants. Some of his immediate followers did not, however, admit

more on this point, than that the body and blood of Christ were really present in the sacrament; but that the manner of that presence was an inexplicable mystery. Yet, in some more important respects, Luther and the Consubstantialists wholly escaped the errors of the Church of Rome as to this sacrament They denied that it was a sacrifice; and that the presence of the body and blood of Christ gave to it any physical virtue acting independently of the disposition of the receiver; and that it rendered the elements the objects of adoration. Their error, therefore, may be considered rather of a speculative than of a practical nature; and was adopted probably in deference to what was conceived to be the literal meaning of the words of Christ when the Lord's Supper was instituted. - Watson, Theological Institutes, II, pp. 663, 664

If we would get at the idea which lies at the foundation of the .Lutheran doctrine regarding the Lord's Supper, we must bear in mind that it is an idea independent of those scholastic forms, in which the old theology endeavored to develop it, and especially independent of that doctrine regarding Christ's unlimited ubiquity, the one-sidedness of which we have referred to in our Christology. It is, in fact, the idea of Christ as the head of that new creation whose final end is redemption and perfecting of human nature as a whole, as undivided body and soul. As Christ is not a spirit only, but the incarnate logos; as man, created in God's image, is in the true conception of Him, the center in which spirit and nature unite; as the resurrection of the body is the last eschatological event which Christianity presents; the Lord's Supper is an act of union with Christ, as the principle of that holy marriage of spirit and nature which is the final end of creation. The Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper is thus, in the truest sense of the expression, prophetically Christian, that is it recognizes in the Eucharist the actual anticipation of that union with the Saviour, the perfection of which will be reached in the consummation of all things. It sees, accordingly, in the Lord's Supper, not only, like Calvin, an aliment for the soul but an aliment for the whole new man, for the future man of the Resurrection, who is germinating and growing in secret, and who shall be manifested in glory, in exact likeness with the glorified humanity of his Lord. Holy Scripture itself thus associates the doctrine concerning the last things with the Lord's Supper, not only in the words of the Apostle Paul, "Ye do shew forth the Lord's death fill he come" (I Cor. 11:26); but in the words of our Lord himself, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:1618). However these words may be interpreted as regards particulars, they plainly give us to understand that the Lord's Supper is an actual prophecy, type, and anticipation of the Union with the Saviour, which will take place in the realm of bliss; and not only of union with the Lord, but of the inward fellowship of love by which believers shall he united to one another in that blessed kingdom. For in the Lord's Sup per believers are all united together into one body, because, as the apostle says, they are partakers of one bread. (I Cor. 10,17) . - Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, pp. 436, 437

Zwingli asserted as strongly as Calvin the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, denying with him the carnal and corporeal presence, either in the form of transubstantiation or consubstantiation. "Christ," he says, "is spiritually present in the consciousness of the believer. In the recollection of His sufferings and death, and by faith in these, His body is spiritually eaten. We trust in the dying flesh and blood of Christ, and this faith is called the eating of the body and blood of Christ." . . . . Zwingli regarded the sacrament of the Supper as a means of grace and sanctification, because of its didactic character; . because, by evidently setting forth before the eyes Jesus Christ crucified (Gal. 3:1), it teaches in a vivid . and special manner the great truth of

Christ’s atonement and redemption, and confirms the soul of the believer in it. It is an object lesson. In this respect, the function of the sacrament is like that of the Word. Gospel truth is taught in both alike. Both alike are employed by the Holy Spirit in enlightening, strengthening, and comforting the mind of the believer. - Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 370, 371 The Lutheran asserts that Christ is "spiritually present in the sacrament of the Supper as to the manner, but corporeally as to the substance." That is to say, the substance of Christ’s spiritual and glorified body as it once existed on earth, is actually present in and with the sacramental emblems. Consequently, the spiritual and glorified body of Christ is present in the bread and wine, wherever and whenever the sacrament is administered. This requires the ubiquity of Christ’s glorified body, whereby it can simultaneously be in heaven and on earth. But the glorified body of Christ, like that of His people, though a spiritual body, has form, and is extended in space. The description of Christ’s body after His resurrection and ascension proves this. But one and the same form cannot occupy two spaces at one and the same moment. Christ’s glorified body can pass from space to space instantaneously, but cannot fill two spaces at the same instant. When Christ’s body passed through, the "doors being shut" (John 20:26), and stood in the midst of the disciples, His body was no longer on the outside of the doors, and could not be.]

2. The doctrine of Consubstantiation was adopted by Luther respecting the presence of Christ in the sacrament. While protesting against the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, he yet felt the need of conserving in an objective manner, the saving significance of the ordinance. He accepted, therefore, the words of institution in their literal significance, but denied that the elements were changed by consecration. He maintained that the bread and the wine remained the same, but that in, with and under the bread and the wine, the body and blood of Christ were present in the sacrament for all partakers and not merely for believers. With the bread and wine, therefore, the body and blood of Christ are literally received by all communicants. Since Christ’s presence is only in the use of the elements, the remnants are only so much bread and wine. It is in the use also, that the blessing is given to those who partake in faith. Luther’s doctrine of consubstantiation is closely bound up with his Christological teaching concerning the ubiquity of the glorified body of Christ. It is this that makes possible his belief in the real presence, and lates it in some sense to the doctrine of the logos

3. The doctrine of the Lord’s Supper as a Commemorative rite was advanced by Zwingli, the Swiss reformer and contemporary of Luther. He objected to the literal interpretation of the words of institution as taught by Luther, and maintained instead, that when Jesus said, "This is my body, this is my blood," He employed a common figure of speech, in Which the sign is put for the thing signified. Instead of the elements representing the real presence, they are rather, the signs of the absent body and blood of Christ. The Lord’s Supper, therefore, is to be regarded as merely a religious commemoration of the death of Christ with this addition, that it is naturally adapted to produce helpful emotions and reflections, and to strengthen the purposes of the will. This is the view generally held by the Socinians; and while it escapes the errors of the two former theories, it nevertheless falls short of the full truth

4. The last theory to be mentioned, is that of the Reformers as taught by Calvin. This is a mediating position between Luther and Zwingli, and is now the generally accepted creed of the Reformed churches. Calvin renounced both transubstantiation and consubstantiation. He taught that the body and blood of Christ were not locally, but only spiritually present in the elements. "It is

not the blessing pronounced which makes any change in the cup; but to all who join with becoming affection in the thanksgiving then uttered, in the name of the congregation, Christ is spiritually present, so that they may truly and emphatically be said to be partakers of His body and blood; because His body and blood being spiritually present, convey the same nourishment to their souls, the same quickening to their spiritual life, as bread and wine do to the natural life. According to this system the full benefit of the Lord's .Supper is peculiar to those who partake worthily. For .while all who eat the bread and drink the wine may be said to show forth the Lord's death, and may also receive some devout impressions, they only to whom Jesus is spiritually present share in the spiritual nourishment which arises from partaking of His body and blood" (HILL'S Lectures, quoted in WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p.594). The Reformed doctrine is expressed in Article XXIII of the First Helvetic Confession (1536), as follows: "The bread and wine (of the Supper) are holy, true symbols, through which the Lord offers and presents the true communion of the body, and blood of Christ for the feeding and nourishing of the spiritual and eternal life."

[THE REFORMED DOCTRINE

Dr. Shedd gives the chief points in the Reformed teaching as follows: "(1) the believer in worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper, consciously and confidently relies upon Christ's atoning sacrifice for the remission of his sins. This is meant by the phrase, 'Feed upon Christ crucified.' The Lord's Supper can have no meaning, II His vicarious sacrifice is denied. (2) The 'presence' of Christ is not in the bread or the wine, but in the soul of the participant. Christ, says the Westminster Confession, is 'present to the faith of believers,' and faith is mental and spiritual. The statement of Hooker upon this point is explicit and excellent. 'The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the .worthy receiver of the sacrament.' And again he remarks, 'No side denieth but that the soul of man is the receptacle of Christ's presence. Whereby the question is driven to a narrower issue, nor doth anything .rest doubtful but this, whether, when the sacrament is administered, .Christ be whole (wholly) within man only, or else His body and His blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated elements themselves. Which opinion, they that defend are driven either to consubstantiate and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to transubstantiate and change their substance into His; and so the one holds Him really, but invisibly, molded up with the substance of those elements, the other to hide Him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance whereof, as they imagine is abolished, and His succeeded in the same room." Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 665, 666.] The doctrine which we hold, is well summed up by Dr. Ralston in the following statement. He says, "We conclude that, in this ordinance: (1) No change is effected in the elements ; the bread and the wine are not literally the body and blood of Christ. (2) The body and blood of Christ are not literally present with the elements, and received by the communicants. (3) But the elements are signs, or symbols, of the body and blood of Christ, serving as a memorial of His sufferings on the cross and a help to the faith of the communicant. (4) The elements also possess a sacramental character, being a divinely appointed seal of the covenant of redemption. As the blood of the paschal lamb served as a seal of this covenant under the old dispensation, pointing the faith of the Israelite to the coming Redeemer, superseded by the new, the seal of the covenant should be correspondingly changed; hence at the conclusion of the last authorized Passover, the Holy Supper is instituted, as a perpetual memorial and abiding seal of the covenanted mercy and grace of God) till the Saviour 'shall appear the second time without sin unto

salvation.'" (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, p. 997). As will be easily seen, the above is in perfect agreement with Article XIV of our own creedal statement, as well as those of Protestantism in general

[The true Protestant doctrine may be stated thus: The body and blood of Christ are not corporally present in the ordinance, nor are they received in any corporeal sense; nor are the bread and wine in any sense expiatory, nor do they feed the soul. The body and blood of Christ are received only in a spiritual manner, the benefits of His atonement communicated to the soul by the Holy Spirit, being the only manner in which we can be said to receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. Also faith is the medium through which the benefits of the atonement are received; nor are the bread and wine a channel through which this grace is received, only so far as they are received by faith as Christ's appointed symbols of His body and blood, and so far as they, being received in this light, are a help to our faith. This exposition of the light in which the Supper is to be regarded, falls below what appears to be implied in much of the language employed on the subject, in the old standards and formulas, but if they mean anything more than has been expressed above, they lean too far toward Romish doctrine. If Christ, when He said, "This is my body," meant anything more than "this represents my body," he must have meant that it was His real body, for there can be no medium sense. If He meant no more than "this represents my body," then the exposition which has been given above, is all that is implied in the language, and in all the rational ends to be secured by the institution itself. - Lee, Elements of Theology pp. 575, 576.] The Administration of the Lord's Supper. A few things need to be noted in connection with the proper .administration of the Lord's Supper

1. The elements are bread and wine. While many of the older denominations used fermented wine, and some used leavened bread, our special rules state that "Only unfermented wine and unleavened bread should .be used in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

2. The sacramental actions are symbolical also. These are: (1) The Prayer of Consecration which includes (a) the giving of thanks to God for the gift of His Son; (b) the preparation of the hearts of the communicants for the solemn service on which they are at tending; and (c) the consecration of the elements. (2) The breaking of the bread is significant also as representing the broken body of our Lord Jesus Christ. It .is not essential, however, that it be broken as served

It is the common custom to pass it already broken to those who participate in the service. The cup is to he passed also, as an emblem of His shed blood. (3) The manner of distribution of the elements is also significant, Christ gives; while the disciples, each for himself, receives and partakes of the offered gifts

3. The Lord's Supper is for all of His people. Hence .the invitation is, "Let all those who have with true repentance forsaken their sins, and have behaved in Christ unto salvation, draw near and take these emblems, and, by faith, partake of the life of Jesus Christ, to your soul's comfort and joy. Let us remember that it is the memorial of the death and passion of our Lord; also a token of His coming again. Let us not forget that we are one, at one table with the Lord."

4. The Perpetuity of the Lord's Supper. Since this sacrament was ordained for perpetual observance to commemorate the Saviour and especially His death and His coming again, it is the privilege and duty of all who believe in Christ to participate in it. "The habitual neglect of this

ordinance," says Dr. Wakefield, "by persons who profess a true faith in Christ is highly censurable. In this case a plain command of Christ is violated, though not perhaps with direct intention; and the benefit of this singularly affecting means of grace is lost, in which our Saviour renews to us the pledge of His love, repeats the promises of His covenant, and calls for invigorated exercises of our faith, only to feed us more richly with the bread that comes down from heaven. If a peculiar condemnation falls upon them who partake 'unworthily,' then a peculiar blessing must follow from partaking worthily; and it therefore becomes the duty of every minister to explain the obligation, and to show the advantages of this sacrament, and earnestly to enforce its regular observance upon all those who give satisfactory evidence of 'repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.'" (Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 596)

32. Chapter 33 - ESCHATOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF LAST THINGS

Chapter 33 - ESCHATOLOGY OR THE DOCTRINE OF LAST THINGS

Eschatology, as the term indicates, is the doctrine of Last Things. In preparation for the kingdom of God in its completeness, certain events must take. place which are of vital interest, from both a theological and a practical viewpoint. We have seen that the doctrines of Christianity all point to a final consummation, and that these all converge in one glorious hope the Second Advent of our Lord. As preceding this event, the questions of Death and the Intermediate State must claim our attention; as following it, those of the Resurrection and Final Judgment. "The high importance of the .eschatological problems," says Dr. Van Oosterzee, "scarcely needs to be formally indicated. The question, 'What shall be the end?' slumbers deep in every Christian heart; and it becomes of so much the greater significance, in proportion as for some and for all the end is nearer at hand. As all other articles of Dogmatics presuppose and prepare the way for Eschatology, so does this in turn shed the light of eternity on every cloud which yet rests upon the parts already traversed of the sanctuary of this science" (Van Oosterzee,Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 777). It should be observed also, that since the distance between the actual and the ideal is so great in the kingdom of God, it can never be filled up on this side of the grave. Consequently the life of faith and love on the part of the believer, necessarily becomes a life of hope also. To this lively hope, we have been begotten again, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (I Peter 1:3). It is, therefore, to the Word of God that we must turn for all authoritative information, not only concerning the individual, but also as to the consummation of all things

[We spoke of the means of grace, by which the Holy Spimt calls forth and strengthens the life of faith, and cannot doubt that by a devout use thereof it is possible for each believer, and for the whole Church, to rise to a comparatively high degree of spiritual growth. Yet Scripture and experience equally proclaim that perfection (in the sense of deliverance from the consequences of sin) itself is never attained on this side of the grave; and the Israel of the New Covenant is on this account, like that of the Old, emphatically a people of the future. Thus then this last chapter also of the doctrine concerning salvation stands in direct connection with that which immediately precedes The necessity for understanding something of the things of the future is indeed so universal that every form of religion, of any degree of development, has its own eschatological expectations. - Van Oosterzee,Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 775.]

DEATH The word "death" in the Christian system, carries with it a wide variety of interpretation. (1) It is a penalty imposed upon the human race because of sin, and in this sense the subject has already received ample treatment. (2) Physical death, or the separation of the soul from the body, must be viewed as the last event in the probationary history of man. (3) There is a realm of the dead, or death as a state, commonly known as the intermediate state, and (4) there is death, spiritual and eternal. The first three of these events precedes the Second Advent of Christ; the last follows it, and is bound up with the consummation of all things. In this chapter we shall consider

physical death and the intermediate state as events of eschatological significance, reserving the subject of "eternal Death" for later consideration

[Death as a penalty, whether physically or spiritually considered, is abolished in the gospel of our redemption. (1) In the widest possible sense it is negatived or done away. There is no restriction in the words used to signify the Saviour's endurance of death in the stead of the human race. He underwent in dying the curse of the law; received the wages of sin not due to Himself; and all mankind are delivered as a whole from the original sentence. For the entire family of Adain it is virtually and provisionally abolished. Our Lord tasted death for every man (Heb. 2:9) (2) It is really abolished to all who are found in Christ. "He that believeth on the Son had everlasting life." . . . . It is true that the abolition is conditional, and gradually revealed both in the soul and in the body; even as the full revelation of the death from which we are saved is gradual. "we are saved by hope." This law runs through the Christian economy; we receive only the first fruits, every blessing and every deliverance being at best given in its earnest alone "until the redemption of the purchased pos session." But the day will come when every trace of this sentence shall be effaced. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death (I Cor. 15:26). It was also the first enemy destroyed - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 373.] The Nature of Physical Death.Death never means annihilation. It was not existence which was forfeited by the original sin, but the separation of the soul from the body, and in a spiritual sense, the separation of both from God. Dr. Hodge speaks of it as "the suspension of personal union between the body and the soul, followed by the resolution of the body into its chemical .elements, and the introduction of the soul into that separate state of existence which may be assigned to it by its Creator and Judge" (A. A. Hodge,Outlines of Theology, p. 430). Dr. Pope calls it "the introduction to another world, and therefore as an event in the history of fallen and redeemed man: the separation of the soul from the body" (POPE, Higher Catechism of Theology, p.361). In the Scriptures physical death is mentioned as being gathered unto thy people (Deut. 32:50); a going the way of all the earth (Joshua 23:14); a being gathered unto their fathers (Judges 2:10); a return of the dust to the earth as it was, and the spirit returning unto God who gave it (Eccl. 12:7); a giving up, or a yielding up of the ghost (Acts 5:5, 10); a dissolving of our earthly house of this tabernacle (II Cor. 5:1); and a being absent from the body and present with the Lord (II Cor.5:8)

Death as a Penalty Abolished in Christ. The Scriptures teach thatas by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned(Rom. 5:12). Thus death is the penalty for sin, death physical, spiritual and eternal. But the Scriptures teach with equal clearness that death as a penalty is abolished in Christ.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(Rom. 5:18). Consequently, death as a penalty, whether considered physically or spiritually, is abolished by Christ, and this in two ways: (1) It is abolished provisionally for all mankind. When Christ underwent the curse of the law, and received the sentence of condemnation, He tasted death for every man (Heb. 2:9), and thus removed the specific condemnation from the race. (2) It is actually abolished for all who are in Christ.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(John 3:36). This abolition is both conditional and gradual, even as the revelation of the death from which we are saved is gradual. This is the deep meaning of St. Paul's words, We are saved by hope (Rom. 8:24). The law of the Christian

economy is, that we receive here only the first fruits, as the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession (Eph. 1:14). But we look forward in hope to the day when every trace of death shall be removed from God’s created universe. Death is at once the first enemy, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed - such is the infinite sweep of this great salvation In this gradual abolition of death we may note the following stages: (1) Physical death is now bound up with the divine purpose concerning the destiny of mankind. What that development would have been, had sin not entered the world, we cannot know, but the eternal counsel concerning the human race now is, that It is appointed unto men once to die (Heb. 9:27). Thus death is retained as a law in the divine government

(2) Christian death becomes a part of the probationary discipline of believers, and is hallowed as a ground of fellowship with Christ. It is a faithful saying:For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him(II Tim. 2:11). Man by his federal relation with the first Adam dies that he may rise again with the last Adam. (3) Physical death for the Christian is now transfigured into a simple departure from this life to another.For 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 For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that would we be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life(II Cor. 5:1, 4). With the curse removed, death for the believer in Christ becomes a means to a blessed end. It is the door through which he enters into the new life, the method by which he receives in the resurrection which follows, a new and glorified body as the eternal habitation of his redeemed soul

IMMORTALITY The question of immortality first arises in connection with the nature of the divine image in man. It was therefore briefly, and in a preliminary manner discussed in our treatment of this subject (Vol. II, p.34). Now, however, the problem appears in a different light and must be given further consideration. Every man believes in the immortality of his own soul, although he can neither demonstrate it nor disprove it. This fundamental conviction is the strongest proof of immortality outside the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. It is "A solemn murmur of the soul Which tells of a world to be, As travelers hear the billows roar Before they reach the sea." The life of man never ceases to be. As we have shown, the grave is only the tunnel through which men pass in order to reach the life beyond. The nature of this future existence is determined by personal character ; and this in turn by the attitude of the soul toward the atoning work of Jesus Christ. To the believer, it is eternal life; to the unbeliever, eternal death

[The Christian thought of being unclothed is an advance upon any former revelation: the body is the only clothing which, folded in the grave, will be hereafter refashioned for the naked spirit. Death is rest, as of old: but rest in the ceaseless service of the Lord. It is sleep: but it is sleep in Jesus. It is still the penalty of sin: but no longer only a penalty. For to those who believe in Jesus death is no more death: not only is its sting gone, but itself is already as to its terror - which is its shadow following it, the second death - annihilated: "whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" (John 11:26). Finally, it is more than the Old Testament "going the way of all the earth" (Joshua 23:14); it is a departure or decease, for these two words are one. Such it was in the case of our Lord: Moses and Elias spoke of the decease "which he should accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke 9:31). And among the last allusions to death in the New Testament it is regarded as only a removal to another sphere: "the time of my departure is at hand" (II Tim. 4:6); which is the simplest and sublimest description of it given to our faith and hope. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th.,III, pp. 375,

376.] The Philosophical Arguments for Immortality.The philosophical arguments are, after all, less convincing than the inalienable conviction of immortality which every man has in his own breast; and hence the most that can be said of them is, that they are attempts to clarify this deep, underlying conviction. We present them, therefore, merely as a list of the traditional arguments commonly offered in support of immortality

(1) The Psychological Argument is based on the nature of the soul as simple, immaterial essence, indivisible and hence indestructible. This argument tends to show that the soul is self-existent, and therefore will exist forever. (2) The Teleological Argument holds that the human soul does not, and cannot fulfill all its promise in this world; and hence necessitates another world and continued existence, in order to achieve its full complement of blessedness. (3) The Cosmical Argument is based on the fact, that in the natural realm there is the law of gravitation which binds the heavenly bodies together, and yet, there is no basis for the communion of the people of those other worlds. Hence there must be another mode of existence in order to fulfill the possibilities of human life. This argument was used by Kant, Herder, Lange, Chalmers and others. (4) The Analogical Argument is drawn from analogies in the organic world. The seed dies, and yet perpetuates its identity; the chrysalis bursts and the butterfly emerges as a new order of being, totally unlike its former mode of existence. (5) The Moral Argument is presented in both its individual and social aspects. It is essentially this - man in this world does not always receive justice. Mere annihilation would not permit degrees of punishment corresponding to the different degrees of guilt. Hence this is an argument from the justice of God to the continued existence of the wicked. Furthermore, in many of its moral aspects life would appear to be a mockery were there no world to come. Thus St. Paul reasoned when he said, If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable (I Cor. 15:19)

[It may he considered to he universally acknowledged in our day that no independent proof can he given of the immortality of man, but that the doctrine of immortality must he derived from the contemplation of life as a whole. In the Christian view of life, immortality appears on every hand. It is implied in the doctrine of a special providence, in the doctrine of the eternal individuality of Christ, in the election of grace, in prayer, in baptism, in the Lord’s Supper, all of which owe their true import to the presupposition of the destiny of the individual to eternal salvation; but the general and fundamental idea lies in the doctrine that man is created in the image of God. All questions concerning human immortality may he traced back to our idea of God. The true conception of man is, that he is the organ of revelation for the Godhead. If God be merely the impersonal spirit of the world, as Pantheism maintains - an impersonal universality - this impersonal spirit needs only impersonal instruments, intermediate channels for his universal life, which possess only a transitory immortality, an immortality limited to that moment only when the eternal Spirit shines through them, and like the rainbow which is formed in the clouds, only for a moment in the presence of the sun. The pantheistic Godhead can have no care for the personal and monadic, because it is itself impersonal. The personal God, on the contrary, cannot find a perfect form for the revelation of Himself in beings which are only impersonal mediums, but only in beings in His own image who are appointed to he permanent witnesses of His eternal power and Godhead. The God of Revelation is Love, and He therefore has interests in the monadic, the minute and individual. - Martensen,Christian Dogmatics, p.452 My belief in the immortality of the soul springs from the Idea of activity; for when I persevere to the end in a course of restless activity

I have a sort of guaranty from Nature, that, when the present form of my existence proves itself inadequate for the energizing of my spirit, she will provide another form more appropriate. when a man is seventy-five years old, he cannot avoid now and then thinking of death. This thought, when it comes, leaves me in a state of perfect peace; for I have the most assured conviction that our soul is of an essence absolutely indestructible an essence that works on from eternity to eternity. It is like the sun, which to our earthly eyes sinks and sets, but in reality never sinks, but shines on unceasingly. - Goethe.]

[The history of primitive religion shows that the hope of immortality is not peculiar to the Christian, but finds expression in religions of the lowest order. Among the Karens the souls of the dead are supposed to assume different aspects as determined by their previous life. Some become divine spirits, while others especially those guilty of murder or adultery assume the forms of monstrous animals. The good go to join their ancestors, while the bad wander about as restless phantoms. The Dyaks of Borneo believe that, as the smoke of the funeral pyre of a good man rises, the soul ascends to the sky; and that the smoke from the pyre of a bad man descends, and with it, his soul is borne down to the earth, and through it to the regions below. The Krumans maintain that the soul of the dead tarries for a while around a fire which is built on the occasion of a death, in order to warm and prepare itself to appreciate the new life into which it has been born. "The idea of a future life," says Pressense, "is inseparable from the idea of God in the credo of the savage."

Victor Hugo (1802-1885) has this sublime passage concerning this own faith in immortality. "I feel in myself the future life. I am like a forest which has been more than once cut down. The new shoots are stronger and livelier than ever. I am rising, I know, toward the sky. The sunshine is on my head. The earth gives me its generous sap, but the heaven lights me with the reflection of unknown worlds. You say the soul is nothing but the resultant of bodily powers. why, then, is my soul the more luminous when my bodily powers begin to fall? Winter is on my head, and eternal spring is in my heart. Then I breathe, at this hour, the fragrance of the lilacs, the violets, and the roses as at twenty years. The nearer I approach the end, the plainer I hear around me the immortal symphonies of the worlds which invite me. It is marvelous, yet simple. It is a fairy tale, and it is history. For half a century I have been writing my thoughts in prose, verse, history, philosophy, drama, romance, tradition, satire, ode, song - I have tried all. But I feel that I have not said the thousandth part of what is in me. When I go down to the grave I can say, like so many others, "I have finished my day’s work, but I cannot say, ’I have finished my life.’ My day’s work will begin again the next morning. The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes in the twilight to open with the dawn. I improve every hour, because I love this world as my father land. My work is only a beginning. My monument is hardly above its foundation. I would be glad to see it mounting and mounting forever. The thirst for the infinite proves infinity."] The Doctrine of Immortality as Revealed in the Scriptures.The only authoritative teaching which we have concerning immortality, is that found in the Holy Scriptures. It is sometimes asserted that the immortality of the soul is not emphasized in the Old Testament, but as a matter of fact this teaching permeates both the Old and the New Testaments. No Hebrew writer, either inspired or uninspired, ever doubted the immortality of the soul, and this, not in a pantheistic but in an individual sense. The scriptures previously cited in disproof of annihilation, serve likewise as proofs of the immortality of the soul. In addition to these, we may note the following:Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the

earth?(Eccl. 3:21). Dr. Clarke says that the literal translation of this text is, "Who considereth the immortal spirit of the sons of Adam, which ascendeth. It is from above: and the spirit or breath of the cattle, which descendeth? It is downward unto the earth, that is, it tends to the earth only." Here the spirit of a man is distinguished from that of an animal, as tending in different directions. That man's spirit goes upward, clearly denotes, not only continued but more elevated existence, and hence survives bodily death. Again,For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God(Job 19:25, 26). Here is a certainty of conviction that there is a life beyond. The psalmist also declared thatThe days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away(Psalms 90:10). The argument hangs on the words "We fly away." The figure itself is borrowed from the belief that man has a soul which departs when the body dies, and can mean nothing other than that the soul exists after death. In the New Testament we cite only a representative text. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul(Matt. 10:28). From . this it is evident that the soul and the body are not identical, and that to kill the body does not kill the soul. This argument from the words of our Lord is conclusive. There are many other Scriptures bearing upon this subject, as the following list of references will show. (Cf. Luke l2:4, 5; Matthew 17:3; Matthew 22:31,32; Luke l6:22, 23; Luke 23:43, 46; Acts 7:59; Rom. 8:35, 38, 39; 2 Cor. 5:1, 6, 8; 2 Cor. 12:2, 3, 4; Phil. 1:21, 23, 24; Rev. 6:9)

[Dr. James H. White has grouped the Bible passages which indicate the soul's continuous existence, by words and phrases descriptive of its conditions and belongings, as follows:

1. It has an existence that is independent of the body, and therefore continuous beyond the death of the body. Man can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul (Matt. 10:28). The soul lives when the body is dead (Matt. 22:32). The soul is capable of suffering when the body is dead and buried (Luke 16:23). The body dead, and the soul in paradise (Luke 23:43). Stephen dies, and his soul is received into heaven (Acts 7:59). The soul may be absent from the body, and present with the Lord (II Cor. 5:8). Such a state is better than the present (Phil. 1:23)

2. Its existence is continuous, because it may suffer eternal or always continuing punishment (Cf. Matt. 18:8 and 25:41). "These shall go away into everlasting punishment"; literally, always enduring punishment (Matt. 25:46). The Revised New Testament in this verse gives us "eternal punishment" and "eternal life" (Cf. also, Mark 3:29; II Thess. 1:9; Jude 13; and Rev. 14:11)

3. Its existence is continuous, because it may enjoy an always enduring life. The passages are numerous wherein eternal and everlasting are connected with the future life and joy of the saints. I need give but a few: Matt. 25:46; John 6:27 ; Gal . 6.8 ; Titus 3.7 ; Hebrews 9.15 ; and II Peter 1:11. These are enough. God would not have us ignorant ''concerning them which are asleep,'' and to this end He has given us the sure testimony of His word. (Quoted in Potts,Faith Made Easy, p. 448).] The Christian Victory The doctrine of immortality comes into its clearest light through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. The ancient writers of the Church unanimously maintained that death as a consequence of sin, was a merciful provision of the Creator; since it was a means by which the spiritual results of sin might cease, and the holy dead no longer be included in the category of sinners. This could not be as long as they were in bodies capable of ministering to sin and under the penalty of death. But with the death and resurrection of Christ,

there is a triumph over death, and consequently a changed attitude toward it. Christ's resurrection, therefore, was not only His own personal triumph over death, it was the triumph of His people also. This is expressly stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews as follows:Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same . that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage(Heb. 2:14, 15). It is this changed attitude toward death through Jesus Christ, that we must now consider

Death in Relation to Jesus Christ. Our discussion must include three important facts: (1) Christ asserts the original law and the original purpose of God for men, not only as to His life on earth, but as to His exit from earth also. He overcame wrong by doing right; He Overcame sin by fulfilling the law of holiness; and He overcame death through the law of the Spirit of life (Rom. 8:2). (2) Christ was made a curse for us, in that He brought Himself under the penalty of a fallen race (Gal. 3:16). But He not only died vicariously for sin, He also died unto sin (Rom. 6:10). For a time therefore, death had dominion over Him; but in subjecting Himself to death under the condemnation of the law, the penalty was fully satisfied, and all organic connection with the world of evil, at once and forever dissolved. Thus His death became an epoch of judicial peace, and an eternal triumph over the curse of the law. (3) Through the offering of Himself upon the cross, Christ endured in reality, the curse entailed by sin, but it became for Him also, a birth into a new order of being. It was the resolution of His earthly life into a post-earthly form of human existence. For this reason He is calledthe firstborn from the dead(Col. 1:18); and again He is said to bethe first begotten of the dead(Rev. 1:5). By His bearing of our sins in His own body on the tree (I Peter 2:24; Gal. 3:13), He not only fulfilled the positive demands of the divine law, but He realized also in Himself, the perfection of human life both of these being demonstrated by the fact of the resurrection. This mystery of the cross is thus stated by St. Peter asbeing put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit(I Peter 3:18). According to the flesh, Christ died a real death under condemnation; but according to the new law of the life-giving Spirit, He was like the grain of wheat which is quickened while it dies. Thus in surmounting death by the giving of His spirit, He at the same time advanced into a new stage of triumphant life. "This mysterious process of the vegetable kingdom," says Dr. Gerhart, "our Lord employs to set forth the more mysterious process of His spiritual kingdom. The one is a fact confronting natural perception; the other a fact concerning spiritual perception" (Gerhart,Institutes of the Christian Religion, II, p. 776)

[The exit of "the spiritual man" from the present world and the exit of "the natural man" are not in kind the same. The exit of each is an epoch in the history of human existence. Neither is the extinction or cessation of being; but the one is an epoch governed by the law of life in Christ Jesus, while the other is an epoch determined by the operation of the law of sin. The exit of "the natural man" is properly denoted by the word "death." Death and sin as to kind are the same, sin being the seed of death, death the bitter fruit of sin. An epoch of transition from the present world to the future world is not in itself abnormal or unnatural. Sound Christian speculation, justified by the history of the Son of Man, may teach that a transition was ordained by the divine idea of human history. It is typified by the translation of Enoch and of Elijah, and demonstrated by the ascension of our Lord. That normal epoch of departure became abnormal in consequence of the entrance of the vitiating power of sin; and because abnormal, the change has the false character which we call death . . . . The life of Jesus, on the contrary, is the ideal human life. He asserts the original law

and the original teleology of man as formed in the image of God, both in His history on earth and in His exit from the earth. His exit was in one respect the normal epoch of transition from the lower to the higher realm which the original law of humanity anticipated and demanded. Considered under this aspect, the epoch is to be regarded as the organic resolution of the earthly order into the heavenly order of ideal human existence. - Gerhart,Institutes of the Christian Religion, II, pp. 773, 774.]

Christ as the Author of Eternal Life. Christ having triumphed over death, becomes the author of life to every believer. Death, therefore, which will eventually be swallowed up of life, is now a conquered enemy. This fact alone makes necessary a changed attitude toward death on the part of the believers. Eternal life as manifested in Christ is in the individual Christian marked by stages and degrees corresponding to the several fundamental epochs in the life of Christ on earth. We may note here three clearly marked periods in the history of the incarnate Christ: (1) From His conception and birth to His death and burial - the ordinary span of a man's life: (2) From His death and burial to His resurrection, including the descent into Hades. This marks a stage in the progress of the new creation, in which our Lord, through death, overcame him who had the power of death, and thus secured deliverance for His people (Heb. 2:14, 15). (3) His life on earth during the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. This marks the establishment of a new order of being the resolution of the earthly into the resurrected state, with freedom from weakness, mortality and corruption for all His people

[Dr. Olin A. Curtis in his chapter on the "Christian Meaning of Death," treats the subject of bodily death (1) as to its Personal Significance; (2) its Moral Significance; and (3) its Racial Significance. First, as to the personal significance of bodily death, he states that the province of the body to furnish man with the machinery of personal expression - a point, which if kept clearly in mind takes on large personal significance. In the experience of bodily death, man undergoes for the first time, the experience of being absolutely alone. As one as he remained in the body, there was something to hear or touch. A man may cease to have fellowship with other men, and as a consequence think that he has exhausted the torture of loneliness. But he has not exhausted it, for he can still see the sun, or hear the thunder, or feel the wind in his face. These things do not of course, meet his personal need at all, but they do occupy his attention, and thus protect him from the solitude of the profoundest introspection. But it is in death that the body is torn away, and no protection whatever is left to the man. All he has is his own isolated poverty of person - a solitary personality all alone in the reaches of the Infinite. Second, man in death is not absolutely alone only, but alone with his own conscience. Not one thing can for a moment shelter him from the violence of the moral smiting. Now, of all times, this lonely sinner needs the presence of God, but death is empty of the friendly God. His death expresses the holy anger of God. The man must now meet the insistence of God's moral concern closely and finally, before the last door of destiny is closed. Third, the death of the body has a racial significance also, since the body is the racial nexus. Not only does physical death isolate the individual person, but it also breaks him off from the race. He is now a man without a race the solidarity of the Adamic race as the groundwork of relations being destroyed by bodily death. One by one men are wrenched out of their racial relations by death, and flung out into the isolation of bare personal existence, to await as responsible persons, the final judgment. - CURTIS,The Christian Faith, pp. 295, 296.]

Since the experiences and achievements of Christ are to be made those of His people also, we may likewise discern three stages in the progress of eternal life as manifested in the individual Christian. (1) The first is that life communicated in the new birth. As Christ became incarnate of the Holy Ghost by the virgin Mary, so the Spirit of God infuses into the soul of the believer, the new life in Christ. (2) The second is that spiritual transformation which is symbolized by the death and resurrection of Christ. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord (Rom. 6:10, 11). This is accomplished through the baptism with the Spirit. Both of these stages are included in Soteriology, and have been previously treated in connection with the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit (Christian Theology, II, pp. 321-326). (3) The third stage belongs properly to Eschatology and has to do with the resurrection of the body. This is commonly known as glorification. Christ departed this life under the curse, but in such a manner as to dissolve His organic connection with the world of moral evil, and thereby realize the perfection of human life in a new order of being. Consequently the curse was removed and death resolved into victory. As in dying, Christ destroyed death in relation to Himself, so His people in dying likewise destroy death in relation to themselves. The curse being lifted, the Christian emphasis is placed upon the inner spirit of life. Hence death to the Christian believer is not now an abnormal event, but the operation of the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The whole process is taken up and glorified. Like the preceding stage, this is also a death to sin, but in a different sense. That was a death to sin as a ruling principle in the individual believer; this is death to sin as an eternal possibility. Consequently the Scriptures now regard physical death as in some sense a birth - not a spiritual birth into the kingdom of God, but a bursting forth of life into the post-earthly realm, a birth into the kingdom of glory. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you (Rom. 8:11)

[Of Jesus Christ as the Head of the new race we therefore predicate only life. "I am the life." By the realization in humanity of the law of holiness Christ annuls the law of sin; by quickening and perfecting the eternal life Christ destroys death. "The spiritual man," being a member of the destroyer of sin and death, lives the life of the ascended Conqueror. The end of his earthly history is not death, but an epoch which on the one hand is victory over the curse of sin, and on the other hand is the transition from a lower to a higher plane of eternal life. - Gerhart,Institutes of the Christian Religion, II, p.777

Christian death is abundantly and most impressively brought to light as not abolished absolutely; but as taken up into the divine plan for the individual just as it is for the race. It enters into the probationary discipline of believers. Hence it is hallowed and dignified as part of the fellowship of their lot with Christ . . . That unknown element in His suffering which negatived the sinner’s eternal death is of necessity unshared, but His physical surrender to death admits us to a fellowship with it . . . . There is no grace of Christian life which is not made perfect in death; not that death is the minister of the Spirit to destroy sin, but the last earthly act and oblation of the sinless spirit in which the sacrifice of all becomes perfect in one. Therefore it is the appointed end of human probation. Other methods of placing a limit to the probationary career, especially in relation to the unfallen creature, may he imagined: this is the appointed end since sin and redemption began. The very execution of doom is made the goal of destiny, in which the sentence is finally reversed. And thus

in a certain sense death is the preliminary and decisive judgement for every individual on earth who knows the connection between sin and deliverance. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th.,pp. 374, 375.]

[Dr. Olin A. Curtis objects to the idealization of death as a friendly and even beautiful event, as is done by some philosophical and poetical writers. "This poetic idealization," he says, "is not to be explained by the natural temper of the poet but rather by the fact that he is (with notable exceptions) a heathen mystic made superficially hopeful by a Christian atmosphere. He is an easy optimist who has never paid the ethical price of a profound optimism." - Curtis,Christian Faith, p. 281.] THE INTERMEDIATE STATE The fact of the immortality of the soul having been established, the question next in order is concerned with its conscious existence between the death and the resurrection of the body. All who accept the teaching of the Scriptures as the Word of God, accept also the fact of an intermediate state; but the point on which opinions differ is the question as to the nature of this state. (1) Sheol is derived from the Hebrew word "to ask" and expresses probably the sense of the English proverb - the "grave crieth give, give." The word sometimes means indefinitely, the grave, or place or state of the dead; and at others, definitely, a place or state of the dead into which the element of misery, and punishment enters: but never a place or state of happiness, or good after death (Cf. BLUNT,Dictionary) . (2)Hadesis a Greek word derived from a primitive and idein and signifies the invisible world of departed spirits. It was used by the authors of the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew wordSheol, as in Psalms 16:10 and Acts 2:27. Dr. A. A. Hodge points out that the word occurs only eleven times in the New Testament (Matt. 11:23; 16:18; Luke 10:15; 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; I Cor. 15:55; Rev. i 18; 6:8; 20:13, 14); and that in every case except I Cor. 15:55, where the more critical editions of the original substitute the word qavnate in the place of hades is translated hell, and certainly always represents the invisible world as under the dominion of Satan, and as opposed to the kingdom of Christ (Cf. A. A. Hodge,Outlines of Theology, p. 435). (3) Paradise, from the Greek word paravdeiso", was adopted into both Greek and Hebrew from some oriental language. The word means a park, or pleasure garden, and was used by the translators of the Septuagint to represent the garden in Eden (Gen. 2:8ff). It occurs only three times in the New Testament (Luke 23:43; II Cor. 12:4; and Rev. 2:7), and the context shows that it is connected with the "third heaven" in one instance; and in the others with the "Garden of God" in which grows the tree of life - all three necessarily referring to a life beyond physical death

[Throughout the Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation, the departed souls of men are represented as congregating in one vast receptacle, the interior conditions of which differ much in the two Testaments and vary in each respectively. On their estate a steady increase of light as revelation proceeds, though even in its final disclosures leave much obscurity which only the Lord’s coming will remove. It Is, however, made certain that the intermediate state is under the special control of the Redeemer as the Lord of all the dead who have ever passed from the world; that those who have departed in unbelief are in a condition of imprisonment waiting for the final judgment, while those who have died in the faith are in Paradise, or rather with Christ, waiting for their consummation; and that the universal resurrection will put an end both to death and to the state of the disembodied dead. Some few hints which the New Testament gives as to the conscious personality of the subjects of the Lord’s Kingdom in Hades have been .made the basis of doctrinal determinations and ecclesiastical institutions and speculative theories which belong to the department of historical theology. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 376.] In our discussion of

this doctrine we shall consider (I) the historical development of the doctrine; and (II) some of its theological implications

I In historical theology, the idea of Hades has undergone a number of modifications. These we shall consider in the following order: (1) The Patristic Doctrine of the Intermediate State; (2) The Heretical Doctrine of Soul Sleeping; (3) The Roman Catholic Doctrine of an Intermediate Place; and (4) The Protestant Doctrine of an Intermediate State The Patristic Doctrine of the Intermediate State.While the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is taught in the Old Testament, the Hebrew people generally seem to have held it in a more or less perverted form. The common belief appears to have been this, that all souls descended at death into Sheol or Hades, which was a gloomy, subterranean abode; and where the inhabitants were shades, existing in a weak, powerless and dreamy state. At other times, Sheol is represented as divided into two departments - Paradise, a place of positive bliss, and Gehenna, a place of positive torment. In the former or Abraham’s bosom, were the Jews, or at least those who had been faithful to the law; in the latter were the Gentiles. It was held, further, that at the coming of the Messiah, the faithful Jews would be resurrected and have a part in His glorious kingdom; while the Gentiles would be left forever in the abode of darkness. The doctrine of an Intermediate State was prevalent in the early church, as is shown by the numerous references to it in the writings of the Fathers. In the main, their teachings were similar to those of later Judaism. Hades, or the invisible region, was an underworld, or realm of the dead. It was a place of partial rewards and punishments. Justin Martyr says of it, that "the souls of the pious are in a better place, those of the unjust and wicked in a worse, waiting for the time of judgment." Tertullian (220) states that "no one, becoming absent from the body, is at once a dweller in the presence of the Lord, except by the prerogative of martyrdom, whereby he gets at once a lodging in Paradise, not in Hades." Cyprian (258) appears to have taken a different view from that of Tertullian, and intimates that the departed saints come immediately into the presence of Christ. Origen (d. 254) taught that since the resurrection of Christ, Hades no longer holds the souls of the righteous - those of the former ages having been transported by Christ to Paradise

[The opinions of the early fathers concerning the residence of the soul in its disembodied state, between death and the resurrection, were somewhat fluctuating. The idea of Hades, or underworld, where departed spirits dwell, was familiar to the Hebrew mind as it was to the Greek, and so far as this idea passed over to Christianity it tended to the doctrine of a state intermediate between this earthly life and the everlasting abode of the soul assigned to it in the day of judgment. Justin Martyr represents the souls of the righteous as taking up a temporary abode in a happy, those of the wicked in a wretched place; and stigmatizes as heretical the doctrine that souls are immediately received into heaven at death. Tertullian held that the martyrs went at once to the abode of the blessed, but that this was a privilege peculiar to them, and not granted to other Christians. Cyprian, on the other hand, says nothing of an intermediate state, and expresses the confident belief that those who die in the Lord, by pestilence or by any other mode, will he at once taken to Him. In the Alexandrian school, the idea of an intermediate state passed into that of a gradual purification of the soul, and paved the way for the later doctrine of purgatory. The doctrine of an intermediate state not only maintained itself, but gained in authority and influence during the polemic period (Ad. 250-730). Ambrose taught that the soul is separated from the body at death, and after the cessation of the earthly life is held in an ambiguous condition, awaiting the final

judgment. Augustine remarks that "the period which intervenes between the death and the final resurrection of man contains souls in secret receptacles, who are treated according to their character and conduct in the flesh." "The majority of ecclesiastical writers of this period," Hagenbach remarks, "believed that men do not receive their full reward till after the resurrection of the body. Here and there, however, there was a dissenting voice. Gregory Nazianzen supposed that the souls of the righteous prior to the resurrection of the body, are at once admitted into the presence of God; in which opinion he seems supported by Gennadius and Gregory the Great. Eusebius also declares that Helena, the mother of Constantine, went immediately to God and was transformed into an angelic substance. In the Middle Ages and the Papal Church, the doctrine of an intermediate state was, of course, retained and defended in connection with that of purgatory. -Shedd,History of Christian Doctrine, II, pp. 400-403.] The Doctrine of Soul Sleeping.According to this doctrine, the soul during the intermediate period is either in a state of unconscious sleep known asPsychopannychism(from pannucizein, to spend all night long, and yuch the soul) ; or that it is in a state of actual death known asThnetopsychism(from qnhvskw, death and yuch the soul) . In neither form has the doctrine been extensively adopted in the church, and therefore has always been regarded as heretical. However, it has had its advocates in every age. Origen in the third century wrote against a small sect which held this doctrine ; Calvin wrote against it in the sixteenth century, and the Roman Catholic Church condemned it in several councils, notably that of Trent (1545-1563). The doctrine is based upon a misapprehension of those passages of Scripture which refer to death as a sleep. Furthermore, the doctrine presupposes that the soul cannot know itself, or in any sense energize except through the instrumentality of the body. It is for this reason that the soul during its disembodied state is regarded as dormant, or as virtually dead. This position, however, is philosophically, pure assumption. Because the soul cannot function except through the body in its relation to material things, it is assumed that it cannot function apart from the body in spiritual things. This error is refuted by the arguments commonly urged against materialism. From the standpoint of exegesis also, the doctrine is false. By no allowable interpretation, can the discourse concerning Dives and Lazarus be made to support the doctrine of soul sleeping; nor can the words of Jesus to the thief on the cross have any meaning unless he was to be consciously with Him in Paradise. Furthermore, the statement of St. Paul in regard to being absent from the body and present with the Lord, cannot be understood, if an interval of unconsciousness is to elapse between the two events

[Dr. E. Y. Mullins points out that there is no basis in the New Testament, for what is known as the doctrine of "soul-sleeping." There are indeed passages which refer to death as a sleep, but it is nowhere said that the soul sleeps. The reference is to the personality as a whole, and the figure of sleep must be interpreted in harmony with the general teachings of the New Testament. Sleep means "not alive to surroundings." A man asleep knows nothing of the activities about him. So death is a sleep in the sense that men become alive to a new set of surroundings and cut off from those of the present life. In one passage the idea of death as a sleep and that of conscious fellowship with Christ are combined in a single statement. In I Thessalonians 5:10 the apostle refers to Christ "Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." (Mullins, The Christian Religion, p. 461.)]

[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 of 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 more philosophical view as to the nature of the connection between life and its material basis, is the one which regards vitality as something super added 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 colors are essential to the artist. Because metal conducts the electric current, and renders it perceptible to our senses, no one thinks therefore of 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 this 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" (Cf. Nicholson, in Hodge,Systematic Theology,III, p. 731).] The Roman Catholic Doctrine of an Intermediate Place. Since the time of Gregory the Great (100: 604), there has been connected with the belief in Hades as an intermediate state, a belief also, in Purgatory as an intermediate place. Purgatory, as the doctrine is elaborated by the Roman Catholic Church, insofar as the souls of departed human beings are concerned, seems to comprise the following departments

1. TheLimbus Patrumis a term referring to the state of the righteous dead, previous to the First Advent of Christ. It is held that when Christ descended into Hades after His crucifixion, He delivered the souls of .the patriarchs and carried them in triumph to heaven. This is, of course, similar to the common Jewish teaching concerning the Old Testament saints. Many hold that this compartment ceased to exist after the ascension, but others maintain that the souls of the departed since that time, are still confined in this intermediate place, awaiting deliverance at the Second Advent

2. TheLimbus Infantumrefers to the supposed abode of the souls of unbaptized infants. This is not regarded as a place either of suffering or happiness. Thomas Aquinas states that although unbaptized infants are deprived forever of the happiness of the saints, they suffer neither sorrow nor sadness in consequence of the privation

3. Purgatory is regarded as the intermediate abode of those who die in the peace of the church, but who need further purification before entering the final state of heaven. The doctrine of Purgatory as held by Romanists is fairly summed up by Dr. Charles Hodge as follows: "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 an 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 (Hodge,Systematic Theology, III, pp. 749, 750). This erroneous doctrine arises from the belief of the Roman Catholic Church, that the atonement of Christ is available for us only in respect to original sin and the exposure to eternal death. That is, Christ delivers us only from thereatus poenae, or culpability, not from thereatus poenae, or liability to punishment. For sins after baptism, the offender must make satisfaction by penance or good works. This satisfaction must be complete in this life if the soul is to enter heaven; if not, then this purification must be completed in purgatory. The Eucharist or Mass is the propitiatory sacrifice intended to secure the pardon of sins committed after baptism ; and since this takes effect according to the intention of the priests, he may if he so desires, by his intention, make it effective for souls in purgatory. The pope, being the vicar of Christ on earth, has full power to forgive sins in this sense - he may exempt offenders from the obligation to make sacrifices for their offenses. This is the doctrine against which Protestantism took such a vigorous stand

[Article VIII of the Tridentine Profession of Faith is as follows: "I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invoked, and that they offer up prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to he had in veneration." This is a general statement and no mention is made as to whether these souls exist in a state of misery or happiness. However, in the catechism of the Council of Trent, drawn up by order of the Fathers, the statement is more explicit. "There is a purgatorial fire, where the souls of the righteous are purified by a temporary punishment, that entrance may be given them into their eternal home, where .nothing that is defiled can have a place. And of the truth of this doctrine, which holy councils declare to be confirmed by the testimony of Scripture and of apostolic tradition, the pastor will have to declare more diligently and frequently, because we are fallen on times in which men will not endure sound doctrine (Catech. Trident. Chap. VI)

Purgatory, as an assumed Christian doctrine, is peculiar to Romanism. It has no place in the creed of any other church, though in some it may be held by individual members. In Romanism Christians compose two classes: the imperfect, and the truly good. The former have impurities which must he cleansed away, and venial sins which must be expiated in penal suffering, in order to a neatness for heaven. Even the truly good, while free from the guilt of mortal sins, yet have deserts of temporal punishment which must be expiated. Purgatory provides for both classes, as in its penal and purifying fires both may attain to a fitness for heaven. But it provides only for such as the Romish Church recognizes as Christians: therefore it has no connection with the doctrine of a second probation. - Miley,Systematic Theology, II, p. 438.]

4. Heaven is defined to be the place and state of the blessed where God is, where Jesus is enthroned in majesty, and where the angels and the spirits of just men are made perfect. It is the place of the highest blessedness. Into this state of perfect blessedness, the

Romanists hold that only a few, even of true believers, enter immediately at death. Instead, both the righteous and the wicked remain in an intermediate state, which for the righteous is known as

Paradise or Abraham’s Bosom, and for the wicked is called Purgatory. From this intermediate state the righteous go to their final reward, and the wicked to their eternal doom, at the last judgment. It is maintained, however, that there are two classes which may enter heaven previous to the resurrection - those who are perfectly pure at the time of death; and those who, although not perfect when they leave this world, have become perfect in purgatory

5. Hell is defined as a place or state, in which wicked angels and the finally impenitent among men suffer forever the punishment of their sins. The sufferings of the lost are due to two things: (1) those of loss or deprivation, in which they are denied the vision, favor and presence of God; and (2) those of positive infliction, such as the sufferings arising from remorse, wicked passions and despair. The Romanists differ, however, as to whether the fire mentioned in this connection is literal or symbolical. Gousset says that on this subject 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 the 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 pam 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" (Cf. Hodge,Systematic Theology, III, pp. 747, 748) The Protestant Doctrine of an Intermediate State. Protestantism retains the idea of an intermediate state, but rejects generally the idea of an intermediate place. We may state the common Protestant doctrine as follows: (1) That at the death the souls of the righteous go immediately into the presence of Christ and of God. The Scriptures make no mention of a long delay; instead it is clearly taught that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (II Cor. 5:6). (2) The souls of the departed exist in a state of consciousness. In referring to the righteous, St. Paul declares that nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ (Rom. 8:38); that is, the moral and spiritual relationship to Christ is continuous and unbroken. No provision is made for an interrupted period of consciousness. (3) Not only are the righteous dead conscious, but they are in a state of blessedness and rest (Rev. 14:13). (4) The intermediate state is not the final state of believers. Man is body as well as spirit, and hence in his disembodied state there is an element of imperfection which can be supplied only by the resurrection. This belief in an intermediate state is perfectly consistent with the teaching of Protestantism, that after the Second Advent and the resurrection of the dead, the state of the soul will be still more exalted and blessed. What has been said of the righteous dead, is equally applicable to the state of the wicked: (1) That at death the souls of the wicked are banished from the presence of the Lord ; (2) that the wicked exist in consciousness ; (3) that this consciousness is one of suffering and unrest; and (4) that the state of the wicked is not final - they too will be raised, but to everlasting shame and contempt; and the judgment will fix their eternal doom

[In the Protestant Church the doctrine of purgatory was rejected; but some difference of sentiment appears respecting the intermediate state. Calvin combated the theory of a sleep of the soul between death and the resurrection, which had been revived by some of the Swiss Anabaptists, and argues for the full consciousness of the disembodied spirit. The second Helvetic Confession expressly rejects the notion that departed spirits reappear on earth. Some theologians endeavored to establish a distinction between the happiness which a disembodied spirit enjoys, and that which

it will experience after the resurrection of the body. They also distinguish between the judgment which takes place at the death of each individual, by which his destiny is immediately decided, and the general judgment at the end of the world. Speaking generally, the doctrine of an intermediate state has found most favor in the Lutheran division of Protestants. In the English Church, since the time of Laud, the doctrine has found some advocates, chiefly in that portion of it characterized by high church views, and a Romanizing tendency. The followers of Swedenborg adopt the tenet in a highly gross and materializing form. - Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, II, pp. 402, 403.]

Growing out of the preceding historical discussion, there are certain questions which, because of their theological implications, demand further consideration. We refer especially to such questions as: (1) Is there an intermediate place as well as an intermediate state? and what are the theological and practical implications which are involved. (2) Is the intermediate state a period of future probation? and (3) Is the intermediate state one of progress and development? These are but a few of the questions which arise in connection with this important subject Is there an Intermediate Place as well as an Intermediate state? This is a question which has engaged the interest of many learned and pious men; and yet it is without value, except for its practical implications. The Scriptures leave the question undecided, some texts appearing to favor one view, and some another. As favoring the idea of an intermediate place, there is the account of Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31), and also the words of Christ to the dying thief, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise (Luke 23:43). The word Paradise is sometimes used in a lower sense than that of heaven; and besides Jesus did not ascend into heaven on that day as His words to Mary indicate, for I am not yet ascended to my Father (John 20:17). As opposed to the idea of an intermediate place, we may cite such texts as the words of St. Stephen, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit (Acts 7 59); and those of St. Paul, to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord (II Cor. 5:8). These passages seem to indicate that the good at death go immediately into the presence of the Lord. But the question may be asked, Does not an intermediate state necessarily imply an intermediate place? We think not. It is the general belief of the church, that during the intermediate state the persons of men are incomplete while their souls and bodies are .separated, but this incompleteness is due to the state or condition, and not to the place. That is, the righteous .and the wicked each go to their place of final abode, but do not thereby enter upon their eternal state. This latter can take place only at the final judgment. The early church seems to have held to a belief in an intermediate place, due to Jewish influence

[According to the doctrine of the New Testament, therefore, there is no third place, or medium, between heaven and hell or between being happy and miserable, although there are very different degrees both of the one and the other. The intermediate condition of which we have spoken must not be understood to imply anything like this. Still an opinion like this got footing very early in the Christian Church. And this gave rise to the custom of praying for the dead, since men were foolish enough to imagine that there is room to obtain an alteration in the yet undecided destiny of departed spirits, while in truth their destiny must depend solely upon their own actions during the present life. This custom had become very general in the fourth century, and was at that time opposed by Aerius, presbyter of Pontus, as we learn from the testimony of Epiphanius, who is very indignant against him on this account. It was also opposed by the Spanish presbyter, Vigilantius, in the fifth century, in reply to whom Hieronymus wrote a violent book. The doctrine was afterward brought into connection with that respecting purgatory, and then followed masses for souls, as

sacrifices for the departed. There are also some traces of prayers for the dead, even among Grecian Jews (Cf. II Mac. 12:43-46) - KNAPP,Christian Theology, p. 350.] This view was held at a later time also, being strongly supported by the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. The churches of the Reformation, however, rejected it, both because of their revolt against the abuses which attached to the doctrine of purgatory, and because of the theological implications involved in it. Dr. Enoch Pond sums up these theological implications as follows: "I have examined, in as few words as possible, the question of an intermediate place, and find no foundation for it in the Word of God. It is of heathen and not Christian origin, and better becomes a believer in the mythology of Greece and Rome than a disciple of the Saviour. I regard the theory, too, as of dangerous influence. Could it be generally received by evangelical Christians, it would be followed, I have no doubt, in a little time, with prayers for the dead, and with the doctrine of a future probation and restoration - perhaps with all the superstitions of purgatory. This is the course which things took in the ancient church, and in all probability they would take the same again. Let us, then, 'hold fast the form of sound words' on this subject - the words of Scripture and of most of our Protestant confessions of faith, and not be 'driven about by every wind of doctrine'"(POND,Christian Theology, p. 552)

[The saints who are in life and death united to Him are spoken of - as those who "sleep in Jesus" He is their koimthrivon or Cemetery, where sleep is life while life is sleep. The current language of the Epistles refers to their death as departure "to be with Christ," the entering "an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," and the attainment of an almost consummate state in "the general assembly and church of the firstborn which are written in heaven," where are "the spirits of just men made perfect." All this seems inconsistent with a locality in any sense corresponding to the underworld of Sheol: in fact the term Hades would be all but lost, save in the symbolical Apocalypse, were it not for the explicit declaration that in the resurrection its victory will be taken away "0 Hades where is thy victory?" With the Lord's resurrection Paradise seems to' have risen also into .a lower heaven: as it were the third heaven if not the seventh. Of the elevation of Paradise some hint was given when "many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection"; these may have been the mysterious symbolical first-fruits, whose .spirits reunited to their bodies "appeared unto many" on their way with Christ from Paradise to heaven. The disembodied ungodly are never spoken of save as being generally or by implication in Hades. - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 379, 380 But though there is no intermediate place in which the soul is confined between death and the resurrection - noumbus patrum, just below heaven; nolimbus infontamfor unbaptized children, or purgatory, just above hell, for unsanctified Christians, as the Papists dream yet there is an intermediate state which some have strangely confounded with the intermediate place the hades, grave, or dormitory of souls - of which the Bible is silent. - Summers,Systematic Theology, I, p. 351 Is the intermediate State a Period of Future Probation?To this question we must reply that there can be no future probation for the wicked beyond the grave. This is evident for the following reasons: (1) It is unreasonable because it is unnecessary. God can extend probation in this life to any extent He pleases, and to suppose another probation, gives rise to more problems than it solves. (2) The very abundance of light and truth would seem to make the next world unfit for a period of trial. The outshining of truth with such effulgence and glory would be compelling rather than probationary. There the very devils believe and tremble, even though afar off from the realms of glory. (3) If the wicked are on probation in the next world, why not the righteous also? If the wicked can be saved

after death, then by a parity of reasoning the righteous may fall away and perish. (4) Sinners sometimes finish their probation before leaving this present world, as in the case of those who have committed the "unpardonable sin." (5) Those who believe in a future restoration, must of necessity regard the punishments of the next world as wholly disciplinary, that is, as designed for the sufferer and not for the public good. If this be true, then they are not a curse but a blessing. But the inhabitants of hell are said to be under the curse of God (Jude 7), and objects of His vengeance (II Thess. 1:8, 9). (6) If it be said that previous to their restoration sinners suffer all that they deserve, then they are saved by works and not by grace - a position entirely out of harmony with the teachings of the New Testament. (7) The Scriptures teach that it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment (Heb. 9:27). Here it is evident that between death and the judgment there are no important changes, which indicates that only while men are in the body are they on probation (II Cor. 5:10). Besides, if sinners are not reclaimed in the judgment, of what value is a second probation? (8) There will be no opportunity for the wicked to return to God through a Mediator, for at the judgment the mediatorial kingdom will come to an end, insofar as it is a provision for the salvation of the lost (I Cor. 15:24-28). We may add also, that the idea of a probation beyond the grave and preceding the final judgment, is out of harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures, but this subject must be reserved for further treatment in connection with the final state of the wicked

[The Scriptures make no announcement of any probation after the present life. The merest suggestion of such a state is all that may reasonably be claiined; and rarely is anything more actually claimed. As to any explicit utterance in favor of a second probation, there is a dead silence of the Scriptures. How is this? Probation, with its privileges and responsibilities, very deeply concerns us. No period of our existence is fraught with deeper interest. The Scriptures are replete with such views of our present probation. They constantly press it upon our attention as involving the most solemn responsibilities of the present life and the profoundest interests of the future life. In a future probation there must be a renewal of all that so deeply concerns a present probation; yet there is not an explicit word respecting it. Such silence of the Scriptures is utterly irreconcilable with the reality of such a probation. - Miley,Systematic Theo1ogy, II, p. 435.] Is the Intermediate State one of Progress and Development?This is not merely a speculative question, but is bound up with psychological and philosophical theory concerning the soul and its relation to the body. While Protestantism rejects the doctrine of a purgatory, the soul’s activity in a disembodied state is a question which has been peculiarly attractive to philosophically minded theologians. The breaking off of the soul from the body as the racial nexus, and the tearing away of the veil of the flesh, furnishes the "aloneness" which underlies Dr. Olin A. Curtis’ chapter on "The Christian Meaning of Death" (CURTIS, The Christian Faith, Chap. XX). Bishop Martensen fairly states the problem as follows: "The departed are described in the New Testament as souls, or spirits (I Peter 3:19, 20); they are divested of corporeity, have passed away out of the whole range of full daylight activity, and are waiting for the new and perfect body with which they shall be ’clothed upon.’ That state immediately following death must therefore be the direct contrast of the present. In contrast with the present state, it must be said that the departed find themselves in a condition of rest, a state of passivity, that they are in ’the night wherein no man can work’ (John 9:4). Their kingdom is not one of works and deeds, for they no longer possess the conditions upon which works and deeds are possible. Nevertheless, they live a deep spiritual life ; for the kingdom of the dead is a kingdom of subjectivity, a kingdom of calm thought and self-fathoming, a kingdom of remembrance

in the full sense of the word, in such a sense, I mean, that the soul now enters into its inmost recesses, resorts to that which is the very foundation of life, the true substratum and source of all existence" (Martensen,Christian Dogmatics, pp. 457, 458). Dr. Curtis denies that the intermediate state is one of a second or even continued probation, but holds that its province is that of adjusting a person's mental life to his moral meaning. This world is planned for an ethical test, but we all reach death holding various sorts of false or fragmentary opinions. These opinions do not determine our central intention or influence our moral ideals; but they do confuse the expression of intention, and entire consistency at the point of judgment. "Therefore in the intermediate state," he says, "our relation to truth and reality is to be fully cleared up. No longer will a perfect purpose be held back by an imperfect judgment. No longer can any man's moral meaning be hidden under a false opinion" (CURTIS,Christian Faith, p. 402). It is further pointed out that the clearing up of the mental life may result in a new formal adjustment to Jesus Christ

[Dr. Olin A. Curtis says, "whatever one may think of the doctrine of the intermediate state from a merely religious standpoint, it has large Christian importance. For no one can see total Christianity, no one can grasp the philosophy of the Christian faith, until he has caught the peculiar significance of that personal experience between death and the resurrection. The systematic theologian is wont to consider the intermediate state as a doctrinal fragment of eschatology; but to me the profounder connection is soteriological." He notes five things that must be considered in a constructive doctrine: (1) The ethical spirit of the New Testament must he protected; (2) we should give this earthly life a full philosophical significance; (3) In the same spirit of Christian economy we must give also to the intermediate state a full philosophical significance; (4) The view of personality and bodily life, already gained, must be maintained watchfully; and (5) the doctrine must he so constructed as to protect the awful Christian emphasis upon death. - Curtis,Christian Faith, pp. 397, 398 As long as man is in this present world, he is in a kingdom of externals, wherein he can escape from self-contemplation and self knowledge by the distractions of time, the noise and tumult of the world; but at death he enters upon a kingdom the opposite of all this. The veil which this world of sense, with its varied and incessantly moving manifoldness, spreads with soothing and softening influence over the stern reality of life, and which man finds ready to his hand to hide what he does not wish to see this veil is torn asunder from before him in death, and his soul finds itself in a kingdom of pure realities. The manifold voices of this worldly life, which during this earthly life sounded together with the voices of eternity, grow dumb, and the holy voice now sounds alone, no longer deadened by the tumult of the world; and hence the realm of the dead becomes a realm of judgment. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgement," - Martensen,Christian Dogmatics, p. 458.[

[After death, the difference in principle, which existed here below, between the children of light and the children of darkness, is thus ever more developing; and the man finds himself placed in a very real and just state of retribution, although a state of retribution as yet only in its beginning, in relation to God and to himself. Upon the broad as upon the narrow way, falls the impenetrable curtain of death; but the first step after borders immediately upon the last step, before this curtain. Death alters our condition and our surroundings, but in our personality, nothing. Individuality, self-consciousness, memory, remains. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 781

Dr. Pope states that the Scriptures indicate "a progress in blessedness and in the development of moral energy during the disembodied state. They have the discipline of hope; and of hope as not

yet eternal in the heavens, though no longer probationary. They wait for the consummation, their Lord’s and their own. And their progress in the spiritual life is not simply that which after the judgment will go on forever, but an advance from stage to stage peculiar to the intermediate state. Time is behind them; time is also before them; the day of eternity is not yet fully come." - Pope,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 384

Steffens calls attention to the fact that what is an evolution within the though - that is a growth and development, must in the intermediate state perfect itself by becoming an involution ever more intense.]

Here again we must turn to the Scriptures for our authoritative teaching on this subject. Nor do they leave us without any light on this important subject. In the Apocalypse we are told that the spirits of the redeemed from among men,follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth(Rev. 14:4); and that havingwashed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, they serve him day and night in his temple(Rev. 7:15). There is one instance also, in which the rapid development in the intermediate state is clearly set forth. St. John having heard the messenger of God says, I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not:I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God(Rev. 19:10). So transformed was the messenger, that St. John did not recognize him as a martyr, but supposed him to be a divine being to be worshiped. We may well believe then, on the authority of the Scriptures, that the intermediate state will be one of progress in righteousness for the righteous, and in wickedness for the wicked [THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY

1. History of the Doctrine. The idea of purification by fire was familiar to the Greek mind, having been taken up and made a part of his philosophy by Plato. He taught that no one could become perfectly happy after death until he had expiated his sins; and that II they were too great for expiation, his sufferings would have no end. That this doctrine passed from the Greeks to the Jews is inferred from the fact that Judas Maccabeus sent money to Jerusalem to pay for sacrifices to he offered for the sins of the dead. Also from the fact that the Rabbins taught that children by means of sin offerings could alleviate the sufferings of their deceased parents. Paradise, it seems, was regarded as encompassed by a sea of fire, wherein the blemishes of souls must he consumed before their admission to heaven. For this reason they taught that all souls not perfectly holy must wash themselves in the fire-river of Gehenna; and while the just would soon he cleansed, the wicked would he retained in its torments indefinitely The doctrine of purgatorial purification first began to he approached in the third century by Clement of Alexandria, who speaks of a spiritual fire in this world; and was followed by Origen, who held that this purifying fire continues beyond the grave. There were two the ones in the early church, which although they differed from each other, were not necessarily exclusive, and may have been held together in many cases. (1) There was the judgment day purgatory which was based upon the words of St. Paul taken literally, that the "fire shall try every man’s work"; and that even those who had built with wood, hay and stubble, would be saved if they had built upon the right foundation saved . as by fire (I Cor. 3:11-15). Both Hilary and Ambrose speak of the severity of the judgment day purification. Origen often speaks of judgment day fire through which even St. Peter and St. Paul must pass, though they shall hear the words, "When thou passest through the fire, the flame shall not harm thee." Basil says that baptism may he understood in three senses - in the one of regeneration by the. Holy .Spirit; in another, of the punishment of sin in the present life; and in a third, of "the trial of judgment by fire."

Both Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen mention the fire of the judgment This judgment day purgation differs widely from the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. (2) There was the doctrine of a purification in the intermediate state, or a temporary punishment between death and the resurrection. This was held chiefly by the western divines, who followed Augustine and developed the Roman Catholic doctrine as it is now understood. Augustine taught with respect to purgatory, first, that the souls of a certain class of men who are ultimately saved, suffer alter death; and second, that they are aided through the Eucharist, and the alms and prayers of the faithful. Cesarius of Aries (543) further developed the idea of purgatory by making a distinction between mortal crimes .and lesser sins, holding that the latter might be expiated by good works in this life, or the cleansing fire in the life to come

Gregory the Great (604) gathered together the vague and conflicting views of purgatory, and brought the doctrine into such shape that it became effective both for discipline and for income. For this reason he is commonly known as "the inventor of purgatory." "It is believed," he says, "that there is, for some light faults, a purgatorial fire before the judgment." However, the idea must have been vaguely entertained as early as the time of Perpetua, or even Augustine tacitly admitted the truth of her vision. From the eighth century on through the Middle Ages, the doctrine of purgatory took fast had upon the popular mind, and was one of the most prominent topics of public conversation. Both scholastics and mystics were explicit and vivid in their descriptions of purgatory, and the belief was supported by a multitude of dreams and visions. Among these were the visions of Fursey and Drycthelm mentioned by Bede (736). Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Garson and other great men of the Middle Ages held that the fires of purgatory were material, although Aquinas admitted the difficulty of understanding how literal fire could infllct pain on disembodied spirits. He held, also, that only those would go to purgatory who required it, but the saints would go at once to heaven, and the wicked to perdition The Greek Church never fully accepted the views of purgatory held in the west, and at the Council of Florence (1439) it was one of the irreconcilable differences between them. The mystic Weasel (1489) allegorized the popular language as "a spiritual fire of love, which purifies the soul of its remaining dross, and consists in the longing alter union with God." John Tauler rejected the popular trifling with the doctrine, and maintained that "to behold the glory of God is Paradise." The Cathari, Waldenses and Wycliffe (1384) rejected the doctrine. The Reformers unanimously denounced the doctrine in unmeasured terms. The Council of Trent on the other hand, pronounced an anathema against all those who reject the doctrine

II. Objections to the Doctrine of Purgatory. As indicated, the Reformers rejected the whole purgatorial theory as out of harmony with the teachings of the Scriptures, and the fundamental doctrines of grace. Excellent treatises on this subject may be found in the writings of the Reformed theologians, The following is Dr. Charles Hodge’s summary of his own teaching on the subject He says: (1) That it is destitute of 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 has always 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 the Romanists, and which is taken for granted in their doctrine of purgatory, finds no support in the words of Christ, as recorded in John 20:23 and Matthew 16:19, 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 origin, and to have been developed

by slow degrees into the form in which it is now held by the Church of Rome (Cf. Hodge,Systematic Theology, III, p. 766).]

33. Chapter 34 - THE SECOND ADVENT

Chapter 34 - THE SECOND ADVENT In approaching the subject of our Lord’s Second Advent, we are about to enter one of the most delicate and controversial fields of theology. The differences of opinion which have occasioned these controversies, are not merely speculative. They touch the deeper springs of the heart, and are vitally related to the experiences of men. It is a theme, also, which has periodically agitated the Church, always coming to the front when man feels most his need of divine help. In times of disaster, war, pestilence or persecution, the hope of His coming has always occupied the thoughts of men. Furthermore, this doctrine cannot be considered as merely one among many; it is rather a viewpoint - a determining principle by which men shape all their beliefs in logical order. Whether one believes in a "personal return of Christ," or merely in an increasing spiritual effusion," is not a matter of indifference. These positions reach back into the whole history of redemption, and affect some of the most commanding points in Christian theology. What he believes is the culminating point of his entire scheme of faith. It determines the whole character of his theology. The importance of the subject therefore demands the most careful and conscientious consideration The glory of Christianity, as over against the ethnic religions, is nowhere more manifest than in its eschatology. In our discussion of the Nature and Existence of God, we endeavored to show that the idea of God is a fundamental concept in religion, and therefore a determinative factor in theological thought. But the religious knowledge of God cannot rest in abstract thought. It must take shape in a comprehensive view of the world, of nature, of human history, of heaven and of hell. The history of religion reveals the fact that no religion has ever come into prominence without developing some form of a world order. The imagination blends the primitive religious concepts into mythology - hence we have the Greek religion of beauty, and the stronger Germanic conceptions embodied in the myths of the North. Bishop Martensen maintains that mythology is the attempt of the cosmical spirit or principle to embody itself in human history, and hence the ethnic religions must be regarded as the embodiment of the relative rather than the real - the spirit of the world manifested in heathendom which honors not God. He says, "As the created universe has, in a relative sense, life in itself - including as it does, a system of powers, ideas and aims, which possess a relative value - this relative independence, which ought to be subservient to the aims of the kingdom of God, has become a false ’world autonomy.’ Hence arises the scriptural expression ’this world,’ o kosmos outos, whereby the Bible conveys the idea that it regards the world not only ontologically, but in its definite and actual state, the state in which it has been since the fall. ’This world’ means the world content with itself, in its own independence, in its own glory; the world which disowns its dependence on God as its Creator. ’This world’ regards itself not as the ktisis, but only as the kosmos as a system of glory and beauty which has life in itself and can give life. The historical embodiment of ’this world’ is heathendom, which honoreth not God as God. In the consciousness of heathendom the visible and invisible kosmos is taken to be the highest reality; and the development of this consciousness displayed in heathen mythology, is a reflection of the universe, not of God, an image of the world, not the manifestation of the true image of the Lord. The darkness of heathen consciousness does not consist in the total absence of any enlightening idea of what is really true and universally

excellent, but in the fact that it does not see that idea reflected in God. It is not the contrast between the idea and the want of it - between the spirit and the spiritless - which must guide us in judging of heathenism; it is rather the contrast between idea and idea, between spirit and spirit, between the holy aim and the world's aim, between the Holy Spirit and the spirit of the world (Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, pp. 183, 184). Over against this purely relative expression, it is the glory of Christianity that it presents a revelation of reality. It finds its highest expression in the return and reign of the God-man, who as the Christ or Anointed One, Creator and Redeemer, will establish Himself in a perfect world order - the kingdom of God in a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness

We shall consider this subject under two general heads - the Personal Return of Our Lord; and The Order of Events Connected with His Return. The first is of course, the more important. The personal return of Christ has been frequently denied by a rationalistic philosophy and a faithless church, and must be defended by an appeal to the Scriptures as our sole authority. The second is concerned largely with the development of the various millennial theories in the history of the Church. These have always had a peculiar fascination for the curious minded, but are not vital to Christian experience in the same sense as is a belief in the personal return of Christ. The more specific divisions of this chapter will be as follows: (1) The Personal Return of Our Lord; (2) The Development of the Doctrine in the Church, including a review of the various millennial theories; (3) Modern Types of Millennial Theory; and (4) The Parenthetic View of the Millennium

[Bishop Martensen points out that the oj kovsmo" ouJ'to" or "this world" as used in the Scriptures, is "not confined exclusively to the old heathenism; it is wherever that kingdom does not exercise its guiding influence. This world is ever striving after an earthly state which does not make itself subordinate to God's rule; it develops a wisdom which does not retain the living God in its knowledge; it forms for itself an excellency which is not the reflection of His glory. And this glittering pantheistic world-reality is not a mere imaginary thing, for the powers of the universe are really divine powers. The elements, the materials with which this world builds its kingdom, are of the noblest kind, their want of genuineness lies in the ethical form given to them; or in the false relation between the glory of this world and the will of man." - Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 184.] THE PERSONAL RETURN OF OUR LORD The Scriptures clearly teach that as Christ once came into the world to effect man's redemption, so also, He will come again to receive His redeemed Church to Himself. This is expressly stated in the words, Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shalt he appear the second time without sin unto salvation (Heb. 9:28). This Second Coming will be personal, visible and glorious. Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen (Rev. 1:7). It is evident from this that the appearance of Jesus will not be merely to the eye of faith, but in the sight of heaven and earth - the terror of His foes, and the consolation of His people. This is confirmed by the incident on the Mount of Ascension. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, 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 1:9-11). According to Dr. Whedon, "This passage is an immovable proof text of the actual, personal,

Second Advent of Jesus. It is the same personal, visible Jesus which ascended that shall come. The coming shall be in like manner with the going. A figurative or spiritual coming would clearly not be a coming of the same Jesus, and still more clearly not a coming in like manner." Dr. Hackett in his comment on this verse says that the words oJvn provpon mean in this place, visible and in the air; and that the expression is never employed to affirm merely the certainty of one event as compared with another. By the analogy of the first coming of Christ as literal and visible, so also we must expect the Second Coming to be likewise literal and visible

[The Christian belief in the coming again of Christ is the expression of the well-grounded expectation, that He will ever increasingly make manifest before every eye the splendor of His dominion, and one day visibly appear as King of the Church, and Judge of the world, forever to end the present dispensation, and to complete, in a manner worthy of Himself, the kingdom of God founded by Him. . . . That the New Testament really teaches such a visible final coming again cannot be seriously denied. The Lord repeatedly says that He shall appear in splendor, and visible to the eyes of all - in a glorified body, therefore upon the clouds of heaven, in the full radiance of His kingly majesty (Luke 17:24; Matt. 24:30; 25:31). He compares Himself to a noble-man who goes away in order to receive a kingdom, and then again to return (Luke 19:12). In other parables, also, He gives us to understand the same thing (Matt. 13:40, 41, 49; Luke 18:8); and His last prolonged discourse (Matt. 24, 25) is devoted to the unveiling of the mysteries of the future, - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, pp. 577, 579 The Second Coming of our Lord is the one all-commanding event of prophecy and the future: itself supreme, it is always associated with the universal resurrection, the judgment of mankind, and the consummation of all things. Though these epochs and crises are in the style of prophecy presented together in foreshortened perspective, they are widely distinct. But while treating them as distinct, we must be careful to remember their common relation to the Day of the Lord; which is a fixed and determinate period, foreshadowed in many lesser periods to which the same term is applied, but the issue and consummation of them all. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 387.]

[Christ always spoke of His coming as that of the Son of man. By this He himself taught the same truth with which afterward the angel at the ascension reassured the disciples who stood "gazing up into heaven," namely, that He that shall come then shall he the "same Jesus" which was taken up. It will then be in human form that He will appear, and with the same sympathizing human as well as divine love toward His own which He so wonderfully displayed while on earth. But the Apostle Peter, at Pentecost, said, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). Hence the apostles, almost exclusively, speak of Christ as Lord in connection with His Second Coming. This was their common name for Christ, and they recognized the glorious reward bestowed upon Him for the salvation wrought for them, and the "all power" given unto Him in heaven and earth. - Boyce, Abstract of Systematic Theology, p. 453 The Creedal statements concerning the Second Advent are as follows: "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." - the Apostles' Creed. "And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end." - The Nicene Creed, "Christ did truly rise again from death and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day." - Art. IV of the

Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church. "Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again His body. with all things appertaining to the perfection of man 5 nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day." - Art. Ill of the Twenty-Five Articles of Methodism. "We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ will come again; that we who are alive at His coming shall not precede them that are asleep in Christ Jesus; but that, if we are abiding in Him, we shall be caught up with the risen saints to meet the Lord in the air, so that we shall ever be with the Lord." - Art. XI of the Articles of Faith of the Church of the Nazarene,]

Modern theology has frequently been too much inclined to deny the personal, visible return of our Lord, and to substitute instead, a belief in His spiritual presence only. William Newton Clarke may be regarded as a representative of this modern viewpoint. In a summary of his teaching on the Second Coming of Christ he says, "No visible return of Christ to the earth is to be expected, but rather the long and steady advance of His spiritual kingdom. The expectation of a single dramatic advent corresponds to the Jewish doctrine of the nature of the kingdom, but not to the Christian. Jews, supposing the kingdom of the Messiah to be an earthly reign, would naturally look for the bodily presence of the king: but Christians who know the spiritual nature of His reign may well be satisfied with a spiritual presence, mightier than if it were seen. If our Lord will but complete the spiritual coming that He has begun, there will be no need of visible advent to make perfect His glory on the earth" (William Newton Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology, p. 444). But the terms paraclete and parousia must not be confused. The former, or paracletos (paraklhto"), means an advocate or an intercessor, and is the term applied by Christ to the Holy Spirit - the Paraclete or Comforter. It therefore represents Christ as spiritually and invisibly present in the Holy Spirit, while parousia (parousia or presence), signifies His personal, visible presence. It is sometimes argued that parousia simply means presence with, and therefore does not denote an act of coming. This position cannot be substantiated as the following passages of Scripture will show (1 Cor. 16:17; 2 Cor. 7:6, 7; and 2 Peter 3:12). Since these passages cannot be rendered other than as a coming or arrival, so also we may believe that there must be a coming of Christ in order to His presence with us. The full meaning of the word parousia is generally understood to be such a coming that His presence shall be abidingly with His people, and His absence shall have passed away forever. There are two other terms used in connection with the Second Advent. The first is apocalypsis (apokaluyis), from which our word apocalypse is derived, and in its simplest form means an unveiling. As used in connection with the Second Advent, it means a disclosure or manifestation of Himself from the heaven which had received Him. The second word is epiphaneia (epifaveia) from epiphaino (epifainw) a verb signifying to give light to (Luke 1:79), or in the passive, to become visible, or to appear (Acts 27:20). In its simplest sense, therefore, the word means an appearance or a manifestation. St. Paul uses it in reference to the First Advent in these words, But is now made manifest by the appearing [epifaneias] of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2 Tim. 1:10). He uses it in connection with the Second Advent when he enjoins Timothy to keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing [epifaneia"] of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 6:14). It is hardly probable that the apostle would use the word to express a personal coming of Christ in the first instance, and not use it in the same sense concerning the Second Coming. St. Paul uses all three words in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, to set forth or describe the influence of the coming of Christ upon the Wicked or Lawless One. He says, When the Lord Jesus shall be

revealed [apokaluyei] from heaven (2 Thess. 1:7) then shall that Wicked be revealed [apokalufaneia], whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness [epifaneia, by the appearing] of his coming [ths parousias autou, of the presence of himself] (2 Thess. 2:8). To the unbiased student of the Holy Scriptures, there can be but one conclusion concerning the Second Advent, that is - a personal, visible, glorious return of our Lord to this earth, However, it may be well to note at this time, that while these words clearly indicate a personal return of our Lord as over against the theory of a purely spiritual effusion, the fact that they are often used interchangeably, would seem to render futile any attempt to build a theory of the Second Advent on a distinction of terms - the parousia as referring to one phase of His appearing, and the apokaluyis to another

[There are some signs of a present tendency of thought away from the traditional doctrine of a personal, visible advent, in favor of a merely spiritual or providential manifestation. The prevalence of the new view would carry with it a recasting of the traditional doctrines of the general resurrection and the final judgment. or, rather, the elimination of these doctrines. We see no sufficient reason for the acceptance of this view, and therefore adhere to the manner of the advent s long held in the faith of the Church. That the Scriptures set forth the coming of Christ as in a personal, visible manner can hardly be questioned. Indeed, such expression of it seems so definite and clear as to leave no place for the opposing view. - Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 440.]

[The word epifaneia occurs in the New Testament six times, namely, in the following passages: I Tim. 6:1 4 "the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Tim. 1:10, "the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ 2 Tim. 4:1, "at his appearing." Verse 8, "love his appearing." Titus 2:13, "glorious appearing of the great God," and 2 Thess. 2:8, "destroy with the brightness [that Is, the appearing] of his coming." H. Bonar in his comments on the last verse says, "the word epifaneia which the apostle uses here occurs just six times in the New Testament. In one of these it refers to the First Advent, which we know was literal and personal. In four it is admitted to refer to the literal and personal Second Coming: the fifth is the one under discussion, and it is the strongest and most unambiguous of all the six. Not one of these others is so explicit, yet no one thinks of explaining them away. Why then fasten upon the strongest, and insist on spiritualizing it? If the strongest can be explained away so as not to prove the Advent at all. If the anti millennarian be at liberty to spiritualize the most distinct, why may not the Straussian be allowed to rationalize or mythologize the less distinct. - Bonar, Coming and Kingdom, p. 343.] With this general survey of the subject we must now turn our attention to the more important details of the doctrine, as follows: (1) The Scriptural Basis of the Doctrine; (2) The Sign of His Coming; (3) The Manner of His Coming; and (4) The Purpose of His Coming. Scriptural Basis of the Doctrine. The most direct, and what in this sense may be regarded as the primary revelation, is to be found in the words which fell from the lips of our Lord himself. Following a solemn warming to the Jews, He declared, Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord (Matt. 23:38, 39). Immediately following this, His disciples called His attention to the buildings of the temple which had been erected with consummate architectural skill, but He only replied, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down (Matt. 24:2). Seated upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us,

when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? (Matt. 24:3). These questions were the occasion of the remarkable eschatological discourses found in the Gospel of Matthew (chapters 24 and 25); and in a more condensed form in the Gospels of Mark and Luke. The climactic utterance, however, is that before the judgment seat of the high priest, and is expressed in these words, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven (Matt. 26:64)

[The word parousia is used in the New Testament twenty-four times. the following being all of the passages in which it is found: Matt. 24:3, sign of thy coming"; 5: 27, "the coming of"; 5: 39. "the coming of the Son of man"; I Cor. 15:23, "Christ's at his coming"; 16:17, "coming of Stephanus, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus"; 2 Cor. 7:6, "coming of Titus"; 5: 7. "by his coming"; 10:1 0. "his bodily presence"; Phil. 1:26, "by my coming"; 2:12, "my presence only"; 1 Thess. 2:19, "at his coming"; 3:13, "at the coming"; 4:15, "coming of the Lord"; 5:23, "coming of our Lord"; 2 Thess. 2:1, "coming of our Lord"; 5: 8. "brightness of his coming"; 5: 9, "him. whose coming"; James 5:7, coming of the Lord"; 5: 8, "coming of the Lord"; 2 Peter 1:16, "coming of our Lord"; 3:4, "promise of his coming"; 5: 12, "the coming of." and I John 2:28, "at his coming." - Taylor, The Reign of Christ on Earth, p. 389.]

[Inasmuch as this subject involves, almost exclusively, the use of prophecy, it may be well to note in brief some, of the principles which apply to this department of biblical study. The first prophecy, or what is commonly known as the Protevangelium (Gen. 3 14.19), is not only the foundation of all prophecy, but includes within itself, all the prophecies touching the conflict between the serpent and the seed of the woman. It suggests also, both the nature of the conflict and the final outcome. In the words to the serpent are contained the spiritual issues. in those to the woman, the social order, and in those to Adam, the physical consequences. There is nothing in time or eternity - spiritual, social or physical - that is outside the scope of this foundational and all inclusive prophecy. With this as a basis, all prophetic utterance and all historic development may rightfully be viewed as a detailed explanation of what is here contained in germ form. The promises to Abraham, the words of the dying Joseph, the elaborate system of religion set up under Moses, and all the period of the Old Testament, must all be regarded as the unfolding of this primitive prophecy. The Old Testament prophecies may be analyzed as follows: (1) those that were fulfilled before the incarnation; (2) those that were fulfilled by the incarnation; and (3) those that extended into the New Testament and church periods. In the New Testament, prophecy would again be regarded as threefold: (1) an explanation of those prophecies already fulfilled in and by the incarnation; (2) an explanation of those prophecies projected from the Old Testament into the time period succeeding the incarnation; and (3) a new set of prophecies beginning with the New Testament period and looking forward to the time of the end. This latter would include the foundational statements of Christ, such as the Sermon on the Mount, and those specific counsels which guided the Church in its development, as over against the background of the Gentile and pagan world. - Rev. Paul S. Hill.]

It is not surprising, therefore, that these predictions fixed the truth of the Second Coming firmly in the mind of the Church; and that the apostles should constantly present it as an incentive to holy living. With this insight into prophetical truth also, the apostles were enabled to lift out of the Old Testament certain mysterious passages and interpret them in the light of the new dispensation. Thus St. Peter in his sermon at Pentecost, quotes the prophecy of Joel, assigning that portion

referring to the promise of the Holy Spirit to the opening of the dispensation, and that concerning the great and terrible day of the Lord to its close, or the time of the Second Advent (Cf. Joel 2:28-31; Acts 2:16-21). St. Jude, likewise, quotes a prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds (Jude 14, 15). Whatever doubts may be had in regard to the passages in the Old Testament which are sometimes presented as proofs of this doctrine, the New Testament cannot be called in question. To the early Christians it was the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (Titus 2:13). St. Paul further states that our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body (Phil. 3:20, 21). St. Peter gives us this exhortation, Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ (1 Peter 1:13); while St. James gives a like exhortation, Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord, establish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draw eth nigh (James 5:7, 8). Perhaps the most loved text is that of St. John, Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also (John 14:1-3). Two generations after His ascension, our Lord appeared to His disciple in Patmos, and closed the revelation of Himself with the words, Surely I come quickly (Rev. 22:20), the very last words which men were to hear from Him who spake not only on earth but also from heaven

[We can touch only on the ground forms and main lines - not on the complete filling up - of the Christian eschatological doctrinal structure. The foundation for this structure can be no other than that which a true God has revealed in His infallible Word concerning the things of the future. While the philosophy of religion in general may apply itself to the examination as to what human reason by its own light proclaims concerning immortality and external life, Christian Dogmatics avails itself of another torch in this mysterious obscurity. Here it emphatically presupposes the truth of that which has already been earlier treated of. such as the supranaturalistic Theistic conception of God; the existence of a particular revelation of salvation; the trustworthiness of the words of the Lord and of His first witness concerning things unseen and eternal. It consequently has not to return to the question as to the continued existence of the spirit. which was already treated of in connection with Anthropology; and just as little to that as to the nature of death, which was already entered into in connection with Hamartiology. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II. p. 776.] The Sign of His Coming. In His reply to the question of the disciples, What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? (tou aiwnos, or the age), our Lord did not hesitate to describe the vicissitudes of the Church in the present age. In his reply, there is a prediction of three classes of events, which we understand from the remainder of His discourse, are not to be regarded as distinct epochs set off from each other, but as being in a large measure coincident in time, (1) There will be an age of tribulation, in which there will be disturbances in the physical world, great political upheavals and social disintegration, For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places (Matt. 24:7). These our Lord declares are the beginning of sorrows (Matt. 24:8). From the words, but the end is not yet (Matt. 24:6), we may infer that this beginning of sorrows will precede the

Second Advent by a considerable space of time. But our Lord predicts the deepening shadows of a greater tribulation as the end of the age approaches, This he introduces with warnings and exhortations of great moment (Matt. 24:15-20) and concludes by saying, For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened (Matt. 24:21, 22). (2) The Preparation of the Church and the Evangelization of the World, mark the second prediction of our Lord. The circumstances of the world will serve to discipline the Church, and only those that endure to the end shall be saved. At our Lord's coming He will exact an account of all His stewards. Those who are found faithful will be rewarded, and those who have been untrue to their trust will be punished for their negligence or infidelity. This stewardship is immediately related to the dissemination of the gospel, as given to the disciples in the Great Commission (Matt. 28:19, 20). To preach the gospel and to bear witness of Christ is the supreme duty of the Church in this age, over against which idle and curious questions concerning the future were regarded by you? Lord as of little importance (Acts 1:7, 8). Hence we are told that this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come (Matt. 24:14). (3) The third prediction is that of an apostasy or falling away due to the deceptiveness of sin. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold (Matt. 24:10-12). Our Lord seems to indicate also, that as the tribulation deepens toward the end of the age, so also the deceptiveness of sin increases. Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For 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. Behold, I have told you before (Matt. 24:23-25). The progressive unfolding of divine truth concerning the Antichrist is very marked in the Scriptures. Here our Lord speaks of false Christs and false prophets, as indicating all those who are in opposition to Christ and the truth. These, of course, could find no place in history until after the appearance of the true Christ. St. John likewise speaks of a plurality of antichrists. 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 (1 John 2:18). But St, John goes farther than this. He says, 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 (1 John 4:3). St. Paul also reveals the fact, that while there will be a great falling away in the last time, there will be also the revelation of a "man of sin" who with wicked presumption, will assume the place of God and lay claim to the honor of divine worship. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God (2 Thess. 2:3, 4). Here, then, in the eschatological discourses of our Lord do we find a delineation of the events which shall characterize the present age, and therefore serve as a sign of His coming. It is sometimes said that this emphasis upon the increase of wickedness tends to inculcate a belief in the gradual and necessary decline of Christ's kingdom; and consequently begets a passive and hopeless attitude toward sin. To this we reply, that Christ does not teach, nor does the Church believe that His kingdom shall decline. Our Lord teaches that the same harvest season which ripens the wheat,

ripens the tares also; that there is, therefore, a progress in wickedness as well as in righteousness; and that both the wheat and the tares are to grow together - not one grow and the other decline. But the true motive for evangelism as found in the Church, is not in the glory of outward success, but in a deep sense of obedience to a trust, and a fervent love for her Lord. As the end of the age approaches, we may expect an increase in righteousness and in wickedness, and the Church must gird herself for an aggressive and constant warfare against sin until Jesus comes

[Dr. Blunt gives this interesting note in connection with his article on the Second Advent. He says, "In association with the sign of the Son of man and the coming as lightning. it is observable that lightning has frequently been known to leave the mark of the cross upon the persons and garments of those whom it has struck. Bishop Warbuton gives some indubitable instances of this." He therefore regards "the sign of His coming" as a celestial Labarum which will herald the immediate approach of Christ. He says. "All will then see Christ's cross stretched forth in the midst of the darkness as the bright standard of the King of kings, and will at once know that it is set up as the token of His coming to reign in judgment." - Blunt, Dictionary, Art. Second Advent.]

[Dr. Blunt points out that "the great object of Antichrist will be to set himself up as the object of men's worship instead of Christ; the great means by which the seduction of his worshipers is accomplished will be the supernatural power which he will be able to oppose to the supernatural power of Christ. "His coming will therefore be preceded by a manifestation of the power of Satan communicated to the Antichrist. It is recorded that Satan said to our Lord in the second temptation, "All this power will I give thee. and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me. all shall be thine" (Luke 4:6, 7). It is to this evidently that St. Paul refers when in speaking of the Antichrist. he says, "His coming [parousias] is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs. and lying wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9). "It thus seems." Dr. Blunt continues, "that the supernatural power of working miracles will be accompanied by a universal authority or kingdom. won, perhaps. by means of them. Thus the opposition of Antichrist to Christ will consist in setting up a person instead of Him as the object of worship. in working miracles such as characterized Christ's First Advent. and in establishing a universal empire in the place of the church. The elements of seduction contained in such a power are sufficiently evident. and perhaps they will possess all the greater strength in proportion to the high developments of a civilization uninfluenced by love of Cod. Men will be attracted to become followers of Antichrist first by his accumulation of universal empire, reverencing in its extreme development (Rev. 13 4ff) that success which is said to be the most successful of all things. They will be attracted also by his supernatural power. the visible exercise of which subdues at once. . . . After the chains of such seductions have bound the minds and affections of mankind, they will be easily prevailed upon to take the last step in apostasy. 'Fall down and worship me.' Such. it seems. will be the course of the great apostasy. the last stage in the preparation for Christ's Second Advent" (Cf. Blunt, Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology. Art. Second Advent).]

[The many false Christs or even the spirit of the Antichrist as specifically opposed to the true Christ. could find no place of importance in history until after the real Christ had made His first appearance. The story of the rise of many who claimed to be the Christ is well known. They were numerous in the days of the early church. as our Lord had predicted. They were in the deserts and in the secret places. The spirit of these pretenders was of course opposed to the real Christ, and thus they became the forerunners of the whole antichristian program of the New Testament

period. Doubtless there will be an increasing intensity of this spirit, which shall reach its culmination and final defeat in the last great conflict. - Rev. Paul Hill The climax of the misery of the last days is attained in the appearing of the Antichrist. whom the prophetic word leads us to expect. The reference to the rise and development of this expectation must be left by Christian Dogmatics to the Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments. Here it can only be said, that for him who interprets the Scriptures without preconceived views, and allows his thoughts to be brought into captivity to the obedience of the Word, there can be no doubt that a personal Antichrist will yet arise before the close of the world's history. . . . If we see already in the history of the world colossal figures arise in the service of the powers of darkness; and if already in connection with many a name there was heard from sundry lips the question whether this was the Antichrist; nothing prevents our seeing in their appearance the preparation for a future central personality, in whom the spirit of evil will as it were embody itself, and display its full power. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 796.] The Manner of His Coming. Here again our Lord's discourses must be the source of our authority concerning this great eschatological event. Having warned against the deceptiveness of false Christs and false prophets, He instructs the disciples concerning the manner of His coming, in these words, Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be (Matt. 24:26, 27). He indicates also, that there shall be disturbances of a cataclysmic nature in the physical universe, preceding the Second Advent. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and 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. And 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. 24:29-31)

[As to the Antichrist, whose coming was expected to precede the final consummation, it was a common opinion that he should be a being of supernatural origin. . . . Another opinion was, that he already had appeared in the person of Mahomet, that the apocalyptic "Number of the Beast," 666, denoted the duration of his power, and that his downfall might be looked for toward the end of the thirteenth century. This expectation seems to have assisted in producing the enthusiasm of the Crusades, which declined as the expected time passed by, and the Mahometan power continued to flourish. Others, again, discerned Antichrist in the various sects, which in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, refused submission to the pope; while these in turn, applied to him the same title. This was done as early as 1204, by Amalric of Bema; and Louis of Bavaria, Emperor of Germany, about 1327, 50 designated Pope John XXII. Wycliffe (1384) and the Lollards also denounced the pope as Antichrist. - Crippen, History of Christian Doctrine, pp. 233, 234.] Our Lord teaches also, that a certain unexpectedness will attend His coming. The time of the Second Advent is veiled in mystery. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, but my Father only (Matt. 24:36). He instructs His disciples, therefore, to give the utmost attention to watchfulness and faithfulness in the things of the kingdom. Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come (Matt. 24:42); and again, Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh (Matt. 24:44). He further declares that at the time of His Second Coming the world will be pursuing its ordinary course, unmindful of the

great event which will take place suddenly and without special warning. But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be (Matt. 24:37-39). This does not apply solely to the wicked, for then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left (Matt. 24:40, 41). We may confidently believe then, that the Second advent will be a sudden and glorious appearance of our Lord, bursting in upon the ordinary course of the world as an unexpected cataclysmic event. To the righteous, who have through faith in His Word prepared themselves and are watching for His return, this appearance will be hailed with supreme joy; to the wicked who have rejected His words, saying Where is the promise of his coming? It will be a time of consternation and condemnation

[It is obvious that the Supreme Prophet of His own dispensation has made it a law of His kingdom that its final consummation shall forever be uncertain as to its date. Hence in His eschatological discourses He answered the disciples' double question, "Tell us. when shall these things be?" in such a manner as to prevent their attempting to define either the date of the nearer end of the world. the destruction of Judaism, or that of the more distant end of all things. - Pope. Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 391

Under both dispensations. patient waiting for Christ was intended to discipline the faith, and to enlarge the conception, of God's true servants, The fact that every age since Christ ascended has had its Chiliasts and Second Adventists should turn our thoughts away from curious and fruitless prying into the time of Christ's coming. and set us at immediate and constant endeavor to be ready. at whatsoever hour He may appear. - Strong. Systematic Theology, III. p. 1007.] The Purpose of His Coming. Our Lord sets forth the purpose of His coming in the latter part of this eschatological discourse, by means of two familiar parables - that of the Ten Virgins, and that of the Talents. In the former He emphasizes more especially the lack of a proper preparation for His coming, while in the latter He condemns the violation of a trust. Both emphasize the sins of omission rather than those uf commission. The outstanding truth, however, which is set forth in these parables is the same - that of a coming judgment in which the righteous shall be rewarded and the wicked punished. Hence it is, that following the second parable, our Lord clearly states the purpose of His Second Coming as that of judgment. His words are unmistakable. 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: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:31-34). Following this He depicts in vivid colors the scene of judgment, in which He pronounces sentence upon those on his left hand, saying, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41); and concludes the discourse with the solemn words, And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal (Matt. 25:46). From these words of our Lord concerning the Second Coming as directly related to judgment, there can be no appeal

There are two of our Lord's earlier parables which express this idea of judgment also, that of the Sower, and that of the Drag Net. In His interpretation of the former, Jesus states that the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them '.5 the devil; the harvest is the end of the world [aijw'no" or age]; and the reapers are the angels (Matt. 13:38, 39). In the application of the parable, we are told that 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 cast 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. 13:41-43). While judgment is expressed, it is evident that the dominant thought of the parable is the purification of the kingdom from those things which hinder its progress and which veil the true character of its subjects. In the second parable - that of the Drag Net and the separation of the good and bad fishes, the application is the same with the emphasis more especially upon the judgment. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matt. 13:49, 50)

Turning from the Gospels to the Epistles, we find the Second Advent presented in the light of its concomitants - the resurrection, the judgment, and the consummation of all things. These subjects must receive consideration later. It is sufficient here, to mention only a few of the scriptures in which the Second Advent is given prominence. St. Paul places it in close time relation to the resurrection, making the resurrection of the righteous dead to precede immediately the translation of the living saints. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that 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 (1 Thess. 4:14-17). Here it is evident that the coming of Jesus with His saints (the dead in Christ whose souls have already gone to be with him), and the coming of Jesus for His saints (those that are alive and remain) must be associated n9t only with the same event, but must be regarded also, as indicating the order of the happenings in that event. "That the return of the Lord will not be simply a momentarily becoming visible from heaven, but a return to earth, is according to the Scriptures beyond doubt. Those dwellers on the earth, who, according to 1 Thess. 4:17, are caught up to meet Him in the air, must certainly be conceived of as then returning with the heavenly host again to the earth. They form an escort to the King, who personally comes to this part of His royal domain. Simultaneously with the coming of Christ takes place the first resurrection. The believers, who live to witness this appearing of Christ upon earth, are without dying, by an instantaneous change, made meet for the new condition; and the departed who are ripe for the life of resurrection, live and reign with Christ on earth" (Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, pp.798, 799). St. Peter places the Second Advent in a time relation to the consumatio seculi or final consummation of the present order. But 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. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness (2 Peter 3:10, 11). Here the Second Advent is connected with the

day of the Lord, which introduces another phase of the subject

We may conclude, then, that as an event the Second Coming of Christ will be associated in time with the resurrection, the judgment and the final consummation. As directly related to the work of Jesus Christ, it may be summed up in a threefold purpose. (1) It is a part of His total mission of redemption. As the incarnate Son in heaven, He is still subordinate to the Father, and consequently is sent of the Father on this final mission. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began (Acts 3:20, 21). (3) It marks the day of the Lord. "Thus it is the coming, in one sense, in another, it is the Second Coming, or the coming again of the Lord. Hence also, the scripture rises above both these phrases, and speaks of that future event as his day, or that day, or the day of Jesus Christ (Cf. Luke 17:24; 2 Tim. 1:18; Phil. 1:6), which is in the new economy all that the day of Jehovah was in the old. The day of the Lord is the horizon of the entire New Testament: the period of His most decisive manifestation in a glorious revelation of Himself which could not be, and is never, predicated of any but a divine Person" (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 388) DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH Our study of the scriptural basis of the Second Advent has made it clear that this doctrine had an apostolic emphasis. Three things characterized their teaching:

(1) the prominence which they gave to eschatological subjects; (2) their association of the hope of eternal life with the Person of the risen Christ and His promised return; and (3) that this hope of eternal life reached out beyond this period of earthly development to a new heaven and a new earth. Furthermore, the New Testament seems to indicate that the apostles themselves expected a speedy return of their Lord, and the Church evidently shared with them in this hope. It is for this reason that Dr. Dorner calls the Second Coming the oldest Christian dogma. Consequently, the Church during its persecutions and martyrdoms, opposed to heathenism a complete renunciation of the world and a firm confidence of final triumph when Christ should come again. It is not surprising, therefore, that we find this same note in the writing 0£ the earlier Fathers. Clement of Rome (100: 95) in his First Epistle says, "Of a truth, soon and suddenly shall His will be accomplished, as the Scriptures also bear witness, saying ’Speedily will He come, and will not tarry:’ and ’The Lord shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Holy One, for whom ye look.’ " Ignatius of Antioch (d.100: 107) in a letter to the church says, "The last times are upon us. Let us therefore be of a reverent spirit, and fear the long-suffering of God, that it tend not to our condemnation." We may say, then, that the attitude of the earlier Fathers was one of expectancy, one of watching and praying for the soon coming of Christ, their Lord

[In one of the anonymous writings of this period, generally attributed to Barnabas and sometimes dated as early as A.D. 79, we find the following: "Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. ’And he rested on the seventh day.’ This meaneth: when His Son, coming again, shall destroy the time of the wicked man, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall He truly rest on the seventh day." From one of the visions in the Shepherd of Hermas, we have the following: "You have escaped from great tribulation on account of your faith, and because you did not doubt in the presence of such a beast. Go, therefore, and tell the elect of the Lord His mighty deeds, and say to them that this beast is a type of the great tribulation that is coming. If then ye prepare yourselves, and repent

with all your heart, and turn to the Lord, it will be possible for you to escape it, if your heart he pure and spotless, and ye spend the rest of the days of your life in serving the Lord blamelessly."

Ignatius writes to Polycarp saying, Weigh carefully the times. Look for Him who is above all time, eternal and invisible, yet who became visible for our sakes."] The personal return of Christ was very early associated with the idea of a millennium (from the Latin mille, a thousand), or a reign of Christ on earth for the period of a thousand years. Those who embraced this doctrine were known as Chiliasts (from the Greek cilia", a thousand). The development of the doctrine of the Second Advent must, therefore, in a large measure include a treatment of the various theories of the millennium which have developed in the history of the Church. The history of millennialism falls into three main periods: (1) The Earlier Period, from the Apostolic Age to the Reformation; (2) The Reformation Period, to the middle of the eighteenth century; and (3) The Modern Period, from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present The Earlier Period. It is commonly agreed by historians that, from the death of the apostles to the time of Origen, Chiliasm, or what is now known as premillennialism, was the dominant, if not the generally accepted faith of the Church. Two fundamental affirmations characterized this doctrine - that the Scriptures teach us to look for a millennium, or universal reign of righteousness on the earth; and that this millennial age will be introduced by the personal, visible return of the Lord Jesus. It is very frequently asserted that this theory was brought over from Judaism, and to a certain extent, doubtless, this is true; for it appears far more prominently among the Jewish Christians than in the Gentile churches. But Christian Chiliasm must be distinguished, both from Judaism on the one hand, and a pseudo-chiliasm on the other. Over against Judaism it maintained: (1) that the inheritance of the kingdom is conditioned solely by regeneration, and not by race or ritual observances; (2) that the nature of the kingdom is not carnal or materialistic, but suited to a sanctified spirit, and to a body at once spiritual and incorruptible; and (3) that the millennium is only a transitional stage and not the final state of the world. For this reason, Dr. Dorner maintains that so far from being derivable from it, it may in part be more justly regarded as a polemic against Judaism (Cf. Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, I, p~ 408). Over against the false and fanatical theories, the Church maintained that the millennium is to be introduced by the return of Christ, and condemned all attempts of the pseudochiliasts to institute this reign of righteousness by material force. Nitzsche points out also, that the doctrine was already received by the Gentile Christians before the close of the first century, and was expressly rejected during the first half of the second century by the Gnostics only. Millennialism received a fresh impulse, doubtless, from the persecutions which came upon the Church, during which the saints took comfort in looking forward to a speedy deliverance by the return of Christ. The doctrine is first mentioned in the Epistle of Barnabas (100: 120). Hermas (100: 140), Papias (100: 163), Justin (100: 165) and Irenaeus (100: 202) all interpreted the twentieth chapter of Revelation in a literal manner, and therefore held that between the two resurrections Christ should reign over Jerusalem, either literally or spiritually, for a thousand years. Justin says, "I and others, who are right-minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned and enlarged.... There was a certain man with us whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied, by a revelation made to him, that those who believed in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that thereafter, the general, and in short the eternal resurrection and judgment of all men would likewise take place." (Trypho LXXX and LXXXI) Papias wrote extravagantly of the millennial fertility and fruitage of the earth, and these were

reproduced in some measure by Irenaeus. The latter places the coming of Antichrist just before the inauguration of the millennial reign. He teaches that the just will be resurrected by the descended Savior, and dwell in Jerusalem with the remnant of believers in the world, being there disciplined for the state of incorruption which they are to enjoy in the New Jerusalem which is from above, and of which the earthly Jerusalem is an image. Tertullian (d. 240) says, "Of the heavenly kingdom, this is the process. After its thousand years are over, within which period are completed the resurrection of the saints, who rise sooner or later, according to their deserts, there will ensue the destruction of the world and the conflagration of all things at the judgment." No trace of millennialism is found in the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras or Theophilus. Hippolytus (100: 239) wrote an elaborate treatise on the rise and overthrow of Antichrist, whose manifestation was generally regarded as preceding the Second Advent. Cyprian (100: 258) does not express any well-defined views on the subject

[Dr. Blunt gives this description of Chiliasm. "The Millennarians, or Chiliasts, accepting this prophecy literally (Rev. 20:1.7), hold. that after the destruction of the powers symbolized by the beast and the false prophet, Satan will be 'bound,' that is, his power will be suspended for the period of a thousand years, or for the period represented by a thousand years; that there will be a first resurrection of martyrs, and of those worthy to share in the martyr's crown; that for the thousand years these will live and reign with Christ on earth, in free communion with the heavenly powers; that after this will be the general resurrection. There are on both sides many shades and varieties of teaching, but the crucial point is that of the first and second resurrection."]

[Semisch holds that the ultimate root of millenarianism is the popular notion of the Messiah current among the Jews. The prophecies of the Messiah had affirmed that a period of peace and triumph of Israel would follow the establishment of His kingdom. The fancy of the Jewish people, misinterpreting these prophecies, reveled in dreams of an external kingdom, in which the Messiah should reign from Jerusalem, and inaugurate an era of inexpressible happiness. Some of these thoughts passed over to the Christians, who, however, made this period of the visible reign of the Messiah on earth only the prelude of a second and final stage of heavenly glory

Professor Moses Stuart calls attention to the fact, "That the great mass of Jewish Rabbins have believed and taught the doctrine of the resurrection of the just in the days of the Messiah's development, there can be no doubt on the part of him who has made any considerable investigation of this matter. The specific limitation of this to the commencement of the millennium, seems to be peculiar to John" (Commentary on the Apocalypse, I, p. 177)

Joseph Made says, "Though the ancient Jews had no distinct knowledge of such an order in the resurrection as first and second, but only of the resurrection in gross and general . . . yet they looked for such a resurrection, wherein those that rose again should reign some time upon the earth. . . . In fine, the second and universal resurrection, with the state of the saints after it, now so clearly revealed in Christianity, seems to have been less known to the ancient church of the Jews than the first, and the state to accompany it (Cf. Mede, Works, II, p. 943).] The third century was the flowering period of chiliasm, but the doctrine was carried to extreme length by the Ebionites, a Jewish sect of Christians, and later by the Montanists. It is easy to understand how this doctrine would be open to perversion and misunderstanding. The new heavens and the new earth would naturally be described in the language of temporal felicity, such as is found in the Old Testament,

and this could easily be perverted to mean a carnal kingdom. Thus Dr. Blunt says that "there can be no doubt that some, perhaps many, held the doctrine in a carnal sense, but it is a misrepresentation to attribute that sense to such writers as, for example, Irenaeus." Cerinthus, a Gnostic with Judaistic tendencies, and the opponent of St. John, is said to have perverted this doctrine by promising a millennium of sensual luxury. Mosheim, however, endeavors to show that this originated with Caius and Dionysius, who, to suppress the doctrine, made it appear that Cerinthus was the author of it. The Montanists began as a reform movement in Phrygia, during the latter part of the second century under the leadership of Montanus, who seems to have regarded it as a special mission to complete in himself and by his system, the perfection of the Church. He was regarded by his followers as one to whom the Holy Spirit had made special revelations. Rebelling against the secularism of the Church, Montanism presented a model of church discipline such as they conceived the nearness of Christ's coming demanded. Long and stringent fasts were established, celibacy enjoined and a rigid penitential system set up

[Origen (185-254) was the chief opponent of the earlier chiliasm, and Augustine (353-430) its later opponent. Origen in his "Dc Principus" says that those "who receive the representations of Scripture according to the understanding of the apostles, entertain the hope that the saints will eat indeed, hut that it will be the bread of life. . . . By this food of wisdom the understanding is restored to the image and likeness of God, so that . . . the man will he capable of ?eceiving instruction in that Jerusalem, the city of the saints

Augustine was at one time a chiliast, but abandoned the doctrine, it is said, because of the influence and misrepresentations of his enemies, particularly, Eusebius. He then developed what is now known as the Augustinian view of the Millennium, which afterward became prevalent.]

Montanism was the occasion of the opposition to the millennial theory which arose in the earlier part of the third century. Caius of Rome (100: 210) is said to have been the first to write against it, and greatly embarrassed the situation by referring to those who held this doctrine as heretics. The chief opposition, however, came from the Alexandrian School. Origen, who regarded matter as the seat of evil, referred to the view of an earthly kingdom of Christ, full of physical delights, as "an empty figment," and "a Judaizing fable." Nepos, a bishop in Egypt revived the doctrine, holding that the promises in the Bible should be interpreted as the Jews understood them. He supposed that there would be a certain millennium of material luxury on this earth. His work entitled, "A Refutation of the Allegorists," was answered by Dionysius in another entitled On the Promises. Methodius, bishop of Tyre (d. 311) defended the millennial doctrines against Origen, but the decline had set in, and the last apology for it, was a pamphlet by Apollinarius of Laodicea against the positions of Dionysius. In the West, the doctrine was maintained for a longer period, its chief exponents being Lactantius (100: 320) and Victorinus, bishop of Petau, who flourished 100: 290 A.D. Even Jerome did not dare to condemn the position on chiliasm. The fate of the doctrine, however, for this period, was settled by Augustine (De Civitate Dei 20: 7-9), who declared that the Church was the kingdom of God on earth. Eschatological questions sank into insignificance, once the Church had won the protection of the state. As to the thousand years mentioned in the Apocalypse, Augustine suggests that they denote either the last thousand years of the world's history, or the whole duration of the world - the number one thousand being a reference not so much to a definite period as to the totality of time. By the reign of the saints during the millennial period, he means nothing more than the dominion which pertains to the Church. "The Church even

now is the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of heaven. Accordingly, even now His saints reign with Him, though otherwise than as they shall reign hereafter" (De Civitata Dei, XX, 7-9). The first resurrection according to Augustine was the spiritual resurrection of the soul from sin. For the remainder of this period, millennialism was practically an obsolete doctrine. The clergy possessed the kingdom for a thousand years in the Church as triumphant over kings and princes. Semisch says that "the circles which were prophetic of the reformation period looked for the regeneration of the Church, not from the visible coming of Christ, but in a return to apostolic poverty and piety, or the enthronement of a righteous pope. Peter de Olivia explained the Second Coming by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart."

[Lactantius gives a rather detailed account of his doctrine of the Second Advent in the Epitome (LXXII). He says, "Then the heaven shall be opened in a tempest, and Christ shall descend with great power, and there shall go before Him a fiery brightness and a countless host of angels, and all the multitude of the wicked shall be destroyed, and torrents of blood shall flow, and the leader himself shall escape, and having often renewed his army, shall for the fourth time engage in battle, in which, being taken, with all the other tyrants, he shall be delivered up to be burnt. But the prince also of the demons himself, the author and contriver of evils, being bound with fiery chains, shall be imprisoned, that the world may receive peace, and the earth, harassed through so many years, may rest. Therefore, peace being made, and every evil suppressed, that the righteous king and conqueror will institute a great judgment on earth respecting the living and the dead, and will deliver all the nations into subjection to the righteous who are alive, and will raise the righteous dead to eternal life, and will Himself reign with them on earth, and will build the holy city, and this kingdom of the righteous shall be for a thousand years. Throughout that time the stars shall be more brilliant, and the brightness of the sun shall be increased, and the moon shall not be subject to decrease. Then the rain of blessing shall descend from God at morning and evening, and the earth shall bring forth all her fruit without the labor of men. Honey shall drop from rock, fountains of milk and wine shall abound. The beasts shall lay aside their ferocity and become mild, the wolf shall roam among the flocks without doing harm, the calf shall feed with the lion, the dove shall be united with the hawk, the serpent shall have no poison; no animal shall live by bloodshed, for God shall supply to all abundant and harmless food. But when the thousand years shall be fulfilled, and the prince of demons loosed, the nations will rebel against the righteous, and an innumerable multitude will come to storm the city of the saints. Then the last judgment of God will come to pass against the nations, for He will shake the earth from its foundations, and the cities shall be overthrown, and He shall rain upon the wicked fire with brimstone, and hail, and they shall be on fire, and slay each other. But the righteous shall for a little space be concealed under the earth, until the destruction of the nations is accomplished, and after the third day they shall come forth, and see the plains covered with carcasses. Then there shall be an earthquake, and the mountains shall be rent, and valleys shall sink down to a profound depth, and into this the bodies of the dead shall be heaped together, and its name shall be called Polyandrion (a name sometimes given to cemeteries because many men are borne thither). After these things, God will renew the world, and transform the righteous into forms of angels, that, they may serve God forever and ever; and this will be the kingdom of God, which shall have no end. Then also the wicked shall rise again, but not to life, but to punishment, for God shall raise these also, when the second resurrection takes place, that, being condemned to eternal torments and delivered to eternal fires, they may suffer the punishments which they deserve for their crimes."] From the time of Augustine to the

Reformation, the doctrines of chiliasm were given but little prominence. The Apostles' Creed - an early document, but dating in its unchanged form from 100: 390; the Nicene Creed as revised at Constantinople (381); and the Athanasian Creed (100: 449) to which an anathema is attached, were the accepted standards of the Church. However, these were interpreted in opposition to the millennial theory, for Rome was anti-chiliastic. But Dr. Blunt cites the Formula Doctrinae by Gelassius Cyzicenus of the Council of Nicea, to show that the Scriptures were understood by that body, to teach that the saints receive their reward under the reign of Christ on earth; and that the Nicene statement, "He shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end," is to be interpreted in the light of a millennial reign. In spite of the opposition, Harnack points out that the doctrine "still lived on in the lower strata of society." It was preserved in the teachings of the Waldenses, the Paulicians, the Albigenses, the Cathari, and many of the Mystics, although in those dark ages, connected with much that was erratic and unorthodox

[The reference to the Formula Doctrine of the Council of Nicea is as follows: "We look for new heavens and a new earth, when there shall have shown the appearing and kingdom of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ: and then, as Daniel saith, the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom. And the earth shall he pure, holy, the earth of the living, and not of the dead (which David foreseeing with the eye of faith, exclaims, I believe verily to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living), the earth of the gentle and lowly. For, blessed, saith the Lord, are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth: and the prophet saith, the feet of the poor and needy shall tread it" (Cf. Art. Millennium in Blunt's Dictionary)

Some of the sects catalogued as heretical, are such only on certain doctrines. Many of them, such as are mentioned above were in reality prophets of the Reformation, and were classified as heretics solely because of their opposition to what they regarded as the secularization of the Church. Thus Mr. Wesley speaks of Montanus as "not only a good man, but one of the best men then upon earth" (Works, Xl. p. 485). Doubtless this was true as to purpose and intent, but the historical records of the excesses of the Montanists cannot be denied, although many of these were excrescences and not typical of the movement as a whole. Hurst, Milner and other church historians take practically the same position in regard to the Waldenses, the Cathari and similar sects, seeing in them the precursors of the Reformation From the tenth to the fourteenth century the notion prevailed that the end of the world was at hand. The state establishment of Christianity by Constantine was thought to be intended by the figure of the first resurrection; the thousand year's reign was conceived of as actually passing. and drawing to a close; Antichrist would then appear. and the end of all things would promptly ensue. These expectations find their expression in the devotional literature of the period. - Crippen, Hist. Chr. Doct., p. 233.] The Reformation Period. The beginning of the Reformation is generally dated from the time when Luther began his public labors, or about A.D. 1517. During this period the doctrine of the millennium which had fallen into disrepute was again revived. Several things were conducive to this renewed emphasis. First, there was a growing decline of the papacy, which was regarded as one of the sure signs of the soon coming of Christ. The Reformers generally held that the pope was the Antichrist. Second, there were many strange natural occurrences during this period, such as comets and earthquakes. Then, too, there were many national changes - all of which produced an unrest and a nervous tension which resulted in many and various forms of mass hysteria. The Anabaptists determined

to prepare the way by violence and consequently established a new Zion at Muenster in 1534, organized along communistic lines. All these things seemed to be indicative of the approaching end of the world. The Reformers shared in this expectation of the soon coming of Christ, but kept themselves free from fanatical teachings. Also, they appeared to studiously avoid all millennial doctrines. The Heretic and Augsburg Confessions condemn the excesses of the Anabaptists, as does also the English Confession of Edward VI, from which the Thirty-nine Articles were condensed. It is commonly stated that these creeds condemn premillennialism as merely a Jewish opinion, brought over without due warrant, into the Christian Church. A careful consideration of the articles in question, does not seem to sustain this position. Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession as translated by Philip Schaff, is as follows: "They condemn others, also, who now scatter abroad Jewish opinions, that, before the resurrection of the dead, the godly shall occupy the kingdom of the world, the wicked being everywhere suppressed. (Schaff, Creeds of Christendom). Melanchthon, who wrote the Confession, explains Article XVII as follows: "The Church in this life is never to attain to a position of universal triumph and prosperity, but is to remain depressed, and subject to afflictions and adversities, 'until the time of the resurrection of the dead (Corpus Reformatorum XXVI, p. 361) . From this it is evident that the Article does not condemn premillennialism unless a prior or first resurrection be denied; otherwise it condemns in strong words, the theory of postmillennialism which looks for an era of spiritual triumph previous to the Second Advent of Christ

[As we have shown, there was very little taught concerning a future millennium during the period from Augustine to the Reformation. Chiliasm was almost annihilated. From the time when the Council of Rome under Pope Damascus formally denounced it in A.D. 373, its condemnation was so effective. Baronius, a Roman Catholic historian of the sixteenth century, writing concerning the millennialist views of the fifth century says, "Moreover the figments of the Millennaries being now rejected everywhere, and derided by the learned with hisses and laughter, and being also put under the ban, were entirely extirpated!" This was the general attitude of the Church at the beginning of the Reformation

Elliott in his Horae Apocalypticae, a learned and exhaustive treatise in four volumes, sums up the millennial view at the beginning of the Reformation as follows: "That the Millennium of Satan's binding, and the saints' reigning, dated from Christ's ministry, when He beheld Satan fall like lightning from heaven; it being meant to signify the triumph over Satan in the hearts of true believers; and that the subsequent figuration of Gog and Magog indicated the coming of Antichrist at the end of the world - the one thousand years being a figurative numeral, expressive of the whole period intervening. It supposed the resurrection taught, to be that of dead souls from the death of sin to the life of righteousness; the beast conquered by the saints, meant the wicked world; its image, a hypocritical profession; the resurrection being continuous, till the end of time, when the universal resurrection and the final judgment would take place." Dr. Elliott points out that this view prevailed from Augustine's time among certain writers to the Reformation; and also that it was held, although in a more ecclesiastical sense and with certain modifications, after the Reformation, by Luther, Bullinger, Bale, Pareus and others (Cf. Taylor, The Reign of Christian Earth, pp. 114-116).]

[Sheldon sums up the attitude toward chiliasm during the Reformation period as follows: "By all the larger communions chiliasm or millenarianism was decidedly repudiated. It had, however,

considerable currency among the Anahaptists. Some of the mystical writers taught kindred views. The English Mede and the French Calvinist, Jurieu, held the early patristic theory. In the days of the Rebellion and the Commonwealth, quite a number of the sectaries were millenarians. Such was the party designated as Fifth Monarchy Men. John Milton believed in a future visible appearing and reign with Christ upon earth - a reign of a thousand years. Near the close of the period, William Peterson attracted attention as an enthusiastic advocate of the same doctrine. At the same time, a departure from the interpretation of Augustine began to be made by some who. like him, did not believe in the visible reign of Christ on earth. Instead of placing the beginning of the millennium in the past, they located it in the future. Whitby and Vitringa were prominent representatives of this view" (Sheldon, Hist. Chr. Doct., II, p. 213).]

Beginning with the seventeenth century, millennialism again came into prominence, due perhaps to the religious wars in Germany, the persecution of the Huguenots in France, and the Revolution in England. The immediate occasion of the interest in millennial studies, was the publication of the Clavis Apocalypticae by Joseph Mede (1586-1638), commonly known as "the illustrious Mede." Dr. Elliott states that "his works have generally been thought to constitute an era in the solution of Apocalyptic mysteries, for which he was looked upon and written of, as a man almost inspired." In Germany, Jacob Spener was regarded as holding millennial views. Jacob Boehme, the mystic (1624) warmly advocated millennialism, as did the Lutheran Bishop Peterson at a later date (1705). Among the outstanding premillennialists associated more or less closely with Mede, may be mentioned Dr. William Twisse (1575-1646), a pupil of Mede, and the first moderator of the Westminster Assembly of Divines; Nathaniel Homes, whose Revelation Revealed was published in 1653; Thomas Burnet (1635-1715), known for his Sacred Theory of the Earth, published in Latin (1681) with an English translation (1684-1689); Thomas Goodwin (1600-1679) an independent minister of the rigid Calvinistic type (Works in five volumes, 1681-1704) and Joseph Perry, whose work entitled The Glory of Christ’s Visible Kingdom, was published in 1721

[There were many in this period who held to a firm belief in the Second Advent, and who were known to have held millennial views, but have written to no great extent on the subject. Some like Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661); Jeremy Taylor (1613-1677); Richard Baxter (1615.1691) and Joseph Alleine (1623-1668) were devotional writers, and their views of the Second Advent are largely expressed in their heart-longings for the return of their Lord. John Bunyan (1628-1688) "the Prince of Dreamers"; John Milton (1608-1674) "the Christian Homer"; Matthew Henry (1663-1714), the celebrated commentator; John Cocceius (d. 1669), professor of theology at Bremen; Isaac Newton (1642-1727) and a host of others. The following list of names may be helpful - Joseph Farmer, Peter Sterry, John Durant, Simon Menno (founder of the Mennonites), John Alstead, and Robert Maton

Interpretations of the Book of Revelation are divided into three classes: (1) the Praeterist (held by Grotius, Moses Stuart and Warren), which regards the prophecy as mainly fulfilled in the age immediately succeeding the time of the apostles (666 - Neron Kaisar); (2) the Continuous (held by Isaac Newton, Vitringa, Bengel, Elliott, Kelly, and Cumming), which regards the whole as a continuous prophetical history, extending from the first age until the end of things (666 - Lateinos); Hengstenberg and Alford hold substantially this view, though they regard the seven seals, trumpets, and vials as synchronological. each succeeding set going over the same ground and exhibiting it in some special aspect; (3) the Futurist (held by Maitland and Todd), which considers

the book as describing events yet to occur, during the times immediately preceding and following the coming of the Lord. - Strong, Systematic Theology, III, p. 1000.] The dominant type of premillennialism, held by the writers of this period [17th and 18th centuries and earlier - GL] may be summed up in the following general statements: (1) They identified in point of time, the rapture, the revelation, the first resurrection, the conflagration, and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, and taught that all these events occurred before the millennium. (2) They taught that the church was complete before the millennium - the wicked having been destroyed by the brightness of His coming; and (3) they identified the millennium and the period of the investigative judgment. On the second and third points, there were more or less differences in opinion. Mede held that a distinction must be made between the state of the New Jerusalem, and the state of the nations which walk in the light of it. The New Jerusalem is not the whole Church but the metropolis of it. He says "I make this state of the Church to belong to the Second Advent of Christ, or the day of the judgment, when Christ shall appear in the clouds of heaven to destroy all the professed enemies of His Church and kingdom, and deliver the creature from that bondage of corruption brought upon it for the sin of man." Mede also taught that this state is neither before nor after, but is itself the day of judgment; and that the Jews never understood the expression to mean otherwise than a period of many years' continuance. Homes differed from Mede in holding that only the open and obstinate of the ungodly would be destroyed by the conflagration, the rest being reserved out of the fire as "an appendix of the new creation." Burnet taught that all the wicked would perish in the conflagration; while Perry went still farther and denied the existence of either saints or sinners in the flesh during the millennium. Since these writers all maintained that the Church was complete at the time of the Second Advent, their problem was to explain the appearance of the wicked at the close of the millennium. Homes held, that those who escaped the conflagration would be restored in body and soul to the natural perfection which Adam had in the state of innocency, but being mutable, would likewise fall when assaulted by Satan. Burnet was forced to adopt the position of a double race, which he regarded as being very different from each other - the one sons of God by resurrection, the other, sons of the earth generated from the slime of the ground and the heat of the sun. Since Perry maintained that the earth during the millennium would be in the exclusive possession of men in the resurrected state, he resorts to an explanation "which he knows is out of the common road of almost all expositors," that is, that the Gog and Magog who will rise at the end of the thousand years, "will consist of the number of all the wicked when raised out of their graves." These are but a few of the difficulties which arose in connection with this subject, and which formed the basis of further discussion in the next period

[Mede comments on I Thess. 4:14-18 as follows "After this, our gathering together unto Christ at His coming, we shall henceforth never lose His presence, hut always enjoy it. . . . The saints being translated into the air, is to do honor to their Lord and King at His return . . . .and they may be preserved during the conflagration of the earth, and the works thereof: that as Noah and his family were preserved from the deluge by being lifted up above the waters in the ark, so should the saints at the conflagration be lifted up in the clouds, unto their ark, Christ, to be preserved there from the deluge of fire, wherein the wicked shall be consumed." On 2 Peter 3:8 he says, "But whereas, I mentioned the day of judgment, lest ye might mistake it for a short day, or a day of few hours, I would not, beloved, have you ignorant that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day . . . these words are commonly taken as an argument why God should not be thought slack in His promise, but the first Fathers took it otherwise, and besides it proves it

not. For the question is not whether the time be long or short in respect of God, but whether it be long or short in respect of us, otherwise not only a thousand years, hut an hundred thousand years, are in the eyes of God no more than one day is to us, and so it would not seem long to God if the day of judgment should be deferred till then (Cf. Joseph Mede, Works, III, p. 611; IV, p.776).]

[Nathaniel Homes was a Puritan writer of great ability, and a contemporary of Joseph Mede. In his Revelation Revealed he says, "In that new creation Christ restores all things to their perfection, and every believer to his; to the end that all believers may jointly and coordinately rule over the whole world, and all things therein, next under Christ their Head. I say all, and not a part, as some unwarily publish. And I say jointly, and not one part of the saints to usurp authority over all the rest, as many dream. And co-ordinarily, all upon equal terms, not some saints to rule by deputies made of the rest of the saints, as men seem to interpret." Concerning those who are "reserved out of the fire to be an appendix of the new creation, as Lactantius, Sixtus, Senensis, and Dr. Twisse understand," he says that these "by virtue of the Adamic covenant, shall be restored in soul and body to the natural perfection which Adam had in the state of innocency; but being mutable, they shall fall, when in like manner they are assaulted by Satan. Out of these shall spring the brood of Cog and Magog. . . . The Church, being now as heaven on earth, the false-hearted spawn of the future Cog and Magog, shall be remote on earth near their future hell. But if these hypocrites were nearer the Church, might they perhaps be converted? We answer, No; for it is (if we may use the word) the fate of the millenary period, I mean, God’s righteous peremptory sentence, that as all that time there shall be no degenerating of believers, so no more regenerating of any believers." - Homes, Revelation Revealed, pp. 279, 282

Thomas Burnet agreed with both Mede and Homes as to the time of the conflagration and the new heavens and the new earth, and also with the completion of the Church which should reign in a resurrection state on the new earth. "Neither is there any distinction made," he says, "that I find by St. John, of two sorts of saints in the millennium, the one in heaven (in resurrection bodies), the other upon earth (in a mortal state). This is such an idea of the millennium as to my eye hath neither beauty nor foundation in Scripture." He admits the difficulty of accounting for the wicked, who at the close of the millennium, will compass the camp of the saints and the beloved city (Rev. 20:7-9). His own solution is as follows: "It seems probable that there will be a double race of mankind in the future earth, very different from one another, . . . The one born from heaven, sons of Cod and of the resurrection, who are the true saints and heirs of the millennium: the others horn of the earth, sons of the earth, generated from the slime of the ground and heat of the sun, as brute creatures were at the first. This second progeny, or generation of men, in the future earth, I understand to be signified by the prophet under these borrowed or feigned names of Cog and Magog," - Burnet, Theory of the Earth, IV, p. 7.]

[On the subject of the completion of the Church, Perry states that "It is Certain that when Christ personally comes from heaven will be the time of the open solemnization of the marriage glory between Him and His Spouse; and, if so, then the Bride must be ready against that time, as it is expressed in this text, "And his wife hath made herself ready’; which cannot be if they were not all converted before Christ comes. For this I think is undeniable that by the ’wife,’ ’bride’ or ’spouse’ of Christ, the whole elect must be understood. . . . How can it be thought that Christ when He comes from heaven to celebrate the marriage feast between Himself and His people, that He should have lame and imperfect bride, as she must be, if some should be with Christ, in a perfect and glorified

state, and some of His mystical body at the same time in an imperfect and unglorified condition. " - Joseph Perry, The Glory of Christ's Visible Kingdom, pp. 225, 226. Perry also states that "The last restitution, or the restitution of all things, will not be, as I conceive, until Christ's personal coming. As the heaven received Him, so it will retain Him until this time, in which all things shall be restored. . . . When though this restitution of all things takes in the restitution of the creation unto its paradisiacal state; yet it is certain that the bringing in of the elect by regenerating grace, and completing the whole mystical body of Christ, is the principal part of that restitution, they being principally concerned in it, and for whose sake all other creatures are to be restored; all which shows that there will be no conversion when Christ is come" (Ibid, p. 224) The Modern Period. Beginning with the middle of the eighteenth century, a new period in the history of millennialism was ushered in by the publication of Bengel's Commentary on Revelation (1740), and his Sermons for the People (1748) Attention was soon turned to the question of prophecy, and the study of Revelation became popular in pious churchly circles. The French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, gave a fresh impetus to prophetical studies, and premillennialism was adopted by many of great scholastic ability and high standing in the Church. Bengel (1687-1751) it will be recalled, was the originator of the modern Biblical Movement and the author of the Apparatus Criticus (Cf. I, p.90). Dr. Adam Clarke says that "In him were united two rare qualifications - the deepest piety and the most extensive learning"; and Mr. Wesley is thought to have followed him in his interpretation of the Apocalypse. Bengel held a peculiar position concerning the millennium, arguing from Revelation 20: that there is a double millennium, namely, a thousand years' reign on earth, followed by a thousand years' reign in heaven; the first the seventh, and the second the eighth thousand years from creation. He believed that the millennium on earth would be a time of rulers, marriage, agriculture and all the course of life as it is now known. His belief concerning the completeness of the Church, led at length to the adoption of the Bridehood theories, as limitations of this completeness. A distinction is made, therefore, between the "Church as the Bride," and the whole number of the "saved" regarded as outside the bridehood the "Church of the Afterborn" as contrasted with the "Church of the Firstborn." Thus Dr. Bickersteth says that the "Church which is to appear as a complete and corporate body with Christ at His coming, is not all the saved, but only a peculiar portion of them called the "Bride," the Assembly of the Firstborn, the kings and priests unto God, the Holy City; whose blessedness is distinct and peculiar, not holiness and blessedness merely, but these in a peculiar form." This led immediately to the question, Who then constitutes the Bride? Dr. Bickersteth thinks that the Bride consists of all the saints who have believed up to the commencement of the millennium; the Duke of Manchester limits the Bride still further, by excluding from this company all those who lived prior to the ascension; while Mr. Bonar holds that the saints of the millennial age will be the same as all others, except that they will not have shared in the trials of the preceding saints, and therefore will not attain the dignity of the Bridehood, which is reserved exclusively for the tried saints. Here, again, we may say that speculative theories seem eventually to fall of their own weight. These theories, however, led to another type of premillennialism, which holds that the Church is incomplete at the time of the Second Advent, and consequently is followed by the millennium as a further period of salvation

[Bengel wrote, "Apart from all the details of chronological computation, we can but think ourselves approaching very near to the termination of a great period; neither can we get rid of the idea, that troublesome times will soon supersede the repose we have so long enjoyed. At the approaching

termination of any great and remarkable period, many striking events have been found to take place simultaneously, and many others in quick succession; and this after a course of intermediate ages in which nothing unusual has occurred. - Bengel, Memoirs and Writings, p. 311

Dr. John Gill (1697-1771) was an English contemporary of Bengel. Concerning the Millennium or Personal Reign of Christ, he says, "I observe that Christ will have a special, peculiar, glorious, and visible kingdom, in which He will reign personally on earth. (I) I call it a special, peculiar kingdom, different from the kingdom of nature, and from His spiritual kingdom. (2) It will be very glorious and visible; hence His appearing and kingdom are put together (2 Tim. 4:1). (3) This kingdom will be, after all the enemies of Christ and His people are removed out of the way. (4) Antichrist will be destroyed; an angel, who is no other than Christ, will then personally descend to bind Satan and all his angels. (5) This kingdom of Christ will be bounded by two resurrections; by the first resurrection, or the resurrection of the just, at which it will begin; and by the second resurrection, or the resurrection of the wicked, at which it will end, or nearly. (6) This kingdom will be before the general judgment, especially of the wicked. John, after he had given an account of the former (Rev. 20), relates a vision of the latter. (7) This glorious, visible kingdom of Christ will be on earth, and not in heaven; and so is distinct from the kingdom of heaven, or ultimate glory."]

[Dr. Bickersteth says. "The Bride consists of all who have believed Up to the commencement of the millennium. These alone are the mystical body of Christ. . . . But after they are completed, at the Second Advent, the earth will be peopled by nations of the saved, in flesh and blood, friends, companions, servants of the Bridegroom - a totally different party from the glorified Bride." - Bickersteth, The Divine Warning

According to the Duke of Manchester, "The gifts necessary for the forming of Christ's mystical body were not conferred Until after the ascension of Jesus. . . . We could not, therefore, say with propriety that the Church under the former dispensation was 'Christ. The Bride is the New Jerusalem. . . . Now the great glory of the New Jerusalem is, that it is the abode of Deity. But for the believer to be a habitation of God, is the peculiar glory of the dispensation, founded by the apostles, according to the promise, 'he dwelleth with you and shall be in you.' " - Duke of Manchester, The Finished Mystery, pp. 284-288

Mr. Bonar differs from both the preceding positions. "All the saints redeemed amid toil and temptation, sorrow and warfare, shall form the Bride at the Lord's coming; and this Bride shall reign with Him a thousand years. Then as the saints who shall people the earth during these thousand years, they are as really saints and as simply dependent on their Head as any one of those already in glory. - A. A. Bonar, Redemption Drawing Nigh, pp. I 24ff.] In addition to the premillennial development, there arose during this period an opposition movement known as postmillennialism. Daniel Whitby (1638-1726) reverted to the Augustinian view, that the millennium referred to the beginning and progress of the Church between the two Advents. This spiritual progress of the Church he viewed as ending in a final triumph over the world, or a millennial reign of righteousness preceding the Second Coming of Christ to judgment. Whitby is generally regarded, therefore, as the author of the postmillennial theory in modern times - a theory which he himself explained as "A New Hypothesis." He was followed by Vitringa, Faber and David Brown, the latter being especially able in his presentation and defense of the doctrine. These later developments must now be reviewed more fully as Modern Types of Millennial Theory MODERN

TYPES OF MILLENNIAL THEORY

We have attempted to trace in a brief way, the history of millennial theory from the patristic age to modern times, and shall conclude this historical survey with a review of some of its more prominent types. These fall into two main groups which may be classified as (1) Literalistic Theories; and (2) Spiritualistic Theories. These can be given only brief mention The Literalistic Theories. These include in general, the premillennial theories of every type. As our historical statement has shown, the early church held universally to a belief in the personal return of Christ. This return soon took the form of a personal reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years, or during the millennium, which most writers regard as practically universal to the time of Augustine, when the spiritualistic theories came to the front and chiliasm sank into decline. With the Reformation, the premillennial theories again came to the front, especially during the seventeenth and earlier part of the eighteenth centuries. These theories as we have indicated regarded the Church as complete at the time of the Second Advent, and only later, was the millennium viewed as an extension of the Church age. Many and varied as these theories were, they have in modern times developed into two general types of premillennialism. (1) Those which regarded the Church as complete, and therefore identified in point of time, the Second Advent with its rapture and revelation, the first resurrection, and the conflagration, placing all these events before the millennium, developed into what is known at present as the Adventist Theory. (2) Those which regarded the Church as incomplete at the time of the Second Advent, have separated between the rapture and the revelation on the one hand, and the conflagration on the other, making the millennium to lie between these two terminal points. This we think may properly be termed the Keswick theory, at least, it will be granted that the Keswick people have been enthusiastic in their support of this position. We give now simply a general statement of these positions.]

[Dr. Daniel Steele in his book entitled, "Antinomianism Revived," deals with what he terms "The Plymouth Eschatology." His discussion is concerned with the eschatology of the Plymouth Brethren, but the theory discussed is the same as that which we have called "The Keswick Theory." That the modern Keswick movement is largely an outgrowth of the earlier Plymouth movement will not be questioned. While Dr. Steele discusses this premillennial position solely from the standpoint of a postmillennialist, his references to the underlying antinomianism are well taken. The repression theory of the millennium is but an extension of the repression theory of sin in the individual heart, a position decidedly in opposition to Wesleyanism. The emphasis upon election at times, as Dr. Steele points out, needs only the doctrine of a limited atonement to make the scheme of Calvinistic antinomianism complete,

1. The Adventist Theory. The theory held by the Adventist people is generally characterized by the following positions. (1) The rapture, the revelation, and the conflagration are all identified in point of time. (2) The wicked are all destroyed at the coming of the Lord (1 Thess. 1:7, 8). (3) The righteous are taken to heaven (John 14:2, 3; 1 Thess. 4:17). (4) The earth is rendered void, an abyss or bottomless pit (Cf. Gen. 1:1 with 2 Peter 3:10). (5) Satan is bound through lack of opportunity to exercise his powers (Rev. 20:1-3). (6) The millennium is in heaven and not on earth. The saints are engaged in the investigative judgment (Rev. 7:9-15; 21:2). (7) The descent of the Holy City to judgment, and the resurrection of the wicked (Rev. 21:2). (8) The apostate nations are the wicked dead resurrected, whom Satan rallies to attack the Holy City. Satan loosed because of opportunity to again deceive the wicked. (9) Satan’s host defeated through fire from heaven which

sweeps them away to the Great White Throne Judgment (Rev. 21:11-13). (10) The punishment of the wicked by fire from heaven which destroys sin and annihilates the wicked in the lake of fire, which is the second death (Rev. 20:14, 15). (11) The earth purified and made new through the fire which destroyed it at the Second Coming of Christ (2 Peter 3:12, 13). The righteous saved by being lifted above it. (Cf. Noah and the Ark (1 Peter 3:20, 21). (12) The Eternal State. The new heavens and the new earth become the abode of the saints. These are understood to be the present heavens and earth purified by fire. Here it will be seen that the earlier theories as to the completion of the Church and the identification of the millennium with the day of judgment are continued; but the creation of the new heavens and the new earth are regarded as following, rather than preceding the millennium. It is to be regretted that the Adventist people have attached to this doctrine formerly regarded as orthodox, the untenable and unscriptural doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked

[W. W. Spicer in his work entitled, "Our Day in the Light of Prophecy." gives us the following summary of the Adventist position. (I) The Millennium is the closing period of God’s great week of time, a great Sabbath of rest to the earth and to the people of God. (2) It follows the close of the Gospel Age, and precedes the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God on earth. (3) It completes what in the Scriptures is frequently spoken of as the "Day of the Lord." (4) It is bounded at each end by a resurrection. (5) Its beginning is marked by the pouring out of the seven last plagues, the Second Coming of Christ, the resurrection of the righteous dead, the translation of the saints to heaven; and its close by the descent of the New Jerusalem with Christ and the saints from heaven, the resurrection of the wicked dead, the loosing of Satan, and the final destruction of the wicked. (6) During the thousand years the earth lies desolate, Satan and his angels are confined here; and the saints with Christ sit in judgment on the wicked, preparatory to final punishment (Cf. Jer. 4:23-26; Earth desolate). (7) The wicked dead are then raised, Satan is loosed for a little season, and he and the host of the wicked encompass the camp of the saints and the Holy City, when fire comes down out of heaven and devours them. (8) The earth is cleansed by the same fire that destroys the wicked and the earth renewed becomes the eternal abode of the saints. (9) The millennium is one of the ages to come." Its close will mark the beginning of the New Earth State.] The Keswick Theory. As the Adventist theory is built upon the supposition that the Church is complete at the time of the Second Advent, so the Keswick theory has as its presupposition, the idea of its incompleteness. The former links the millennial reign more closely to the eternal state; the latter regards it as an extension of the Church age. Here again, the variations in matters of detail are exceedingly numerous, but perhaps the best representative of this type of premillenialism is that of Dr. Joseph A. Seiss. This theory which was published in his work entitled The Last Times, and more fully discussed in his later works, is as follows: (1) Christ Jesus, our adorable Redeemer, is to return to this world in great power and glory, as really and as literally as He ascended from it. (2) This Advent of the Messiah will occur before the general conversion of the world, while the man of sin continues his abominations, while the earth is yet full of tyranny, war, infidelity and blasphemy, and consequently before what is called the millennium. (3) This coming of the Lord will not be to depopulate and annihilate the earth, but to judge, subdue, renew, and bless it. (4) In the period of His coming He will raise the holy from among the dead, transform the living that are waiting for Him, judge them according to their works, receive them up to Himself in the clouds, and establish them in a glorious heavenly kingdom. (5) Christ will then also break down and destroy all present systems of government in church and state, burn up the great

centers and powers of wickedness and usurpation, shake the whole earth with terrific visitations for its sins, and subdue it to His own personal and eternal rule. (6) During these great and destructive commotions the Jewish race shall be marvelously restored to the land of their fathers, brought to embrace Jesus as their Messiah and King, delivered from their enemies, placed at the head of the nations, and made the agents of unspeakable blessings to the world. (7) Christ will then re-establish the throne of His father David, exalt it with the heavenly glory, make Mount Zion the seat of His divine empire, and with the glorified saints associated with Him in His dominion reign over the house of Jacob and over the world in a visible, sublime, and heavenly Christocracy for the period of a "thousand years." (8) During the millennial reign in which mankind is brought under a new dispensation, Satan is to be bound and the world enjoy its long expected Sabbatic rest. (9) At the end of this millennial Sabbath the last rebellion shall be quashed, the wicked dead, who shall continue in Hades until that time, shall be raised and judged, and Satan, Death, Hades, and all antagonism to good, delivered over to eternal destruction. (10) Under these wonderful administrations, the earth is to be entirely recovered from the effects of the fall, the excellence of God's righteous providence vindicated, the whole curse repealed, death swallowed up, and all the inhabitants of the world thenceforward forever restored to more than full happiness, purity and glory which Adam forfeited in Eden The objection urged against this type of premillennialism, centers largely in its emphasis upon a continuance of the work of salvation during the millennium. The ground of this objection is found in those scriptures which seem to indicate that when Christ comes the Intercession will cease and the Judgment begin. It is in this work of the Intercession that the merit of Christ's death and the might of His Spirit find their logical connection, and by means of which the one passes into the other. The continuous Intercession makes possible the acknowledgment of Christ's right to receive and dispense the Spirit, without which salvation is admittedly impossible. This is the whole tenor of the New Testament, the deep undertone of the work of redemption. The force of this argument will be clearly seen by those who care to consider those Scriptures which bear upon the relation of the Spirit to Christ, such as, I will pray the Father, and he shalt give you another Comforter (John 14:16); when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father (John 15:26); Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he has shed forth this, which ye now see and hear (Acts 2:33); he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour (Titus 3:5, 6), and many others. But the scriptures which bear more directly and specifically upon the intercessory work of Christ are found in Hebrews 7:25 and 9:12, 24-28. In the latter text three things are mentioned, each of which is termed an appearance, and to which the word "once" is attached either directly or indirectly. These are the incarnation, or the First Advent; the intercession, and the Second Advent. Once in the end of the world hath he appeared [pefanerwtai] to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place . . . not into the holy places made with hands but into heaven itself, now to appear [emfanisqhntai] in the presence of God for us: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear [ofqhsetai] the second time without sin unto salvation. This last statement according to Dr. Pope means that He shall appear "without any redeeming relation to the sin which He will still find, and for the complete and bodily salvation of those whom He has already saved in spirit (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 389). So also, Dr. David Brown in commenting on this text says, "When the Advent arrives, the intercession is done; and when the intercession is done, salvation is done.

When Christ appears the second time to us, He will cease to appear in the presence of God for us (Brown, Christ's Second Coming, p. 112). The argument against the continuance of salvation after the Second Coming of Christ, is not only urged against this type of premillennialism by the postmillennialists, but also by the premillennialists of the earlier type

[The Keswick theory holds that the work of salvation will continue throughout the millennium. Dr. Seiss further says, "I therefore hold it to be a necessary and integral part of the scriptural doctrine of salvation, that our race, as a self-multiplying order of beings, will never cease either to exist or to possess the earth." And again, "The earth, and generations and nations of earth, notwithstanding the momentous changes that are to happen, will extend through and beyond the thousand years, if not in some sort forever" (Seiss, Millennialism and the Second Advent). He holds, further, that these nations will exist in their present state as far as their mortality and inward depravity are concerned, hut that there shall be established a new form of administration in which outward obedience shall be made compulsory. He says, "the so-called Millennium brings with it an altogether different dispensation from that under which we live. . . . The great work and office of the Church now is to preach the gospel to every creature, and to witness for Christ to an adverse and gainsaying world: but there is not one word said about any such office in mortal hands during all that long period. In its stead, however, there is to be a shepherdizing of the nations with a rod of iron, an authoritative and invincible administration of right and justice on the part of immortal king-priests, and a potent disciplining of men and nations far beyond anything which the mere preaching of the gospel has ever wrought or was ever intended to do for earthly society..... Now we can only beseech men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God; then they will be compelled to take the instructions given them, to serve with fear and rejoice with trembling. to kiss, give the required adoration to the Son or perish from the way (Psalm 2:10-12). Now it is left to men's option to serve God or not, with nothing to interfere with their choice but the judgment to come; then they will be obliged to accept and obey His laws, or be smitten and blasted on the spot (Cf. Seiss, Lectures on the Apocalypse. III, pp. 346, 347). The discerning reader will hardly fail to see here the Keswick teaching of the repression of inbred sin in the individual heart, extended to the millennial reign in its external aspects. Those who hold that sin in the heart is not merely to be repressed but purged out, find it difficult to accept this external and repressive type of a millennial reign. If the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God now, how can it be during the millennium. This is one of the perplexing problems which attach to this form of millennialism.]

[It is common for the advocates of this type of millennialism, to ground their objections to postmillennialism on the basis of the parable of the Tares and the Wheat. We may cite the following paragraph from Rev. A. Sims as an illustration. He says, "The current theory (referring to postmillennialism) is opposed to the spirit and teaching of the parable of the Wheat and the Tares. These are not to be separated, but are to grow together till the harvest, or the end of the age, when Christ shall come in judgment. But how can the growth of evil alongside the growth of good continue till the close of the dispensation if all are to be saved and a thousand years of righteousness are to take place before the Second Coming of Christ? The prevailing view of the millennium thus teaches that the wheat and the tares shall not grow together till the harvest, but that the tares shall all be converted into wheat, and It also puts off the Second Coming of Christ for a thousand years" (Sims, Deepening Shadows and Coming Glories, p. 19 I). Here the writer objects to postmillennialism on the ground that it teaches a reign of absolute righteousness

previous to the coming of Christ a reign in which all the tares shall be converted into wheat. If postmillennialists believed this, it would be a strong argument against them; that they do not, is evident from a careful perusal of their writings. But the argument is reactionary. The plain inference is, that the millennium which follows the coming of Christ will not be a mixed reign in which sinners and the righteous shall dwell together; but the tares having been destroyed, the people shall be all righteous. If this be not the inference, then there is no point to the argument against the postmillennialists. But does this type of millennialism thus teach? It most certainly does not. It holds that the work of salvation during the millennium will continue as before, and that there shall still exist an admixture of the wicked and the righteous, the tares and the wheat.]

[Dr. Pope in commenting on Hebrews 9:12, 24-28 says, "This is a cardinal text, and the variation in the phraseology, chosen with great precision, must be observed. In this verse the word is ofqhsetai (Heb. 9:28, appear the second time), while in another which 8ays that 'He appeared to put away sin' it was pefanerwtai, his manifestation between these two, 'now to appear in the presence of God for us,' is emfanisqhntai. The first is the most visible exhibition of Himself as King, in the judicial form of His kingly office. He vindicates His atonement as against all who have despised it. Sin will be finally punished as the rejection of Himself and His redemption. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ': upon all hearers of that gospel who shall then be found without evangelical knowledge of God. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III. p.390

Mr. Barker in his comment on Hebrews 7:25 says, "It is absolutely necessary to remember that the word 'ever' signifies continuity, not eternity of action; for the office of Christ as our Intercessor will have its close when He has brought all His people with Him." - Barker, Hope of the Apostolic Church, p. 184 The Duke of Manchester, an ardent premillennialist, takes the same position. He says, "When Messiah shall leave the 'Holy of Holies' where He has now entered, to 'appear in the presence of God for us' - intercession, which is peculiar to his being in the Holy of Holies, shall have ceased. . . . Coincident with this, upon resigning the kingdom (that in which He now reigns, hut which He will resign at the millennium), to the Father, He will leave 'the throne of grace,' on which He shall reign until the effectual application, by the Holy Ghost, of all His work toward 'the restitution of all things.' " - Duke of Manchester Horae Hebraicae, p. 90.]

[Joseph Perry, a strong advocate of the earlier type of premillennialism, rejects the idea of a continuance of salvation after the Second Advent, believing the Church to be complete previous to that time. He says, "There are some things that these last do hold, that I cannot by any means assent to; and that is, when Christ shall be established upon the throne of His glory, in His kingdom, and all the saints with Him, in a perfect, incorruptible state of immortality, that then there shall be the preaching of the gospel, and conversion work go forward among the multitude of the nations that shall be found living when Christ cometh, according to the opinion of some good men. I say this is that which I cannot fall in with, but must profess my dislike against, because I cannot believe that the Lord Jesus Christ will come down from heaven, and leave that great work of intercession now at God's right hand, until the whole number of God's elect among the Jews and Gentiles are converted, and the mystical body of Christ completed. And if so, where is there any room for conversion work to go on after this?" - Perry, Glory of Christ's Visible Kingdom

Thomas Burnet declared that we can ’as well open a lock without a key as interpret the Apocalypse without the Millennium." He identified the millennium with the period of the new heavens and the new earth, and therefore a period of unmixed righteousness. This he said, was the doctrine of all the ancient millennaries, and we ought to be careful and locate it thus." He contends that the New Jerusalem state is the same as the millennial state, and is ushered in by the seventh trumpet and the judgment; and that during the millennium there will be a lustral appearance of Christ and the Shekinah. He affirms that placing the millennium in this earth before the renovation, was what brought the doctrine anciently into discredit and decay (Cf. Taylor, The Reign of Christ on Earth, p. 214) The following analysis of Augustine’s position is arranged from Elliott’s abstract of the "City of God," and is quoted in Silver’s work entitled, "The Lord’s Return." (a) The first resurrection is the rising of dead souls into spiritual life, beginning with the ministry of Christ, from which the millennium dates. (b) The devil, the strong man armed, is bound and expelled from the hearts of the disciples of Christ. (c) The reign of saints is their personal victory over sin and the devil. Satan no longer deceives. (d) The ’beast’ is the wicked world; his ’image’ is hypocrisy. (e) The millennium will end in 650 A.D., terminating the six thousandth year period and introducing the rise of the Antichrist.] The Spiritualistic Theories. These theories are more abstract in nature, and while they date back to an earlier period, came into special prominence at the time of Augustine. Reacting from his earlier chiliastic views, Augustine taught that the reign of Christ referred to the Church age, and embraced the whole period of time between the First Advent and the Second. He also taught that the millennium was the sixth period of one thousand years in the world’s history. However, the Church rejected this theory, and held that the millennium was to be identified with the whole gospel dispensation. The number they held to be purely symbolical, and as signifying a totality, rather than a definite period of time. From this impetus given to the spiritualistic phase of the millennium, two types of theory have developed - the Roman Catholic, and the modern Postmillennial Theory

1. The Roman Catholic Theory. The theory held by the Church is essentially that of Augustine, with this exception, they reject his position of the thousand years, and hold rather to his primary statement, that the millennium is identical with the reign of the Church on earth, and is to be followed by the judgment. Dr. Wilmers, S.J., in his Handbook of the Christian Religion states that "Christ shall come again to judge the living and the dead; and this general judgment will close the present order of things. No one can with certainty foretell the day of judgment. But we know that it will not come until certain signs and prophecies have been fulfilled. The gospel shall be preached over the whole world (Matt. 24:14); there will be a great apostasy in the Church (2 Thess. 2:3); a great decadence in Christian life, great corruption of morals, manifesting itself in luxury and sensuality (Luke 17:26-30); finally, Antichrist shall appear (2 Thess. 2:3, 4). The last day shall be preceded by war, pestilence, and famine (Matt. 24. 4, 5); and by diverse signs and catastrophes (Matt. 24:20; Luke 21:25, 26). The day of judgment will close the present order of things. The time of probation will have passed, and there will remain only two classes - the blessed in heaven, and the reprobate in hell. . . . At the last judgment the whole visible world shall be changed (2 Peter 2:11-14). That is to say, after the complete victory over sin, the earth, which till then shall be under the curse of sin, and the visible universe, shall be made to harmonize with the glorious existence of the risen man. Even now, according to the apostle, nature sighs for the day of deliverance (Rom. 8:19)." The Post-millennial Theory. This theory is so-called because it regards the Second Advent as following, rather than preceding the millennium. As to the personal, visible return of our

Lord, postmillennialists hold this belief as firmly, and cherish it as highly as do the premillennialists. The difference in the theories concerns only the order of events which attach to the Second Advent. Modern postmillennialism is generally attributed to Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), and as revived by him, is essentially a return to the Augustinian position. However, instead of adopting the modified Augustinianism which regards the millennium as being in the past; or identifying it with the entire Church age, as does Roman Catholicism, he regarded the millennium as a reign of righteousness in the future. His doctrine appears to be only a restatement of what Dr. Charles Hodge calls, "the common doctrine of the Church" as expressed in the Reformed Confessions, with particular emphasis upon the final triumph. Dr. Elliott sums up the position of Daniel Whitby as follows: (1) The first resurrection is a revival of the cause, principles, doctrines, character and spirit of the early martyrs and saints. It is ecclesiastical, spiritual, national. (2) It lies in the future. The millennium will be preceded by triumph over the Antichrist. (3) Satan no longer deceives; the doctrines of the martyrs and their spirit is revived like that of Elias in John the Baptist. (4) The Church will flourish and holiness will triumph for a thousand years. The world will enjoy paradisiacal blessedness while martyrs and saints in heaven will sympathize with its joy. The triumph on earth will be universal

[Dr. Charles Hodge presents this doctrine as follows: "The Common church doctrine is, first, that there is to be a second, personal, visible and glorious Advent of the Son of God. Secondly, the events which are to precede that Advent are: (I) 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: (I) The resurrection of the deed, of the just and the unjust. (2) The general judgment. (3) The end of the world. And (4) The consummation of Christ’s kingdom." - Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 792 The Arminian theologians have almost without exception, been the exponents of the postmillennial theory. Here may be mentioned Richard Watson as the earliest Methodist theologian, Pope. Raymond, Wakefield, Miley, Summers, and Field. Among the Calvinistic or Reformed theologians, we may mention in addition to Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, Strong, Shedd and Boyce. Some of these. however give little attention to the subject in their theological treatises

Dr. Pope says, "No church having incorporated the doctrine (premillennialism) into its profession of faith, it has been in modern times confined to schools of thought within the several communions. influenced, for the most part, and led by individual students of prophecy. . . . This belief has, during the present century, been incorporated into many systems, being almost the leading characteristic of some. Still it is generally speaking held only by individuals and private schools of interpretation: inconsistently by divines of the Lutheran, Anglican, Westminster, and some other Confessions; consistently by those alone who in other respects deny the analogy of the faith as expressed in the ancient creeds and the formularies of the Reformation and the general consent of the Catholic Church, being limited by no Confession. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 397, 398

Dr. I. A. Dorner and Bishop Martensen emphasize the importance of the Second Advent, and in some sense may be regarded as premillennialists, although their teachings more nearly approach in many instances, the postmillennial theory - or to them, the common teachings of the Confessions.]

[Dr. Van Oosterzee among the Dutch theologians holds to the premillennial theory. He says, "The term millennial kingdom has in many an ear so unpleasant a sound that, even from the believing standpoint. some courage is required to range oneself among the defenders of Chiliasm. If we do so, nevertheless, in obedience to faith in the Word, without which we know nothing of the future, we must begin with repudiating the Jewish form, in which this prospect is represented by some, in a manner which furnished a ready occasion to the Reformers to speak of 'Judaica somnia.' For us also is the hope here treated of 'a real pearl of Christian truth and knowledge'; but it is so only after we have separated the pearl from the variegated shell, in which it is so often profered us. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, 11, p. 799 The postmillennial position is ably stated by Dr. Beckwith in his article on the Millennium in the new Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge

1. Through Christian agencies the gospel gradually permeates the entire world and becomes immeasurably more effective than at present 2. This condition thus reached will continue for a thousand years 3. The Jews will be converted, either at the beginning or some time during this period 4. Following this will be a brief apostasy and terrible conflict of Christian and evil forces

5. Finally and simultaneously there will occur the Advent of Christ, general resurrection, judgment, the old world destroyed by fire, the new heavens and the new earth will be revealed

It is well known that John Wesley followed Bengel in his interpretation of the Apocalypse. Dr. Owen also holds this view. They assert that there are two distinct periods of a thousand years spoken of in Rev. 20:1-7, and Dr. Steele remarks that the Greek article sustains this view. The first period is that during which Satan is bound for a thousand years, which as Bengel states, indicates the great period of prosperity in the Church. The second is that of the martyrs who lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. Concerning this last, Bengel says, Whilst Satan is loosed from his imprisonment of a thousand years, the martyrs live and reign, not on the earth, but with Christ: then the coming of Christ in glory at length takes place at the last day; then, next, there is the new heaven, the new earth, and the new Jerusalem." He further states that "the confounding of the two millennial periods has long ago produced many errors, and has made the name of Chiliasm hateful and suspected." Dr. Daniel Steele in commenting on the above positions says, "Thus Bengel and Wesley, instead of being premillenarians, were, in fact, what most modern Methodists are, post. millenarians." - Steele, Antinomianism Revived, p. 241.]

"The term millennium," says Dr. Raymond, "long since came to be used in a generic sense, to signify the time when the kingdom of Christ on earth should be in the ascendant, should be in its highest power, exaltation and glory. All Christians now speak of a millennium in which they believe; all look forward to a time when the kingdom of Christ shall be perfected, shall be in completeness, when the highest earthly purposes contemplated in the gospel dispensation shall be accomplished. All believe in a millennium, though there is now, as there always has been, great diversity of opinion as to what will be the precise state of things when the millennium shall have fully come" (RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, II, p.472). As to the nature of the millennium as held by postmillennialists, we may likewise look to Dr. Raymond for a typical example of this teaching. "To our thought," he says, "the idea of a millennium is the idea of a complete success, as to the Church as now constituted, and as to the enterprises of the Church now in operation, when that time has fully come, there will be but one religion, and that the Christian religion, upon the

whole surface of the globe; all will have adequate educational and religious privileges; the mass of mankind will have attained a commendable moral character; the pious will be more eminently pious than were their ancestors; universal peace and general prosperity will prevail over all the earth; but some will refuse to obey, will persist in rebellion, and men who are the enemies of God and holiness will be found on earth when the Lord comes to raise the dead and judge the world" (RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, II, pp. 493, 494)

[Dr. Raymond also says, "Will all the inhabitants of the earth be true Christians in the time of the millennium? We think not; for to suppose they will be is to suppose that probation has ceased, and that men on earth have attained to the condition of their heavenly state. To affirm the certain salvation of a class requires the assumption of an agency which will secure results; such an assumption is the contrary of contingency. If the salvation of all living at any given time be certainly secured, their salvation is not a contingency; they are not probationers. The true millennium is gospel success; the gospel is preached unto moral agents, capable of accepting or rejecting. . . . By what means are we to expect that the millennium will be ushered in? We have assumed that the present is the last time; the last dispensation of grace and probation provided for men; that Christ's coming is at the end of the world; that the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, will be at the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the unjust in immediate succession after that of the just. This assumption is equivalent to an affirmation that the means of gospel success are the same as those now in operation, and that have been in operation from the beginning. changed only in that they shall be greatly increased in number and efficiency. - Raymond, Systematic Theology, II. pp. 490-492 From what has been said, it must be evident, even to the casual reader, that premillennialism and postmillennialism represent opposite extremes of thought, and a totally different method of approach. One can sense the difference in the feeling tone. The millennium as postmillennialists conceive it, is the flowering age of the Church - a time in which righteousness shall reign and peace spread throughout the world. This condition will be brought about by the present means of evangelism, to which will be added, "the binding of Satan," or the restraining judgments of God. While the righteous are in the ascendancy, the millennium is, nevertheless, a mixed condition of saints and sinners - all in the flesh. Post-millennialists do not, therefore, regard the millennium as an absolute reign of righteousness, as some premillennialists argue; and furthermore, the inconsistency of the argument by those premillennialists who likewise regard the millennium as a mixed reign, must be evident to all

What may be said to be the scriptural basis upon which this superstructure of postmillennialism rests? It is built upon two assumptions: (1) the spiritual nature of the first resurrection; and (2) the spiritual character of the reign of Christ during the millennium

Post-millennialists generally, though not universally, maintain that the first resurrection is purely spiritual, and that the second only, is bodily and literal. This argument for the two types of resurrection is drawn from the words of our Lord found in John 5:24, 25 and 5:28, 29, Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath evertasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live (John 5:24, 25). There can be no doubt that our Lord refers here to a spiritual resurrection, and that St. Paul also, uses the same figure in his epistles. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in 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 5:28, 29). This refers, of course, to a bodily or physical resurrection. In commenting on these scriptures Dr. Pope says, "Now we have seen that our Lord expressly speaks in one and the same discourse of a first resurrection, understood spiritually, and of a second resurrection understood physically. If we apply the same principle here, this much contested symbolical prophecy (Rev. 20:1-9) is made perfectly harmonious with the rest of Scripture, and the most substantial ground of the premillennial Advent is taken away (POPE, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 898)

[Dr. David Brown, a postmillennial writer of note says, "On opening your hooks (referring to Mr. Bickersteth's Guide") we find you making the millennium the same Christian state that we expect it to be. The Jews you say, looking on their pierced Savior will repent and believe, and be the missionary instruments of the Gentiles' conversion; and you speak of the spiritual blessedness of that period when 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea,' when 'the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.' when 'men shall be blessed in Christ [with salvation of course], and all nations shall call him blessed. Here, then, is the inextricable difficulty into which your system shuts you up; and yet you are either unaware of it, or will not face it. You expatiate with equal confidence upon two things, the one of which is destructive of the other. You rejoice that Christ will bring all His people with Him, before the millennium. You no less rejoice in the prospect of a world peopled with believing men for a thousand years after His coming!" - David Brown, Christ's Second Coming, p. 78

Dr. Daniel Steele makes the following statements concerning the views of John Wesley: "Wesley, in his 'Notes on the New Testament. followed Bengel largely but definitely on the nearness of the binding of Satan and the millennium; also in the opinion that Rev. 20:1-l1 included two thousand years, the first of which Satan will be bound and the Church and the world will have 'immunity from all evils and an affluence of all blessings' - the millennium. During the second thousand years Satan will be loosed, and 'while the saints reign with Christ in heaven, men on earth will be careless and secure.' After this second thousand years, according to Mr. Wesley, the Second Advent will occur. His words are unequivocal and decisive: 'Quickly he [Satan] will be bound; when he is loosed the martyrs will live and reign with Christ, Then follows His coming in glory,' (Notes on Rev. 20:1-1l) So, in his sermon on 'The Great Assize,' Wesley distinctly places the Second Advent at the judgment (Rev. 20:11.15), which the apostle says and all admit is after the millennium. These facts show conclusively that Wesley placed the Second Advent after the millennium. And in this parted from Bengel, if, as alleged, he placed the Advent before the millennium." - Steele, Antinomianism Revived, pp. 273, 274.]

2. Post-millennialists uniformly regard the reign of Christ during the millennium as purely spiritual., Consequently they generally view the apocalyptic statement (Rev. 20:1-11) as purely symbolical or figurative. In a reference to premillennialism, Dr. Miley says, "The chief reliance of the theory is upon a single passage of scripture (Rev. 20:1-6). This may be said, first, that the passage contains not a word respecting any Advent of Christ, nor a word respecting His reigning personally on the earth. Further, it is in a highly figurative or symbolical book, and is itself highly symbolical. Consequently the construction of a theory of the Advent on such ground is without the warrant of any principle of doctrinal formation, and the more certainly so as there are many explicit texts on

that subject" (MILEY, Systematic Theology, II, p. 442). The various attitudes which postmillennialists take toward the statement in the Apocalypse, and the different construction which they put upon it, must be reserved for the appended notes

[Dr. Raymond in his objections to premillennialism says, "The theory has no support but in a literal interpretation of the twentieth chapter of Revelation. If that chapter contained all the information we have on the subject, we might be compelled to concede that postmillenarianism is the eschatology of the Bible, but the Book of Revelation is confessedly highly figurative and symbolic, and its interpretation extremely difficult. It is an accepted rule of exegesis that the obscure is to be explained by the perspicuous, the figurative by the literal, and not the reverse. - Raymond. Systematic Theology, II, p. 478

Here a difference emerges between the Revelation and the other New Testament writings. Whereas, the latter join the judgment and the consummation of the world to Christ's Second Advent. the Revelation interposes another phase. It makes a thousand years' reign of the rule of Christ fall into this earthly world period, and before the final decisive struggle and the victory of Christ. But the meaning of the passage is disputed. According to one interpretation, the martyrs and saints will he previously raised to life in a first resurrection with glorified bodies. According to others, their resurrection only means endowment with power in order to their reigning with Christ. It is further disputed, whether according to the Revelation Christ will he visible upon earth during the millennium, or will come again at the millennium only in the sense of the triumphant and glorious manifestation of the power of the gospel, upon which depends the other question, whether the joint reigning of the saints with Christ will take place invisibly and therefore spiritually in heaven, the earth remaining the old earth, or upon earth. After the millennium the Revelation makes Satan to he loosed once more for a short time, and Cog and Magog to march against the Holy City, in which representation the earthly relations in the millennium are viewed as essentially the same as the old ones. But this being so, it is improbable that the author is thinking of a visible government of Christ with saints raised in glorified bodies on the old earth. Neither Christ's visible return, nor a glorifying and transforming of the world, is promised in the Apocalypse for the thousand years' kingdom. The only characteristic of Christ's Second Advent mentioned with certainty is the joint reigning of the saints with Christ upon thrones and the temporary binding of Satan's authority, which latter may just as well take place on the outwardly unchanged earth as the time of the unchaining of his power. Only after the last conflict with the antichristian powers do the final judgment and the manifestation of Christ in glory follow (Rev. 20:1 0ff), with the account of the new heaven and new earth, with which cosmical changes the general resurrection is connected (Rev. 20:11 - 15, 2 1:1; Cf. 2 Peter 3:13). - Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, IV, pp. 389, 390 RICHARD WATSON'S STATEMENT OF POST-MILLENNIALISM The following statement in regard to the millennium, and the blessings which shall be more particularly enjoyed during that period as marked out by prophecy, is from the writings of Richard Watson, the earlier theologian of Methodism. The article in its entirety can be found in Watson's Dictionary, Article, "Millennium."

1. It is expressly said of those who shall partake of the first resurrection, that they shall be "blessed and holy"; by which the inspired writer seems to denote that it will be a time of eminent holiness. This will constitute the peculiar glory and the source of the happiness of the millennial state (Zech. 14:20, 21)

2. There is reason to expect a remarkable effusion of the Spirit, about the commencement of this happy period, even as there was at the first setting up of Christ's kingdom in the world. Besides the promises of the Spirit, which were accomplished in the apostolic age. there are others which from the connection appear to refer to the time we are now speaking of. Thus Isaiah, after having described Christ's kingdom which was set up at His First Coming, and then the succeeding desolate state of the Jews, represents this as continuing "until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest" (Isaiah 32:15-19). (Cf. also Rom. 11:26, 27 and Isaiah 59:20:21. Ezekiel 36:27; 39:28, 29; Zech. 12:10)

3. A universal spread of the gospel, diffusing the knowledge of the Lord throughout the world in a more extensive and effectual manner than ever it was before. This is repeatedly promised: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea ; and this shall take place in that day when the Gentiles shall seek to the branch of the root of Jesse, whose rest shall he glorious, and when "the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, . . and he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" (Isaiah II:9-12). The same promise of the universal knowledge of the glory of the Lord is repeated in the prophecy of Habakkuk 2:1 4. This will he attended with corresponding effects: "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee" (Psalm 22:27); "yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him," (Psalm 72:11) - And although we may not imagine that all the inhabitants of the globe will have the true and saving knowledge of the Lord; yet we may expect such a universal spread of light and religious knowledge as shall root up pagan. Mohammedan, and the antichristian delusions, and pro. duce many good effects upon those who are not really regenerated, by awing their minds, taming their ferocity, improving their morals, and making them peaceable and humane

4. The Jews will then be converted to the faith of the Messiah, and partake with the Gentiles of the blessings of His kingdom. The Apostle Paul (Rom. II) treats of this at large and confirms it from the prophecies of the Old Testament. He is speaking of Israel in a IiteraJ sense, the natural posterity of Abraham; for he distinguishes them both from the believing Gentiles and the Jewish converts of his time, and describes them as the rest who were blinded, had stumbled and fallen, and so had not obtained, but were broken off and cast away (Rom. 11:7, II, 12. 15, 17). Yet he denies that they have stumbled that they should fall, that is, irrecoverably, so as in no future period to be restored; but shows that through their fall, salvation might come to the Gentiles, and that this again might provoke them to jealously or emulation (5:11). He argues that if their fall and diminishing was the riches of the Gentiles, and the casting away of them was the reconciling of the world, their fullness will be much more so, and the receiving of them be life from the dead (vs. 12, 15). He further argues, that if the Gentiles "were grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree?" (5:24). Nor did he consider this event as merely probable, but as absolutely certain; for he shows that the present blindness and future conversion of that people is the mystery or hidden sense of prophecies concerning them; and he cites two of these prophecies where the context foretells both their rejection and recovery (Isaiah 59:20, 21; 27:9)

5. The purity of visible church communion, worship and discipline, will then be restored according to the primitive apostolic pattern. During the reign of Antichrist a corrupted form of Christianity was

drawn over the nations, and established in the political constitutions of the kingdoms which were subject to that monstrous power. By this means the children of God were either mixed in visible religious communion with the profane world, in direct opposition to the Word of God, or persecuted for their nonconformity. In reference to this state of things, the angel commands St. John to leave out the court which is without the temple, and not to measure it, for this reason, because "it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months" (Rev. 11:2); that is, they shall pollute and pro. fane the worship and communion of the Church during the one thousand two hundred and sixty years of Antichrist's reign, so that it cannot be measured by the rule of God's Word. But when the period we are speaking of shall arrive, the sanctuary shall be cleansed (Daniel 8:14); the visible communion, worship, order and discipline of the house of God will then be restored to their primitive purity, and accord with the rule of the New Testament

6. The Lord's special presence and residence will then be in the midst of His people. . . . He also calls them to purity of communion and personal holiness, and promises to dwell in them anel walk in them (2 Cor. 6:16, 17); but this will be fulfilled in an eminent and remarkable manner during the millennial period. The Lord, having promised to raise Israel out of their graves, to gather them from among the heathen, and bring them into the Church and kingdom o Christ, as one fold having one shepherd. adds, "And will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore; my tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Ezek. 37:11-27). . . . It is intimated that there will be such visible tokens of the divine presence and residence among them as will fall under the notice of the world, and produce conviction and awe, as was in some measure the case in the first churches (Acts. 2:47; 5:1 I, I 3; I Cor. 24:25). . . . Indeed this is represented by St. John as accomplished: "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God" (Rev. 21:3)

7. This will be a time of universal peace, tranquillity and safety. Persons naturally of the most savage, ferocious and cruel disposition will then be tame and harmless; so it is promised in Isaiah 11:6-I 0. Whether we consider the persons represented by these hurtful animals to be converted or not, it is certain they will then be effectually restrained from doing harm, or persecuting the saints. There shall be no war or bloodshed among the nations during this happy period; for we are told, that in the last days, when the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it; the Lord "shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more' (Isaiah 2:4). Though war has hitherto deluged the world with human blood, and been a source of complicated calamities to mankind, yet, when Satan is bound, his influence upon wicked men restrained, and the saints bear rule, it must necessarily cease

8. The civil rulers and judges shall then be all maintainers of peace and righteousness. Though Christ will put down all that rule, power and authority which opposes the peace and prosperity of His kingdom; yet as rulers are the ordinance of God, and His ministers for good; some form of government seems absolutely necessary to the order and happiness of society in this world; it is thought that when the kingdoms of this world are become our Lord's and his Christ's, the promise will be accomplished, "I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness"; and in consequence of this, "violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within

thy borders (Isaiah 60:17, 18)

9. The saints shall then have the dominion, and the wicked shall be in subjection. This is clear from the united voice of prophecy: "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High" (Daniel 7:27, 28; Matt. 5:5; Rev. 5:10; 20:4). With regard to the nature of this reign, it will undoubtedly correspond in all respects with the spiritual and heavenly nature of Christ's kingdom, to the promotion of which all their power will be subservient.] THE MILLENNIUM AS A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD In reviewing the historical development of the various millennial theories, we have had a twofold purpose: (1) to furnish factual information pertaining to this important subject; and (2) to enable the student through the perspective of history, to attempt an evaluation of the several theories. The amount and variety of the material submitted may seem confusing, but it must be borne in mind that the literature on this subject is enormous. However this confusion will prove to be a blessing to the reader if it serves to guard him against the short and easy methods proposed by those who in overconfidence and self-assertiveness declare to the well-read and informed that they have not as yet seen the problems, much less solved them. In our own thinking, we have come to view the millennium as a transitional period between the present temporal order, and the eternal order that shall be. We view this transition, as we shall later show, after the analogy of the First Advent and the earthly life of Christ. During this time the older dispensation was brought to a close and the new inaugurated - the one in some measure overlapping the other. We are indebted, first of all, to Dr. Gerhart for the seed thought of this position, which he has set forth in such an able manner in his Institutes qf the Christian Religion. Then again, we acknowledge our indebtedness to Dr. J. A. Dorner and Bishop Martensen for the cosmological viewpoint which has shown us the necessity of a perfect fulfillment of the purposes of God - not only for the individual but for the social structure and its physical environment as well. If man is first redeemed from sin, and possesses this treasure in earthen vessels which later through death and the resurrection are to become immortal, incorruptible and glorious, why may not this earth out of which man's body was formed, likewise pass through a state of dissolution and emerge as the new heavens and the new earth? Lastly, we are indebted to the Dutch theologian, Dr. Van Oosterzee, himself a pronounced premillennialist, for a scholarly confirmation of this transitional theory of the millennium. He says, "Altogether there lies over this part of the expectation of the future a transparent cloud, which makes it impossible here to define more particularly; the millennium is a period of transition. The longest night is over, but still the full day has not yet come. Instinctively we think of the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension of Christ; His Church also has now its Calvary behind it, and its Olivet immediately before it, without having yet ascended this latter. Its enemies are driven back, but not yet destroyed. It is evident that the kingdom of darkness cannot rest 'until it has made trial of a gigantic concentration of its remaining forces: to this the prophetic word points; but the unintelligent mode of interpretation which would read, as it were 'between the lines' the names of the nations here intended, is not and cannot be ours" (Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 800)

[On the Lord's return an earthly glorification is also to be expected by His faithful Church, a glorification which js the worthy manifestation of its inner development. Without yet heing wholly overcome, the antichristian power is hound for a certain time; until a last struggle leads to its complete overthrow, and therewith to the utter annihilation of every hostile power. finally also of

the last enemy. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics, II, 798 A pregnant eschatological element lies in the Christian faith, as such. Faith has experienced so much of Christ's effectual working, that in the presence of what is still lacking, however much this may be, it possesses not merely the hope, hut the certainty, that the divine idea of the world will not remain simply a faith, but an impotent picture of the imagination - Dorner. System of Christian Doctrine, IV, p. 377

History must at some time reach its iK~,,', its culminating point. There must he some climax which the human race and the Church may attain to, even within this present state and these earthly conditions, a period which shall present the highest blossoming and flowering of history. Christianity must necessarily and essentially he not only a suffering and struggling power in the world, but a world-conquering, a world-ruling power likewise. It is this idea of the universal triumph of Christianity, as far as this can he realized within the hounds of time and sense, which finds its expression in the millennial reign. - Martensen, Chr. Dogm., p. 470

It is the peculiarity of the New Testament forecast that it strongly tends to mount above the earthly horizon into the sphere of glorified existence. As was noticed in the consideration of the suhject of immortality, the national and preliminary character of the Jewish religion naturally dictated that it should deal somewhat scantily with the supramundane unfoldment of the divine kingdom. Both the Old Testament and the New are intensely prophetical; both show the impress of a divinely enkindled optimism; the great difference is that in the latter the light is upon a loftier horizon, illuminating a scene which is distinctly characterized as belonging to the region of incorruptibility and immortality. - Sheldon, System of Christian Doctrine, pp. 540, 541 The Second Coming of our Lord is the one all-commanding event of prophecy and the future: itself supreme, it is always associated with the universal resurrection, the judgment of mankind, and the consummation of all things. Through these epochs and crises are in the style of prophecy presented together in foreshortened perspective, they are widely distinct. But while we treat them as distinct, we must he careful to remember their common relation to the day of the Lord; which is a fixed and determined period, foreshadowed in many lesser periods to which the same term is applied, but the issue and consummation of them all. - Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 387.] The Analogy of the First and Second Advents. The First Advent marked the transition from the Old Testament to the New - a period of brief duration in which the former dispensation reached its culmination, and the latter had its beginnings. Our Lord declared that the law and the prophets were until John, after which the kingdom of heaven is preached. But the new dispensation which had its inception in the incarnation, was fully inaugurated only with the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. And further, as the ministry of Jesus was preceded by the preparatory work of John, so also after Pentecost, there was a gradual decay of the Mosaic order until the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), which marked its close. At that time, "the church was released from the swaddling clothes of Judaism" and the gospel became the heritage of all nations and all peoples. As the First Advent marked the beginning of an intermediate transitional period, which was preceded by a prophetic preparation and followed by a time of judgment, so we may expect the Second Advent to be. Thus Dr. Gerhart points out, that "like the age of the First Advent, may be the age of the Second Advent - an indefinite, intermediate period between the present aeon and the transcendent aeon. Of the peculiar nature of each of these opposite aeons, the intermediate age may in a measure partake" (GERHART, Institutes, III, p. 814). It is due to the twofold aspect of this transitional period, that much confusion arises. This intermediate period is commonly known as the millennium. Being a

transitional period it looks both ways, and conjoins in itself, two widely different orders. It marks the transition from the natural to the spiritual, from the temporal to the eternal, from the immanent to the transcendent, and from grace to glory. There are those who view the millennium solely from the temporal order, and therefore regard it as merely an extension of the church age; while others, viewing it from the eternal order, sometimes confuse it with the new heavens and the new earth

Characteristics of the Second Advent. The analogy between the First and Second Advents demands further consideration. Three things stand out clearly in the life of Christ. (1) He came into the natural race of men, that He might be the last Adam of the old order, and the New Man of the eternal order. (2) He was born under the Abrahamic covenant of promise, and became the Seed to whom the promises were made. (3) He was born in the bosom of Mosaic economy, by means of which no flesh could be justified. He was therefore manifested to take away our sins. Each of these distinctions, as Gerhart has so ably pointed out, must also bear a relation to the Second Advent. Consequently we must consider the Second Advent as a movement "new in kind, new in relations, new as to its purposes" (Gerhart, Institutes, II, pp. 806ff)

[If the Lord is indeed highly exalted, it can but be the case that this glory should eventually be manifested before the eyes of all; and it is exceedingly worthy of God that the same earth which witnessed His deep humiliation, should also become the scene of His manifested glory. If He still continues to maintain a personal and truly spiritual relation to the Church and the world, wherefore should not here also "embodiment in outward form" be "the end of the ways of God"' . . . If He personally lives and reigns unto eternity, then the King cannot permanently remain unvisible, in the case where the kingdom is everywhere established; and just as little, from the nature of the case, can this appearing he anything else than a final judgment. The expecta. tion of so great a catastroph - whatever enigmas and questions it may leave unanswered - is, for man’s reason itself, much more satisfactory than that of an everlasting continuance of the present economy, a sort of "progressio in infinitum" or indeed a long-continued dying out of creation. - Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics. II. p. 580.]

1. The Second Advent will be a movement new in kind. The First Advent was a coming into the race by means of the Virgin birth; the second will be His coming in kingly glory (Matt. 25:31). In the First Advent, He came as a ministering servant; in the Second, He will sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations (Matt. 25:32). Let it be recalled that there were two great mysteries in Christ, "the union of human nature with the divine, and the unmeasured fullness of the Spirit which dwelt in that holy nature the one administered through the other" (I, p. 330). Hence our Lord speaks of His coming as that of the Son of man; that is, He comes in His perfected and glorified humanity. He came indeed, in a spiritual sense, at Pentecost, manifesting Himself through the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Trinity; but He comes the second time, in His own mode of existence as the Second Person of the Trinity manifested through His glorified humanity. His Second Coming will institute a movement also, new in kind as to the redemption of man’s environment, or the physical universe. By this we mean, not only an ethical and spiritual movement, but a metaphysical restoration of organic nature in the structure of the universe. "The expectation of the future transformation of the earth into a heavenly establishment," says Lange, "of the conjunction of the spiritual kingdom in the other world with that in this, is to man a mere fancy, but to every earnest Christian is a great hope, an assurance of faith, a certain prediction" (Breman Lectures, p. 251)

[The New Testament does not countenance a theory which assumes merely a quiet, steadily growing interpenetration or subjugation of the whole world by Christianity in the course of history. This is the optimistic view, which is unprepared for eclipses of the sun in the firmament of the Church. The New Testament foretells catastrophes to the life of the Church, so that in this respect, also, it is a copy of the life of Christ and indeed catastrophes arise not merely through persecutions on the part of heathen and Jews in its beginning, but also out of itself, that is, from its outward circle, on the ground of intimations of Christ (Matt. 7:21; 24:11, 12, 24; Mark 13:6, 22); according to John and Paul (I John 2:18, where antichrists are spoken of in the plural; 2 Thess. 2:3ff), when the Christianizing of the nations has advanced, false prophets and pseudo-Messiahs will arise, desiring to enter into confederacy with Satan and to some extent with the worldpower against Christians, and to seduce to the denial of Christ. - Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, IV, pp. 387, 388.]

2. The Second Advent will be a movement new in its relations. The First Advent was an entrance into the Abrahamic covenant of promise, conditioned upon obedience unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. 2:8). Our Lord came to a world lying in the Wicked One (1 John 5:19), and brought to man in His own Person, the gift of eternal life. In His humiliation, he was despised and rejected of men (Isa. 53:3); He came unto his own and his own received him not (John 1:11). But His Second Coming will be governed by the law of exaltation and not that of humiliation. He will come to a world where the law of sin has already been broken, and where Satan has been personally defeated in immediate conflict. His Second Advent, therefore, will not be marked by a rejection, but by His people rising with joy to meet Him in the air, and with an innumerable company of angels forming the convoy of their glorious Bridegroom in His return to earth. The unbelieving world shall quail before Him, and the wicked shall cry for the rocks and the mountains to fall upon them, and hide them from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb (Rev. 6:14-17). At His Second Advent He will appear, not to be despised, but to be honored; not to suffer, but to judge; not to overcome death by His resurrection from the dead, but to abolish death (1 Cor. 15:26); not to introduce the principle of eternal life in the midst of the dying world, but to emancipate the members of the new race from all the limitations of the current' age; not to initiate a victorious conflict with the kingdom of darkness, but to put an end to the existing disorganization, transforming the cosmos into the new heavens and the new earth; not to found the Church and proclaim salvation, but to actualize the idea and fulfill the teleological law of the Church in the postmundane perfection of His kingdom" (Gerhart, Institutes, II, p. 810)

3. The Second Advent will be a movement new in its purposes. Christ not only came as the Seed to whom the Abrahamic promise should be given, but as a Deliverer from the bondage of the Mosaic law, as to both its guilt and its penalty. The purpose of the First Advent was the deliverance from the guilt, the power, and the being of sin; the purpose of the Second Advent is the removal of the consequences of sin. The first was wrought by means of a priestly sacrifice for sin, Himself the Priest and the Offering; the second will be accomplished through the "all power" given to Him as our glorious King. He will not only be present with His Church in the Spirit of communion, but as the Logos in nature, He will also transform the mystical body of His Church, and in its own order, the subhuman kingdoms as well. Nature will be fully restored and become the willing instrument of our Lord and His people. Dr. Dorner was right when he said that "redeemed humanity has another goal than that of common zoology, and that goal is the kingdom of the

resurrection. Complete victor Christianity can never be, until nature has become an organ of its service, a willing instrument of the perfect man, that is, of the righteous who are raised from the dead" (DORNER, Person of Christ, I, p.412). Likewise, Dr. Ellicott writes that "Man and the creature, bound together in one common feeling of longing and expectancy, are awaiting that redemption of the body which shall be the immediate precursor of the restitution of the world, and the consummation of all things in Christ" (ELLICOTT, Destiny of the Earth, p.18) The Day of the Lord. As indicated in our discussion of the days of creation (I, p. 455ff), the older Hebrew exegesis never regarded the days of Genesis as solar days, but as day periods of indefinite duration. The word "day" is frequently used in this sense in the New Testament also. Thus our Lord says, Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day (John 8:56) and again, Fo? as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day (Luke 17:24). St. Peter speaks of the day of the Lord (2 Peter 3:10, 12, 13); and St. Paul mentions both the day of the Lord (1 Thess. 5:2, 4, 5), and the day of Christ (2 Thess. 2:1, 2). This day of the Lord is generally, if not always, associated with the idea of judgment, as the following Old Testament references will show (Isa. 2:12, 13; 13:6 - 13; Joel 1:15; Zeph. 1:14; Malachi 4:5). We may confidently believe, then, that the day of the Lord is a period of time, marked by opening, intervening and closing events. "Though these epochs are crises, are in the style of prophecy presented together in foreshortened perspective, they are widely distinct. But while we treat them as distinct, we must be careful to remember their common relation to the day of the Lord; which is a fixed and determined period, foreshadowed in many lesser periods to which the same term is applied, but the issue and consummation of them all. What the Old Testament prediction beheld as one undistinguished whole is now divided into times and seasons, which all, however, converge into one decisive and fixed event, the return of Jesus from the invisible world. There is a rich and steady light thrown upon the Christian day of Jehovah, which is variously described in relation to the final manifestation of the person of Christ, and the final consummation of His work (POPE, Compend, Chr. Th., III, p.387). St. Paul views this day in relation to its opening event, the coming of Christ; while St. Peter regards it as the closing event in Christ’s ultimate and triumphant accomplishment. It is, therefore, a transitional period in which a time or season kairos (kairos), is preceded by other times and seasons, kronoi (cronoi) For this reason it is often difficult to distinguish the preparatory events from those of the final consummation to which they lead

[Throughout the ancient economy a future period called the day of Jehovah appears as the one perspective of all prophecy. In the new Testament this day is declared to have come; all the purposes of the divine mercy and judgment are regarded as accomplished in the Advent of Christ. which is the last time or the end of the world. - Pope. Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 387.]

[Dean Farrar observes that "the main difficulties in our Lord’s prophecy vanish when we bear in mind that prophecy is like a landscape in which time and space are subordinated to eternal realities, and in which events look like hills seen, chain behind chain, which to the distant spectator appear as one." To this J. F. Silver adds that "looking at two heavenly bodies in conjunction, one partially eclipses the other and both present the aspect of a single star. We see the feet of Christ on the Mount of Olivet in the foreground and far beyond we discern the rising mountains that border on the vast eternity. The Millennium lies between." - Silver, The Lord’s Return, p. 236.] In this prophetical day of the Lord, events appear as a confused whole. Prophecy, it has been said, "has no perspective." The seers looked forward to the great goals of the future, without clearly

distinguishing the intervening events. The classical example of this is Christ's reading of the scripture in the synagogue at Nazareth. Having read of His anointing to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, He closed the book, thus indicating that the remaining portion of the sentence, the day of vengeance of our God (Isa. 61:1, 2; Luke 4:19, 20), was not then to be fulfilled. We may note also, that the point of view determines the events which are emphasized by the several writers of the Scriptures. Thus the Apostle Paul comforts the saints with the thought of Christ's personal return; while St. Peter, looking forward to our Lord's ultimate triumph, sees in this day of the Lord, the consummation of all things

If now we analyze the debatable or controversial points connected with Christ's return, we shall find that each is a transitional event. (1) There is the appearance of Christ with its confusion of rapture and revelation; (2) there is a first resurrection, and the resurrection of "the rest of the dead"; (3) there is a judgment set immediately following our Lord's return, wherein the twelve apostles are seated on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; and yet another "great white throne judgment" when the heavens and the earth shall have fled away; (4) there is a gathering of the righteous, and a destruction of the wicked, and yet the nations later appear in a great apostasy; (5) there is a setting up of the kingdom, and yet again, a yielding up of the kingdom; (6) there is a time of restitution of all things, when creation itself shall be delivered from its bondage; and a final dissolution of the earth, out of which shall emerge the new heavens and the new earth; and (7) there is a passing away of the old and sinful order, and the inauguration of a new and eternal Sabbath of rest, when God shall be all in all THE ORDER OF EVENTS IN THE LORD'S DAY At the outset, I may say that I have had considerable hesitancy in discussing this phase of my subject. However, I have not felt free to pass it by without some more or less general statements concerning it. A subject that has caused such a variety of opinion should be approached cautiously, and this we have sought to do. On subjects which are not clearly revealed, one should speak with becoming modesty. Those who speak with such a degree of positiveness as to exclude the sincere thought of Bible students who hold different positions, are neither wise nor reverent. My design, therefore, is to present the material of this division, suggestively, rather than dogmatically, and we trust that the statements here made will serve to provoke further study and research. We may emphasize again, that we regard this whole period as of a transitional nature, one in which the temporal order merges into the eternal, and therefore as a period, partaking in a measure of both orders of existence. According to the law of prophetical reserve, there is enough given us in the Scriptures to furnish the Church with a glorious hope; but the events can never be untangled until prophecy passes into history, and we view them as standing out clearly in their historical relations The Rapture and the Revelation. The Second Coming of Christ is the opening event of the Lord's day. It will be attended by the resurrection of the righteous dead and the translation of the righteous living, both companies of the saints being caught up in the clouds meet the Lord in the air. Here a distinction is made between the Rapture and the Revelation. The Rapture is the catching away of the Lord's people to the meeting in the air; the Revelation is His return to earth accompanied by the convoy of saints and angels. The word "rapture" comes from the Greek verb arpadw which signifies to seize, to take by force, to snatch away, or to rescue. The word "meeting" is from apantaw and carries with it the idea of a going forth in order to return with. It is so used in Acts 28:15. The words used to express the idea of the Revelation have already been discussed, that is, apocalypse apokaluyi" or an unveiling; parousia (parousia or an appearing); and epiphaneia (ejpifavneia or becoming visible). As to the relation of

the Rapture and the Revelation there are widely different opinions. Some identify them, maintaining that when He comes every eye shall behold him, the saints rising with joy to meet Him, and the nations of the earth wailing because of Him (Rev. 1:7). Others separate between the Rapture and the Revelation, maintaining that the former is secret and known only to the saints; the latter alone being visible to the world. As to the time intervening between the two, most writers hold that it will be a period of three and one-half years. During this time the saints attend the marriage supper of the Lamb in the heavenlies, while the earth passes through a period of ’unparalleled tribulation at which time Antichrist assumes full authority. Here we must assert that the general fact of the Rapture and the Revelation is clearly scriptural; the details just mentioned must be a matter of individual opinion

[Post-millennialists identify the judgment mentioned in Matthew 25:3 1-46 with the general judgment at the last day. Premillennialists are divided in their opinion. (I) Writers like Dr. J. A. Seiss look upon this judgment scene as applying only to the nations living when Christ returns, and not caught up to Him in the rapture. Consequently this judgment becomes merely "a shepherdizing of the nations with a rod of iron," only the obdurate and rebellious being destroyed. This destruction, however, is regarded merely as a violent death, such as overtook the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, the dead being raised later for final judgment. as in the case of all who were deceased previous to the coming of the Lord. However, a careful study of this judgment scene mentioned by our Lord, reveals the fact that while it concerns the living nations, it is, after all, a judgment of the individuals. (2) Other premillennial writers, such as Dr. W. B. Riley, regard this statement or account as applying to the final judgment after the millennium. He states that many premillennialists have been led into a misinterpretation here, simply because God does ’not on every age of Scripture, put forth the full program of the ages. As in the case of our Lord, who broke into two parts the prophecy of Isaiah which He read at Nazareth, so here, the juxtaposition of sentences does not involve a closeness of events. The order of judgment is against the "children of the millennium" or the living rebels first; and later, against the unbelieving dead, raised to receive their sentence (Cf. Riley, The Evolution of the Kingdom, pp. 174, 176).] The Investigative Judgment. Immediately following the return of Christ, the investigative judgment will be set. For this we have the clear statement of our Lord Himself. 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: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left (Matt. 25:31-34). And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28). That this is in the investigative judgment of the living nations at the time of the Second Advent is further evidenced by our Lord’s parable of the sower, previously cited. 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 cast 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. 13:41-43) The Destruction of the Wicked. Closely associated with the investigative judgment is the destruction of the wicked. In addition to the scriptures previously cited, St. Paul gives us the following statement: 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: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (2 Thess. 1:7-10) The Fall of Antichrist and the Binding of Satan. Included in the destruction of the wicked, at the time of the Second Advent, is the Antichrist, whom St. Paul calls that "Wicked" or the "Wicked One." And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders (2 Thess. 2:8, 9). We may be permitted to refer at this time to the binding of Satan, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season (Rev. 20:1, 3) The Establishment of the Kingdom. The Church Militant, in its full New Testament sense, began with the Day of Pentecost, and will become triumphant with the rapture of the saints at the coming of the Lord. The Church will then in some sense be merged into the kingdom. In a mystical sense, the kingdom of God is within you (Luke 17:21). St. Paul defines it as not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14:17). But Jesus looked forward also to a kingdom in the future when He said, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom (Matt. 26:29). He said also, I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22:29, 30). We may say, therefore, that we are now in the kingdom of God the Holy Spirit, or the mystical reign of Christ in the hearts of His people. The kingdom of God the Son will succeed this, when the inner mystical kingdom shall find expression in outward glory. Then follows the kingdom of God the Father, when the Son himself becomes subject to Him, that is, the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, may be all in all. From the Parable of the Pounds, it seems evident that some in the days of Jesus looked for the kingdom to immediately appear, and this erroneous view He sought to correct. A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return (Luke 19:12). Jesus, having overcome the world, is now seated on His Father’s throne, awaiting the time when He shall return to be seated upon the throne of His glory (Matt. 25:31). He left a promise also, that To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne (Cf. Matt. 25:31; Rev. 3:21). Thus the Church as the Bride of Christ, anxiously awaits the return of the Nobleman, and daily prays, Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven (Matt. 6:10). It is this kingdom of which the prophets spoke, which John and Jesus heralded, and which the apostles affirmed with confidence

[Concerning the use of the word "kingdom" in the Scriptures, Mr. West says, "In its fullness, it is past, it is present, it is to come; it is inward and spiritual existing now, it is outward and visible yet to exist; it is heavenly; it is a kingdom of grace; it is a kingdom of glory; it is earthly; it is temporal; it is everlasting. In its forms it is many, in its essence it is one. It has various dispensations. It is above, it is below, and its highest consummation is the realization of the will of God on earth as it is now realized in heaven; a consummation begun below, developed in the age to come, and completed in the eternal state." - West, John Wesley and Premillennialism, p. 46

Trench says of this kingdom, that it is "not the unfolding of any powers which already existed in the world - a kingdom not rising. as those other kingdoms, ’out of the earth,’ but a new power brought into the world from above." - Trench, On the Parables, p. 160.]

[In the Parable of the Pounds, it is interesting to note that when the nobleman having received the kingdom returns. it is to call his servants to judgment (Luke 12:19-27)

Dr. William B. Riley, in his hook entitled, "The Evolution of the Kingdom," takes the position that this future millennial kingdom is not made up of mortal men, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of Cod." At the first resurrection when Christ shall come, "corruptible must put on incorruption" and the life of these risen saints will not be dependent upon the heart-beat of flesh and blood. hut rather like that in which their Lord lived again after His resurrection - a body of "flesh and bones" animated by the eternal spirit, "a spiritual body." He interprets the words in Luke "equal to the angels" to mean "angel-like." This does not mean bodiless, for every angel that has appeared on earth, has appeared in bodily form. They have sat at human tables. and have taken human food; they have exercised gracious missions for men in human forms. The great difference has been that they were not mortal,' that their natural home was in a higher sphere. Yet he believes in the "ongoing of the nations" and looks for the restoration of Israel during the millennium. He further states, that "There is no indication either that converts made from the Jewish people and the nations during the millennium. under the personal reign of Christ, will be mortal men, and asserts that the scripture, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint," refers to the children of the kingdom in the millennial age. He bases this upon the words of Christ. "he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live," as referring to all the deceased; and "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" as referring to all those who are alive when Christ comes, and all who believe during Christ's millennial reign. These shall escape the grave and be changed in the twinkling of an eye from the mortal to the immortal (Cf. Riley, The Evolution of the Kingdom, pp. 128-133).]

[Bishop Martensen in referring to the millennium says, "But besides this purely spiritual view, and the literal, the carnal method of interpretation, we must notice a third form of belief which recognizes the historical points here enumerated; hut at the same time maintains that as the millennial reign is an actual prophecy of the glory of perfection, nature also will exhibit prophetic indications, anticipating its future glorification; and though Christ will not he raised up in a literal and sensitive manner to His kingly dominion, yet His presence will not he merely spiritual; visible manifestations of Christ will, during this period, he granted to the faithful, like those to the disciples after the resurrection. According to this view, the thousand years' reign would correspond with the interval of forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. an interval which implies the transition from earthly existence to heavenly glory. - Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 471

Jesus is the lawful successor, as the Son of man, to Adam's dominion; as the seed of Abraham, He is the lawful heir to the throne of David, and as the Son of God, the Father has been pleased to put in subjection to Him, "the world to come, whereof we speak" oikonhn the habitable or inhabited earth; thn mellousan that about coming; peri hs laloumen concerning which we speak (Heb. 2:5). From the numerous passages of scripture referring to this event we select the following only: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, hut it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" (Dan. 2:44). "1 saw in the night visions, and, behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days. and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a

kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not he destroyed" (Dan. 7:13, 14). "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall he given to the people of the Saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him" (Dan. 7:27). "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom" (Isa. 9:7). "The Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously" (Isa. 24:23). "And his dominion shall he from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth" (Zech. 9:10), "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one' (Zech. 14:9). The prophecies of the kingdom found in the Old Testament are reaffirmed in the New, as the following instances will show: "He shall he great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32, 33). "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30). "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:1 5) The character of the citizenship of this kingdom proves a perplexing problem to those types of premillennialism which maintain that the Church is incomplete at the time of the millennium. Postmillennialism which regards the millennium as merely the flowering period of the present age avoids this problem. Jesus specifically states that they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection (Luke 20:35, 36). St. Paul makes a similar statement that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption (1 Cor. 15:50). Hence he says, As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; and again, this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality (1 Cor. 15:49, 53). These are the plain statements of Scripture concerning the nature of the children of the resurrection or the kingdom, and any theory which does not take these facts into consideration cannot be regarded as scriptural The Regeneration of the Earth. It is a significant fact that our Lord connects the regeneration with His coming kingdom. Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28). This statement is very suggestive when we consider that regeneration in the sense of the "new birth from above" stands for the direct spiritual results which come from the grace of God considered personally; and that here it refers to the divine redemption of the earth, which when our Lord appears, shall certainly be delivered from the bondage of corruption. St. Peter speaks of this event as "the times of refreshing" or "restitution of all things," and connects it immediately with the Second Coming of Christ. Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord: and he 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 3:19-21). We have before referred to St. Paul's clear teachings on this subject, and need now to call attention to only one statement, The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of

corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8:21) From the above scriptures it appears that the earth must undergo certain changes at the Second Coming of Christ. In the consideration of this subject, however, we must take into account, a distinction of great importance, that is, we must distinguish between those changes which take place when the curse is removed and the earth restored to its pristine state; and those which are connected with the final consummation of all things, in which the present order shall through dissolution and a process of glorification, be changed into the new and eternal order. The "regeneration" or the "restitution," therefore, pertains to the removal of the curse from the present earth; the consummation, to the emergence of the new heavens and the new earth. The former constitutes the transition to the latter, and it is this period in its preparations and its eternal state to which the prophets have looked forward, since the world began

[Postmillennialists usually regard these expressions as purely figurative. Thus Dr. Raymond says, "The lying down together of the lion and the lamb, of the leopard and the kid, can have no application to the heavenly state, and in the earthly must he figurative, or those animals must undergo a change of nature both as to species and genera. - Raymond, Systematic Theology, II, p. 480.] The nature of the changes which take place in this time of restoration cannot be certainly known, but the prophets give us some foregleams of the miraculous transformations which will occur. Isaiah the prophet is peculiarly rich in his poetical descriptions of "that day." We can cite but a few of the more familiar of his prophecies: (1) There will be an increase in the fertility of the earth. To fallen Adam it was said, Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee (Gen. 3:17, 18); but the prophet sees a day, when, Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off (Isa. 55:13). There are now large portions of the earth which are uninhabitable, but in that day will become the abode of beauty and glory. The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. . . . . For in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes (Isa. 35:1, 2, 6, 7). I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together: that they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it (Isa. 41:19, 20). Amos the prophet sees an enrichment of the soil and increased harvest. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt (Amos 9:13). (2) It appears that there will be a miraculous restoration of the wild animals to their normal instincts. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the falling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaning child shall put his hand on the cockatrice’ den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea (Isa. 11:6-9).

"Each animal is coupled with that one which is its natural prey - a fit state of things under the Prince of Peace. There is to be a restoration to man in the person of Christ of the lost dominion over the animal kingdom, of which he had been designed to be the merciful vicegerent under God for the good of his animal subjects." (3) There will be an increased longevity of life. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them (Isa. 65:20-23). (4) It seems probable that there may be changes in the astronomical heavens in their relation to the earth. Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound (Isa. 30:26). The scriptures which we have just cited are fraught with intense spiritual significance, and have been the source of joy and strength to multitudes of God’s holy people. While this is true, it does not necessarily forbid a conviction of their literal fulfillment also; nor does it detract from their spiritual meaning, but rather increases it The Final Consummation. The Consummatio seculi, or destruction of the world, marks the close of the transitional period, and ushers in the new heavens and the new earth of the eternal order. It is the closing event of the "day of the Lord." As in the beginning of this period, there is the rapture with its resurrection of the righteous dead and the translation of the living saints, followed by the investigative judgment of the living nations; so also the day closes with an apostasy following the thousand years’ reign, the resurrection of the wicked dead, the destruction of the heavens and the earth by fire, and the final judgment with its rewards and punishments. Beyond earth’s fiery baptism is the new and eternal day, a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. However, we are concerned here only with the consummatio seculi - the discussion of the resurrection and the final judgment being reserved for the last chapter. As to the process of this renewal of the earth we are not left to guess. We have only to read, But the heavens and the 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 (2 Peter 3:7). Dr. Eliott in his Horae Apocalypticae, states that these words literally translated should stand as follows: "The same heavens and earth which are now by the same word stored with fire, being reserved unto the judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Commenting upon this Dr. Cumming says, "Just as the earth of old was stored with the waters, whose fountains broken up overflowed the earth, so by the same word the earth, now stored, treasured up, or charged with fire, is ready when the repressive force is withdrawn, to burst forth, to burn up all things, and to cause the elements to melt with fervent heat" (Comming, The Great Preparation, p. 36) . This appears to be the meaning of St. Peter’s further statement that 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; and again, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved and the elements shall melt with fervent heat (2 Peter 3:10, 12). The question is sometimes asked, "Are these words to be taken in their strictly literal sense? If the flood, to which this catastrophe is compared, was a literal and historic fact, then we must regard this cataclysmic event as a literal occurrence also. It is evident, however, that St.

Peter does not intend to teach the annihilation of the world by its fiery baptism, as he does not teach its destruction by a watery baptism. Concerning the flood and its effects he uses the strongest possible expression, saying, The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished (2 Peter 3:6). So also, concerning the coming cataclysmic event he says, all these things shall be dissolved; and again, the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved (2 Peter 3:11, 12). The word dissolved as used here is in the first instance loumenwn, and in the second lhqhsontai both being from the root verb luw which means to unloose, or to loose, to unfasten, to unbind, but never to annihilate. It is used in Luke 19:30, 33 concerning the untying of the colt; in John 1:27 concerning the loosing of a shoe latched; and it is applied to the ship in which St. Paul was wrecked. It is said that the ship was dissolved elueto in the sense of being broken up or destroyed (Acts 27:41). The dissolving of the earth, therefore, is not its annihilation, but the breaking of its bonds, the loosing of it to become what it was originally intended to be - its deliverance from the bondage of corruption. We regard this loosing as an exact parallel of the transformation of the earthly elements in the human body. In the same manner as a man's body is dissolved by death and becomes the subject of decay, out of which it shall be raised immortal, incorruptible, in power and glory; so this earth as man's habitation shall likewise be dissolved, but out of it shall appear in a comparable resurrection, the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Peter 3:13). Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all (1 Cor. 15:24-28)

[Referring to the words of St. Peter, that this world is to be burned up, Bishop Merrill says, "The burning up of this world, if it be literally understood, cannot take place until the close of time, and, if we find it connected with the judgment as one of the Incidents of the day of the Lord, it will follow that the judgment is subsequent to the gospel day. The Scriptures teach that when the gospel dispensation closes, and the Lord descends from heaven and calls the dead from their graves, the visible earth and heaven will be destroyed by fire, and afterward be renewed in righteousness. We accept this statement as pointinmg to a literal fact, and propose to test it In the light of the criticisms and objections offered by the opposers of a literal advent and future judgment." - Merrill, The Second Coming of Christ, pp. 262ff

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comment on 2 Peter 3, writes as follows: "All these things will be dissolved, separated, be decomposed,' but none of them will be destroyed. And as they are the original matter out of which God formed the terraqueous globe, consequently they may enter again into the composition of a new system. and therefore the apostle says, 'We look for a new heaven and a new earth' the others being decomposed, a new system is to be formed out of their materials." Again he says, "The present earth, though destined to burn up, will not be destroyed. but renewed, and refined, and purged from all moral and material imperfections and made the endless abode of happy spirits. But this state is certainly to be expected after the day of judgment."]

34. Chapter 35 - THE RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT

Chapter 35 - THE RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT The resurrection which follows as an immediate effect of the Second Advent must be considered as at once a distinctive and an elementary truth of the Christian system. The doctrine of the resurrection, however, must be clearly distinguished from that of the immortality of the soul. It is possible to believe in the continuous existence of the soui after death without believing in the resurrection of the body. Frequently the two are identified, and belief in one made to stand or fall with the other. This was the case of the Sadducees who identified the two and denied both. Thus our Lord in reasoning with them 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? (Mark 12: 26). Here Christ meets the real objection without meeting it verbally. However, since He refers only to the continuance of the soul after death, some have inferred that He meant to teach only a spiritual resurrection, that is, that the soul does not die with the body but rises to a new and higher life. St. Paul in the elaborate argument found in his epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15: 12-58) seems to regard the denial of the resurrection as tantamount to a denial of immortality. Here again, this has been suggested as a basis for belief, that the only resurrection which the Bible teaches is the resurrection of the soul when the body dies. It becomes necessary, therefore, to first of all examine the Scriptures as to their teaching concerning the resurrection of the body The Scriptures Teach the Resurrection of the Body. The term resurrection signifies a rising again, that is, a rising of that which was buried. It signifies also a restoration to life of that which was dead. Now since the soul does not die with the body, it cannot therefore be the subject of a resurrection, except in an antithetical sense as opposed to spiritual death, which is not now the question. This definition sets at nought also, the doctrine of those who, like the Swedenborgians, hold that man in this life has two bodies—an external or material body, and an internal or psychical body. The former dies and remains in the grave, the other does not die, but in union with the soul enters in upon a future state of existence. It is to the Scriptures, however, that we must turn for any authoritative teaching upon the subject. We, therefore, call attention to (1) The Idea of the Resurrection as found in the Old Testament; and (2) The New Testament teaching concerning the Resurrection

1. The Old Testament makes a distinction between the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. We may believe on the authority of our Lord himself, that the resurrection was everywhere presupposed in the economy of the Old Testament. “As the children of God, so called in the Savior’s new terminology, are the children of the resurrection (Luke 20:36), so the ancient fathers were, and are, and will ever be His in their integrity: His now in their spirit, hereafter in spirit and body. The key thus put into our hands by the Master, His apostles have instructed us to use freely” (POPE,Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 402). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews states that Abraham offered up Isaac, accounting that God was able to raise him up . . . from whence also he received him in a figure (Heb. 11: 19); and again, that the patriarchs desired a better country, that is, an heavenly (Heb. 11:16). There are passages in the Psalms which rise to the hope of a

redemption from Hades, as God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me (Psalm 49: 15). Here the context shows that the object of this hope is the psychical soul animating a body as well as the spiritual soul delivered from imprisonment. While the prophecies found in Isaiah 25: 8 and Hosea 13: 14 refer to the state of the Church as a whole, that found in Isaiah 26: 19 can refer only to the resurrection of the individual, or the resumption by the soul of bodily existence. It is to the Church, however, that this wonderful prophecy is addressed. Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead (Isa. 26: 19). Here the dead are called “my” because they sleep in Him, their disembodied souls existing safely in His keeping. It may be admitted also, that the future restoration of the Church as vividly portrayed in Ezekiel’s well known vision of the “valley of dry bones,” could not have been presented under the symbolism of a dead body raised to life, had not the idea of the resurrection been familiar, both to the prophetic and the common mind (Cf. Ezekiel 37: 1-15). The fact that the prophets nowhere use language which would imply that the idea of the resurrection was new to the people, together with the fact that belief in this doctrine by the Pharisees must have been an inheritance and not the outgrowth of inspired teaching, furnishes a strong argument for the Old Testament belief in a bodily resurrection. The doctrine of the resurrection, however, is explicitly taught in the Book of Daniel. 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 (Daniel 12: 2). Here “the many” is the great company of the dead as contrasted with those who are alive at the time of the end; and “the dust of the earth” indicates that the reference is to the body. Doubtless it is to this that Jesus refers when He speaks of the resurrection of life and the resurrection of damnation (John 5: 29). Taken in connection with the verse which follows, Daniel gives us a long range vision of the resurrection, of both the just and the unjust, the general judgment and the eternity which follows. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever (Daniel 12:3)

2. The New Testament is permeated with the truth of the resurrection, but here it is presented on a far higher level. St. Paul speaks of the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2 Tim. 1: 10). We must understand, therefore, that only through the gospel does the Christian conception of the resurrection and the complete destruction of death find its highest expression. Here is to be found the proclamation which counteracts death in all its manifestations. The basic testimony of the New Testament is found in the words of our Lord himself. Referring evidently to the prediction of Daniel, He says, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live (John 5: 25). This refers, of course, to a spiritual resurrection, or the making alive of souls that are dead in trespasses and sins (Cf. Eph. 2: 1). Immediately following this in the same discourse, He says, Marvel not at this: for 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 5: 28, 29). The gospel announcement, therefore, includes the idea of a resurrection of the whole man, and of the whole race of men to an endless existence. Again, the resurrection is associated immediately with our Lord’s Person and work. He says, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die (John 11: 25, 26). The I am as here used must be taken in connection with John 5:

26, which indicates that there is in the Son a life and power deeper than the purely mediatorial function, For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. Hence it is God's appointment that man must pass through a resurrection in order to the future life, that is, he must know both the power of the spiritual resurrection for the soul, and then the resurrection of the body. For this reason, the resurrection of Christ is the first fruits, or pledge of the resurrection of His people

Further still, Christ's resurrection is the~ Pattern after which the bodies of the saints will be raised. This St. Paul indicates in the words, Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body (Phil. 3: 21). It is union with the risen Christ as the source of life for both soul and body, that is the secret ground and condition of the resurrection of believers. The resurrection of Christ, however, is never represented as standing in the same relation to the unbeliever. The bodies which unbelieving souls inhabit after the intermediate state will indeed be immortal, but in this respect only are they like those of the saints, Hence the resurrection of the just is unto everlasting life; that of the wicked unto shame and everlasting contempt. St. Paul in answering before Felix the accusation of the Jews, speaks of his hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust (Acts 24: 15). Other scriptures bearing immediately upon this subject are the following: But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you (Rom. 8: 11): For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him (1 Thess. 4: 14); and, I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God. . . . And the

Dr. Pope in commenting on Phil. 3:20, 21 says, "There are two words here of great importance: theet~upopçbovsuggests the same idea as "conformable unto his death'; the body is to be subject to the blessed law of our predestination to be "conformed to the image of his Son (Rom. 8:29). This word 'change' is not the same as in the Corinthian chapter: here it is,L€TaeXThLLaT&e~which refers only to the new fashion of the risen body; there it is aXXwy~eó~€Oa, 'we shall be changed,' which refers to the entire transformation of the already existing bodies. Now it is of this latter only that our Savior was the pattern. He 'saw no corruption'; and consequently could not be a perfect example at all points of our restoration from death, any more than He is the pattern at all points of our redemption from the final penalty of sin. There is an analogy here with His example of holiness: }le leads not the way in the process of attainment; but is the consummate exemplar only of what we are to attain. We shall live in glorified bodies like His; but in our redemption from the dust He has no part with us.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 405 sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works (Revelation 20:12-13) The Nature of the Resurrection Body. It is to divine revelation that we must turn for an understanding of this important subject. St. Paul in his Corinthian discourse tells us that It 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. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body (1 Corinthians 15:42-44). Two distinct questions are involved in this statement: (1) What is the principle of identity which links the future body to the present one? and (2) What is the nature of the perfected body in its resurrected state?

1. It is evident that identity is involved in the very nature of the resurrection itself. The church has always held that the bodies, whether of the righteous or the wicked, will be identical with the bodies which they occupy in this world. “It is sown a natural body,” says In former times it was commonly thought necessary to affirm a material identity between the future body and that of the present. But Paul, while he intimates that there is some bond of connection between the one and the other, is far from affirming a material identity (1 Corinthians 15:35-38). The only ground for inferring this identity is the association of the resurrection with the grave, and this is by no means of compelling force. The earth is the common grave of the race. In death men universally give back their bodies to the mass of physical nature. Suppose, then, that one should wish to express in vivid rhetorical phrase the fact that Out of the mass of physical nature the constituents of new bodies will be taken through the marvelous working of God’s power; what better could he do than to 8peak of the grave as yielding up its dead? This is the fitting equivalent in popular discourse for the declaration of the physical nature which receives the old body is to be the source of the new and far more perfect body which is forever to mirror the glory of the indwelling spirit. In reconstituting man’s physical being material identity is of no consequence whatever. One set of molecules is just as good as another of the same order. It is therefore enormously improbable that Cod has devised an intricate and far-reaching economy for conserving from each body the quantity of matter necessary for physical perfection, and has undertaken to gather together in the day of the resurrection the scattered particles which are comprised in this quantity. Sameness of type, resulting from the operation of the same organizing principle, provides for the proper identity of the body through the changes of earthly life; and there is no occasion to suppose any further basis of identity in the future state.— Sheldon, System of Christian Doctrine, pp. 563, 564

St. Paul, “it is raised a spiritual body.” Here the “it” or subject, is the same in each instance; and it is this principle of identity upon which the church bases its doctrine of the resurrection. But what is this principle of identity? That identity depends upon very different conditions is generally admitted. In the inorganic realm, identity depends upon substance and form. If a stone be pulverized and scattered abroad, the substance remains but the form is destroyed, and, therefore, the identity of the object. If water be frozen or heated, the form is changed into ice or steam, but it is still water. If, however, the water be separated into its constituent elements, oxygen and hydrogen, it is no longer water. In the organic world of living substance, identity is something higher. The acorn grows into the oak, and the infant into the man, but here the principle of identity does not appear to lie in either the substance or the form, for both are constantly undergoing change. That there is a continuity between the seed and the plant, the infant and the man, cannot be doubted. So also, although it cannot be explained, it is perfectly rational to assert a continuity between our present and our future bodies, even though we admit that we do not know in what this In our study of Anthropology (Vol. II, pp. 23, 24) we referred to “the immaterial principle” of Agassiz, which he maintained, determines the future bodily form of the organism. Agassiz says, however, that when the individual dies, this immaterial principle ceases to exist. Dr. Julius Mulleron, on the other hand, held that this vital organizing force continues in union with the soul, but is not operative between death and the resurrection. “It is not the eáp~, the mass of earthly material,” he says, “but the ui~a, 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 ecZ~ua7rpeu/Larucóp The object of the resurrection, as the active exertion of the divine-human power, is the body. But this formula must be understood in a wide latitude of meaning. It must

include the perfect or undivided integrity of the man raised up; the actual sameness or unity of the body as the organ of the spirit; and the change that adapts it to its new state when raised. Hence three terms are the watchwords of our doctrine: the integrity, the identity, the glorification of the flesh raised in the last day. The main, or at least the most important teaching of Scripture is that of the return of the whole man to existence, that is, in the integrity of the nature which in the idea of the Creator was that of a spiritual being using a bodily organization. Man suffers in death the penalty of a dissolution which will then be repaired. He is perfect only as spirit, soul and body. . . . The man in his entireness is the man before his Maker, both now and hereafter,—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 406, identity consists. The Church, therefore, asserts that the body will rise, and that it will be the same after the resurrection that it was before; but neither the Bible nor the Church determines wherein this sameness consists

2. As to the nature of the perfected resurrection body, we can of course know but little. Our Lord's revelation of Himself to the disciples, both on the Mount of Transfiguration and after His resurrection, made a profound impression upon them. Of the first St. Peter says, 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 Peter 1: 16; Cf. 1: 17, 18). It may be well to notice at this time, two negative statements which must be considered in our treatment of this subject. There is, first of all, the statement of our Lord addressed to the Sadducees: The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection (Luke 20:34-36). The second is that of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption (1 Corinthians 15:50). "There

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 a "nisus formativus" which belongs to the human soul. 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.—Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 779 seem to be plainly three things implied or asserted in these passages," says Dr. Charles Hodge, (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. 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 encumbered with useless organs, or trammeled by the limitations which are imposed by our present state of existence (HODGE, Systematic Theology, III, p. 780)

St. Paul broadly outlines the nature of the resurrection body in the following series of contrasts: (1) It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. Here the word incorruption signifies, not merely that the body will never decay, but that it is not susceptible to corruption in any form. Consequently, it will not only be free from dissolution and death, but free from every-

John Wesley in his sermon on the “Resurrection of the Dead” (Vol. II, p. 507) says, “The plain notion of a resurrection requires that the self-same body that died should rise again. Nothing can be said to be raised again but that very body that died, If God give to our souls at the last day a new body, this cannot be called the resurrection of our body; because that word plainly implies the fresh production of what was before.”

Dr. Miley points out that the difficulties concerning the resurrection of the body center in two points: (I) the wide dispersion of the particles which composed the living body, and (2) the possibility that in the course of time some may belong to different bodies. To this he replies, “The apparent magnitude of these difficulties is far greater than the real, especially if we view them, as we should, in the light of the divine providence. The dispersion of the particles is real only in our own view, However widely scattered or deeply mingled with other matter, they remain as near to the omniscient eye and omnipotent hand of God as if placed in an imperishable urn at the foot of His throne, Nor is there any probability, even on natural grounds, that in any case so much matter could become common to two bodies as would be necessary to a proper identity of either, When we place the subject in the light of God’s providence, whose purpose it is to raise the dead, all difficulties vanquish.”—Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 455 thing that tends toward that end—disease, pain and suffering. (2) It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in The following particulars, however, may be inferred with more or less confidence from what the Bible has revealed on this subject: (I) 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, . . . (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 ~ocm1 affections there? (e) The Bible clearly teaches that man is to retain all his faculties in the future life. One of the most important of these faculties is memory. If this were not retained there would be a chasm in our experience. 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 having no hope; giving them the assurance that they shall be reunited with all those who die in the Lord.—Hodge, Systematic Theology, Ill, pp. 781, 782 glory. The new body will be immortal. While incorruption is a negative term signifying immunity from decay, the word immortality has more of a positive content, and implies the perpetuity of life, forever redeemed from the empire of death. But the word glory carries the thought still farther, as that which excites wonder and delight. The disciples were overwhelmed with Christ's glory at the transfiguration; the keepers of the tomb became as dead men at the resurrection of our Lord; St. Paul beheld His glory as a light above the brightness of the sun at midday; and St. John declares that His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. St. John also declares that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is (1 John 3:2). It was for this reason that the apostle exhorted true believers not to mourn unduly for their pious dead, for they were to see them again, arrayed in beauty and glory beyond the power of human comprehension. (3) It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. The present body is vitiated by the presence of sin, and its senses are weakened both in quality and extent. Perhaps in the perfected resurrection body, new and exalted capabilities will be discovered, and most certainly those now in use will be immensely increased. However high our expectations may be, they will doubtless fall far short of the full reality of this glorious change. (4) It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. The words natural and spiritual as here used, are most commonly interpreted to mean the adaptation of the body to its environment. Thus a natural body is that by means of The specific resurrection of the flesh; and the express revelation of Scripture is, that the same bodies shall rise from the graves. But the identity of the body is not the identity of the man: nor is the identity of the body dependent upon the continuation of the particles in their union which were deposited in the grave. A brief reference to Scripture examples and testimonies

is sufficient to obviate misconception on this point. If appeal is made to our Lord's resurrection body, it must be remembered that there is no analogy. We have seen that death never finished its work of dissolution on Him: His bodily organization was inviolate. The only permissible argument is that, as His glorification took place upon a physical frame, so also will ours. But it is not said that we shall be raised as He was, in order to be afterward glorified: "it is raised a spiritual body"; raised immediately as such.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 407 which the soul adjusts itself to the present state of existence; while a spiritual body is that which the soul will use to adapt itself to the new conditions of the future life. "It is a remark which must occur to every person," says Dr. Wakefield, "that a spiritual body is an apparent contradiction; and we are therefore under the necessity of taking the word spiritual in an unusual sense. The apostle does not mean that the resurrection body, like the immortal spirit, will be immaterial; for then it could not be the same body that dies. Nor does he mean that it will be so sublimated or etherealized as not to be a body in the proper sense of the word. It will be 'a body' (o-~/La), but it will be so far spiritual as to be without the mere animal functions which are essential to the natural body. The meaning of the apostle seems to be this: As the soul has an existence indep~n~en~L of animal functions, living without nourishment, and incapable of decay, sickness or death, so will be the body in the resurrection. It will be destitute of the peculiar physical organization of flesh and blood; for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (1 Corinthians 15:50). It must therefore undergo a new modification in consequence of which, though still material, it will be very different from what it now is. It will be a body without the vital functions of the animal economy, When Paul asserts that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," he means only to deny that a corrupt and mortal body can thus inherit, and not to assert that such inheritance is not true of a glorified body of material substance, from which all corruption and mortal elements have been removed. We consequently see what he means by the spiritual body in vs. 44-46, where he contrasts it with the "natural," and declares the resurrection body to be "spiritual." It is not spiritual in the sense that it is not material; for it is composed of matter. But it is spiritual, as being fitted for the spiritual life hereafter, as it had previously been natural, as fitted for the animal life of this world. This is the pneumatic body as opposed to the psychical. As the first body had been suited to the present life, and could not be used in the life to come without change; so the resurrection body is suited to the life to come, and not to the present stage of being. Hence it is that the change, with or without death, does not take place until the time of reunion in which the pneumatic life is to begin.—Boyce, Abstract of Systematic Theology, p. 457 For as spirit that serves the flesh is called carnal, so flesh that serves the spirit is called spiritual; not because it is converted into spirit, but because it is subject to spirit with a supreme and marvelous facility of obeying, having no sense of weariness, no liability to decay, and no tardiness of motion.—Augustine, De Civitate Dci, XIII, 20, 22 living in the manner in which we conceive spirits to live, and sustaining and exercising its powers without waste, weariness, decay, or the necessity of having them recruited by food and sleep" (WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, pp. 620, 621). While there are a few writers who regard the resurrection body as a purely spiritual and in no sense material, the commonly accepted view is that which we have just stated The General Resurrection. The term "general resurrectioñ" refers to the belief commonly held in the Church, that at the Second Coming of Christ, all the dead, both the righteous and the wicked, shall be raised simultaneously and immediately brought to judgment. It is in this sense also, that the creeds are commonly interpreted. Thus the Apostle's Creed has the simple statement, "I believe in . . . the resurrection of the body." The Nicene Creed has it, "I look for the

While the body shall be marvelously changed in the resurrection, it shall still be material in substance. The terms “natural body” and “spiritual body” mean simply different states, not any distinction of essence. In a word, the resurrection is a transformation, not a transubstantiation. The latter would mean a future body of the same essence as the spirit of which it shall be a corporeal investment. The incongruity of such a state of things disproves it. The materiality of the resurrection body is entirely consistent with its immortality. The common tendency of material things to dissolution or death is wholly from their interior constitution or exterior condition, or from both. The constitution and condition may be such that both interior forces and exterior agencies shall be efficaciously operative toward the dissolution or death of the body; but just the opposite is also possible with respect to both. Surely God can so constitute and condition the resurrection body that all interior forces and external influences shall work together for its immortality. So far the resurrection bodies of the righteous and the wicked will be without distinction, the immortality of the body being no more determinative of future destiny than the immortality of the soul.—Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 453. -

It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. When words are thus used 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 of the meaning of the word “natural.” The word ~IJUX~K6V translated “natural,” is derived from ~L~vy~ which means sometimes 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. . . . Such being the signification of the ~vy~5, it is plain that the r~a ~uX1K6v, the psychical, or natural body, cannot by possibility mean a body made out of the ~t~uin~. In like manner it is no less plain that the o~a 7rv€u/UZTLK6P cannot by possibility mean a body made of spirit. That indeed would be such a contradiction in terms, as to speak of a spirit made out of matter.—Hodge, Systematic The. ology. III, pp. 783, 784 resurrection ot the dead”; while the Athanasian Creed declares, “At whose coming all men shall rise again in their bodies, and shall give an account for their works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.” Neither the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, nor the Twenty-five Articles of Methodism has a statement concerning the resurrection, other than that which refers to Christ. Our own creed is as follows: “We believe in the resurrection of the dead, that the bodies of both the just and the unjust shall be raised to life and united with their spirits—’they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation’” (Article XII, Section 1). That the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked is simultaneous, is the general opinion of both Reformed and Arminian theologians. Dr. Wakefield, who interprets the Wesleyan theology of Richard Watson, makes the following statement: Under the head of the resurrection as general or universal, he says, “On this subject the language of our Lord is very express. For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their 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 5:28-29). So St. John tells us that he saw the dead, small and great, stand before God (Revelation 20:12). So also St. Paul, in contrasting the benefits of redemption with the evils brought upon man by the sin of Adam, bears witness to the doctrine of a general resurrection. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive (1 Corinthians 15:21-22)”

(WAKEFIELD, Christian Theology, p. 614)

It will appear evident, however, even to the casual reader, that with the exception of the Athanasian statement, the creeds may be interpreted as teaching a general or universal resurrection, that is, a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked, without regarding the two events as simultaneous. This may be urged on the ground (1) that the distinction in the statement itself seems to imply a distinction in the resurrection, both as to character and time. If it is an arbitrary interpretation to separate the two, it is no less so to combine them. (2) The statement in Revelation 20:3-7, even if regarded as figurative, as it is by most of the interpreters who identify in point of time the two phases of the resurrection, yet nevertheless, reveals the fact that its author regarded a distinction in time as permissible to proper interpretation of Daniel 12:2; Mark 12:25; Luke 20:35-36 and in harmony with his own statement in John 5:28-29. The Emphatic Diaglot gives the literal translation of John 5:29 as follows: “Those having done good things to a resurrection of life (dc apao-racrw ~a~c); and those having done evil things, to a resurrection of Judgment (eic apacrracrui Kpw-€wc) .“

(3) A study of the phrase ~K V€KpCiV,out of, or from the dead, and its characteristic use in connection with the resurrection of the righteous, strongly indicates a distinction in time. The phrase ~K V€KpCJV denotes that the individuals or the groups (rciypara, or bands) are chosen out from the many who yet remain in the realm of the dead This last statement concerning the use of the phrase €K V€K~OJJ) deserves further treatment. We are told that the phrase occurs forty-nine times in the New Testament, and not once is it applicable to the resurrection of the wicked, or to the resurrection when considered as embracing both the righteous and the wicked. (1) It is used thirty-four times in connection with Christ’s resurrection, which certainly was out from among the dead (Cf. Notes). (2) It is used three times concerning John the Baptist, who as Herod thought, had been raised out of the dead (Mark 6:14; Mark 6:16; Luke 9:7). (3) Three times the phrase is used in connection with Lazarus, who likewise was raised out from among the dead (John 12:1; John 12:9; John 12:17). (4) Three times it is used in a figurative sense to indicate spiritual life out of the death of sin (Romans 6:13; Romans 11:15; Ephesians 5:14). (5) Once it is used in the discourse concerning Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16:1-31 :

31); and (6) It is used once concerning Abraham’s faith (Hebrews 11:19). There are four passages remaining to be considered, Mark 12:25; Luke 20:35-36; Acts 4:1-2, and Php 3:11. These require brief mention. (1) In Mark 12:25, Jesus says When they shall rise from the dead [E vEKpcov], they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven; and in Luke 20:35-36, They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead ~c dvao-rdo-€wc r~c €K 1~’EKpowJ , neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Here Jesus holds out to His disciples as the hope of the righteous, that they shall be resurrected out from among the dead, which in itself necessarily implies a distinction in the time order. It is further evident, that it is to this St. John refers when he says, But the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power (Revelation 20:5-6). (2) In Acts 4:1-2, it is stated that the Sadducees were grieved because the apostles Peter and John preached through Jesus the resurrection from [E~cv€Kp&v]the dead. If now we take into account the statement in Mark 9:10, that the disciples were perplexed as to what

the rising from the dead should mean, we have a clue to the disturbing doctrine. Jesus had spoken of His own resurrection as out from among the dead. When this had become an established The thirty-four texts referring to Christ's resurrection out from the dead are as follows: Matthew 17:9; Mark 9:9-10; Luke 24:46; John 2:22;

20:9; 21:14; Acts 3:15; Acts 4:10; Acts 10:41; Acts 13:30; Acts 13:34; Acts 17:3; Acts 26:23;

Romans 1:4; Romans 4:24; Romans 6:4-9; Romans 7:4; Romans 8:11; Romans 10:7; Romans 10:9; 1 Corinthians 15:12; 1 Corinthians 15:20; Galatians 1:1;

Ephesians 1:20; C0I. 1:18; 2:12; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; 2 Timothy 2:8; Hebrews 13:20;

1 Peter 1:3; 1 Peter 1:21

Compare also, the following references where the "ek" or out of, is not used. Matthew 22:31; Acts 17:32; Acts 23:6; Acts 24:15; Acts 24:21; 1 Corinthians 15:12-13; 1 Corinthians 15:21; 1 Corinthians 15:42, and especially John 5:28-29 (R.V.), "Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation.~' fact in history, the disciples understood that there was to be an order in the resurrection. This order, St. Paul says, is Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming (1 Corinthians 15:23). The resurrection which the disciples preached, therefore, was out from among the dead, and for those only who were accounted worthy through Christ. The Jews believed in a resurrection of the dead at "the last day"; but that there should be a resurrection out from among the dead, for either Jesus or His anointed ones, was a doctrine obnoxious to them, especially to the Sadducees who questioned the fact of any bodily resurrection. (3) In Php 3:11, St. Paul emphasized that phase of Christ's teaching which regarded the resurrection out from the dead, as a goal to be attained by those only who were accounted worthy. He therefore sought by every possible means to attain unto the resurrection of the dead, that is T'~)I~' €'~ava'o-rao-tu ripi v€~pwv or the out-resurrection of the dead. Tischendorf's text includes the preposition ~K making it, the out-resurrection from the dead. It was for this reason that the apostle said, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus (Php 3:14). It must be evident to all, that this question is vital to the whole millennial theory. Those who fail to make a distinction between the two resurrections are shut up either to post or nil millennialism. The position taken in our discussion of the Second Advent necessarily determines and is determined by, this view of the resurrection The Development of the Doctrine in the Church. The questions which arose in the apostolic church were carried over into the subapostolic period. In his first apology Justin Martyr (100: 138-166) says, "We put up prayers that we may have a resurrection to incorruptibility through our faith in Him." This incorruptibility, however, was not merely a spiritual body, for "in the resurrection the flesh shall arise perfect and entire." Origen (185-254) writes, "Differences of opinion obtain, but the true opinion is that which has been transmitted in orderly succession from the apostles. This teaching is clearly that there is to be a resurrection, when this body, now sown in corruption, shall rise in incorruption. . . . What rises at the resurrection is a spiritual body. . . . We are not to think that bodies of flesh and blood, with passions of the senses, but rather that incorruptible bodies will be given." There developed very early a conflict between the literalistic and spiritualistic views of the resurrection, the former being held primarily in the West, the latter in the East. Irenaeus (100: 202), Tertullian (100: 220), and Cyprian (100: 258) all followed Justin in

the literal interpretation, as did also at a later period Methodius (100: 312), Epiphanius (100: 403), Theophylus of Alexandria (100: 404), Prudentius (100: 405) and Jerome (100: 419). In the East, Origen led the way and was followed by Basil (100: 375), Gregory Nazianzen (100: 376), Gregory Nyssa (100: 395) and Chrysostom (100: 407). These alternating views continued until the time of Augustine (353-430), who succeeded in laying down a middle course, which in a large measure determined the position of later thought. His position was stated in these words: “Spiritual bodies will yet be bodies, not spirits; having the substance, but not the unwieldiness and corruption of the flesh; being animated, not by the living soul but by the quickening spirit. This body is now worn by Christ in anticipation of what we shall wear.” During the Middle Ages the schoolmen took opposite sides and dogmatized after their manner concerning the resurrection body. Erigena seems to have been inclined toward the Origenistic views, and Thomas Aquinas followed Augustine. The Protestant theologians were faithful to the ancient creeds. The Lutherans. with their peculiar Christological doctrines and strongly sacramental emphasis, taught that “our bodies were framed in Adam for immortality; by the incarnation of the Son of God they were taken into affinity with Him; in His resurrection they began to be glorified; they were washed from sin in the layer of regeneration; by faith they became members of His mystical body, the temple of the Spirit; and fed and sanctified by the body and blood of Christ unto eternal life.” Dr. Charles lodge sums up the doctrine of the Reformers as follows: “(1) That the resurrection body is to be numerical~y1 and in substance, one with the presentbody. (2) That it is to have the same organs of sight, hearing, and so forth, as in this life. (3) Many held that all the peculiarities of the present body as to size, stature and appearance, 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 Lutherans as Reformed, confine themselves more strictly within the limits of Scripture (lODGE, Systematic Theology, III, p. 789). This brings us to the next important subject of Eschatology, the Final Judgment THE FINAL JUDGMENT By the final judgment, we understand a~general judgment of all the righteous and all the wicked in one vast public assembly. This has been denied by some who think that the judgment of each man occurs at death; and by others who think that only the wicked will be judged at the last day. But the general judgment is very different from the individual or particular judgment which is passed upon each man, or which he passes upon himself at death. There are many scriptures which substantiate the latter, but which do not go to the extent of establishing the former. However, it is also true that the Scriptures make frequent mention of a day of judgment; and a comparison of these passages makes it clear that they do not refer to death, but to a specific period or day which is to synchronize with the conflagration at the end of the world. The heavens and the 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 (2 Peter 3:7). It is expressly declared that he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness (Acts 17:31). It is also referred to as the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God (Romans 2:5); the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ (Romans 2:16); the day of judgment (2 Peter 2:9); the great day (Jude 1:6); and the great day of his wrath (Revelation 6:17). These scriptures clearly prove three things: (1) there is to be a general judgment; (2) this is to take place at a fixed time; and (3) this great and terrible day is in the future As to the duration of the judgment, the indefinite use of the term “day” forbids any statement of even its probable length. This has already been discussed in connection with the Second Advent. Mr. Wesley says that “the time, termed by the prophet, ‘the great and terrible day,’

is usually, in Scripture, styled the day of the Lord. The space from the creation of man upon the earth to the end of all things, is the day of the sons of men: the time that is now passing over us is properly our day; when this is ended, the day of the Lord will begin. But who can say how long it will continue? ‘One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day’ (2 Peter 3:8). And from this very expression, some of the ancient fathers drew the inference, that, what is commonly called the day of judgment would be indeed a thousand years: and it seems they did not go beyond the truth; nay, probably they did not come up to it. For, if we consider the number of persons who are to be judged, and of actions which are to be inquired into, it does not appear that a thousand years will suffice for the transaction of that day; so that it may not improbably comprise several thousand years. But God shall reveal this also in its season.” (WESLEY, Sermon: The Great Assize). At the other extreme is the opinion of Dr. Pond who says, “The process of judgment will continue long enough to answer all the purposes for which it was instituted; The judgment is emphatically the final revelation of the Judge: as such the consummation of a judicial work that has ever been going on in the world. It will be executed by Christ as God-man, in strict connection with His coming to raise the dead; and its range will be universal and individual. The principles of the judgment will be the application of sundry and just tests, which will reveal the characters of all, to be followed by a final and eternal judgment distinction or severance. In the case of the ungodly this judgment will be condemnation in various degrees but eternal; and in the case of the godly their everlasting confirmation in glory and the rewards of heaven.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 412 but I see no necessity for supposing that it will continue for a very long period, perhaps no longer than a literal day. At the sound of the last trumpet the dead are to be raised, ‘in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.’ In a very little time the thrones can be set, and the books opened, and the worlds assembled before their final Judge. An unerring separation can be made. And by some mysterious process, there may be such a general unfolding of character, that ‘every work shall be brought into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil.’ We know not, at present, how such an exhibition of character is to be made; but who will say that it cannot be made, and made suddenly; so that the whole process of the judgment may pass away in comparatively a little time?” (POND,Christian Theology, pp. 571, 572)

Pc~rticular and General Judgment. The Scriptures make a distinction between particular or private judgment which takes place at death, and a general or pub-lie judgment which takes place at the last day. (1) That there is a particular judgment is shown by the following scri~ptpres: Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it (Ecclesiastes 12:7). Here it is implied that the soul is self-conscious in the presence of God, and hence, of necessity, has a knowledge of its own moral state. St. Paul affirms this position in the words, Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known (1 Corinthians 13:12). We must believe, then, that every man at death has such a self-knowledge as to know accurately his own moral character. In another statement of St. P~iFW ii implied that what takes place in the day of judgment, takes place also in every man’s consciousness at death, Their conscience also bearing witness,

Dr. Boyce says, “It has been argued that, from the vast numbers to be judged, and the many events connected with the life of every man, it will comprise a long period of time. But the rapidity with which, in some conditions, the mind will run over the course of a long life, in a moment of time,

shows that a period of even exceeding brevity may suffice for a full revelation and judgment of all persons and events. The indefiniteness of the word should, however, caution us against the assumption that the day must be of only a few hours' duration."—Boyce, Abstract of Syst. Th., p. 462 and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another (Romans 2:15). In the Epistle to the Hebrews there is this specific text, It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment(KpicrL~). Here the word "judgment" is anarthous, and hence no article being employed it should read, after this, judgment, or a judgment. It is not the judgment, in the sense of the general judgment that follows immediately after death, but a judgment—a particular, private judgment. (2) There is also a general or public judgment, as we have defined it above, clearly taught in the Scriptures. In the Old Testament, we may note the foIT6~wing: But know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment (Ecclesiastes 11:9); For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil (Ecci. 12: 14); the judgment was set, and the books were opened (Cf. Daniel 7:9-10); 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 (Daniel 12:2). The New Testament distinctly teaches a day of public judgment. Our Lord frequently made mention of it in words that cannot be misunderstood. It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you (Matthew 11:22; cf. Matthew 5:24); The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it (Matthew 12:41). The scene of judgment is vividly portrayed by Christ at the close of His parable on the talents (Matthew 25:31-46). St. Paul in his address on Mars' Hill declared that God hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; (Acts 17:31); and again, In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel (Romans 2:16). So also St. Jude says, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all (Jude 1:14-15). In the Apocalypse, after the account of the millennium and the great defection at its close, the writer says, 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. And 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 delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. . . . And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire (Revelation 20:11-13; Revelation 20:15). Here is a plain and uncontestable prediction of a general judgment, at which all the dead and all the living are to be assembled. That both the righteous and the wicked will be present is evident from the fact that those whose names are written in the book of life will be saved, and those whose names are not found there, will be cast into the lake of fire The Person of the Judge. God alone is competent to perform the office of Judge in the last great assize. He, only, is all-wise and to Him alone are known the innermost secrets of men's lives. He understands not only their actions, but their inward thoughts and hidden But at the judgment seat of Christ will be assembled all men, to be judged according to the deeds done in the body; from Adam, the first of the human race, down to the very last one of his numerous posterity. All, all will be there. In that vast multitude ranks and distinctions, such as now exist, will be unknown. Those whom birth, or office, or wealth, or talents placed at a distance from one another, will then stand upon the same level. The great will he without their ensigns of dignity, and the poor without their marks of abasement; for then

moral distinctions alone will be regarded. The oppressor and the oppressed will be there; the former that his violence may be returned upon his own head, and the latter that his wrongs may be redressed. Jews and Gentiles, Mohammedans and Christians, the learned and the illiterate, the bond and the free, the high and the low will be there, to render an account to Him who is no respecter of persons, and whose omniscient eye will distinguish each individual in the immense throng as easily as if he were alone. Not one of the righteous will there be forgotten, and not one of the wicked shall find a hiding-place from the eye of the Judge.—Wakefield, Chr. Th., pp. 625, 626

Every man, every woman, every infant of days, that ever breathed the vital air, will then hear the voice of the Son of God, and start into life, and appear before Him. And this seems to be the natural import of that expression, 'the dead, small and great:' all universally, all without exception, all of every age, sex or degree; all that ever lived and died, or underwent such a change as will be equivalent with death.—John Wesley, The Great Assize motives—even their natures and the possibilities of those natures. But this judgment is not by God as God, For the Father judgeth no man, but hathcom'mitted all ju~g~en~t unto th~Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father (John 5:22-23). The reason for this is, that the Son is not only divine but human, and his relation to humanity peculiarly qualifies Him for this office. Indeed it seems evident that the judgment is to be exercised peculiarly by Christ as man, for St. Peter declares that 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 (Acts 10:42). Specific utterances to this effect are found in Matthew 16:27-28; Matthew 25:31-34. St. Paul preached to the Athenians that God would judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained (Acts 17:31); and in his epistle to the Corinthians declares that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad (2 Corinthians 5:10). The judgment of the world is represented as the last mediatorial act of Christ, After the execution of the final sentence, when the rewards of the righteous are bestowed, and the penalties of the wicked determined, He will deliver up the mediatorial kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all (1 Cor

15:24-28)

It is manifestly proper that He who is the Savior of men should be their final judge. It is fit that the promises which He has made and the threatenings which He has uttered should be carried into effect by Himself; that from His hand those who have submitted to His law should receive their reward, and those who have been disobedient their punishment. It is fit that He should bring to a close the remedial dispensation which He established by His own personal interposition. But in addition to this, as the general judgment is intended to be a public manifestation of the righteousness of the divine administration, it will be necessary that there should be a visible judge, whose proceedings all shall see, and whose voice all shall hear. The proper person, therefore, is Jesus Christ, who, being both God and man, will appear as our visible judge in His glorified humanity—Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 625

Christ is the most proper person to judge. (I) He is in favor of the prisoners. (2) He is righteous, not to be bribed. (3) He is omniscient, not to be deceived. (4) He is almighty; none can escape the sentence dire.—Potts

Development of the Doctrine in the Church. There is very little of detail in the teachings of the earliest fathers concerning the judgment. They were generally content with insisting upon its certainty. Justin (100: 165) says that “Plato used to say that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the wicked who came before them; and we say the same thing will be done, but at the hand of Christ; and upon the wicked, in the same bodies united again to their spirits, which are now to undergo everlasting punishment.” The fathers built their doctrine chiefly upon the imagery of the Scriptures, and their writings were often lurid paraphrases or poetic descriptions. This is especially true of those commonly but perhaps improperly attributed to Tertullian (100: 220) and Hippolytus (100: 239). Origen (100: 254) explains Romans 2:13-16 as follows: “When the soul has gathered together a multitude of evil works, and abundance of sins against itself, at a fitting time all that assembly of evil boils up to punishment. The mind . . . will see a kind of history of all the foul, shameful and unholy deeds which it has done exposed before its eyes. Then the conscience. . . pierced by its own goads, becomes an accuser against itself.” Here it will be noted, the emphasis is placed upon the particular or individual judgment. Augustine sought to reduce the truth found in the scripture imagery to dogmatic statement. His summary of the doctrine is this: “The whole Church confesses that Christ will come from heaven to judge the living and the dead; this we call the last day of divine judgment. But how many days this judgment will be held is uncertain, for that it is the manner of Holy Scripture to put ‘day’ for time, no one who has read the Scripture, however carelessly, can be ignorant. And, The later fathers indulged in rhetorical descriptions of the coming of Christ to judgment. Lactantius (100: 325) said that “Christ, before He descends, will give this sign, there shall suddenly fall from heaven a sword.” According to Cyril of Jerusalem (100: 386), the sign of His coming will be the appearance of a cross in the sky. The descriptions of the judgment found in Basil (100: 375) and Gregory Nazianzen (100: 376) are more or less ornate. Augustine in the Enchiridion held that the fire that is to try every man’s work (1 Corinthians 3:13) takes place in this probationary life, but afterward thought that it might in some sense take place after this life. This is the hint out of which the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory developed, as we have previously indicated therefore, when we speak of the day of judgment, we add ‘the last’; for He judges now, and has judged since the human race began. . . and even if no one had sinned, not without a good and right judgment would He retain every rational creature, perseveringly cleaving to its good, in eternal blessedness. He judges not only of the race of men and demons as a whole, that they should suffer according to the merits of their former sins, but also of each one’s own work, which he has done by his own will.” During the Middle Ages, opinions varied greatly, but generally the judgment was interpreted on the principle of the grossest literalism—an example of which is found in the account of Thomas Aquinas (100: 1274). The theologians of the Reformation simply affirmed the scriptural doctrine, but were careful to distinguish between the final judgment (judicium universale et manifestum), which takes place at the end of the world, and the individual judgment (judicium particulare et occultum), which is passed upon each one at death. The purpose of the former was understood in the sense of a public vindication of the divine justice, in the final awards and punishments The Principles of Judgment. St. Paul enumerates the principles of judgment as follows: To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with

God (Romans 2:7-11). Dr. Wakefield in referring to the statement “the books were opened” (Revelation 20:12) supposes that these are the different dispensaThomas Aquinas says, “How will the Lord come to judgment? Like an emperor entering his city, wearing his crown and other insignia, whereby his coming may be known; thus Christ will come to judgment, in the same form in which He ascended, with all the orders of angels. Angels, bearing His crown, will go before Him; with voice and trumpet they will awaken the dead to meet Him. All the elements will be disturbed, a tempest of mingled fire and frost everywhere raging.” tions under which men have been placed, and according to which justice requires that they should be tried. That portion of the divine will which men know, or might know, will therefore be the standard of trial. (1) The heathen will be judged by the law of nature, or the law originally given to man as the rule of his conduct. Some portion of this law has been preserved among them, partly by tradition and partly by reason; and though the traces of it are in some instances obliterated, and in others greatly obscured, yet enough remains to render them accountable beings, and to be the foundation of a judicial trial. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, that is, the written law as the Jews had it, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another (Romans 2:14-15). (2) The Jews will be judged by the law of Moses and the teaching of the prophets. Our Lord’s own words will be the standard for His own generation—the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day (John 12:48). (3) Christians in general will be judged by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments—especially the gospel as it confers on men superior privileges. If the Gentile who sins against the light of nature is justly punishable; if he who despised the law of Moses “died without mercy,” Of

Only faith in Christ can justify a sinner, but his works must justify him before men. And this faith is not an inoperative principle, an intellectual recognition of the fact that divine justice requires an atonement, but it is such a heart-appreciation of this divine verity as makes a complete change in the whole state and character of the man, as well as his condition before God, which will not only clothe him with the righteousness of Christ, but will infuse into him the holy principles of the Lord of glory.—Prentiss

Dr. Boyce points out that in the wonderful combination by which the created spirit, and even created matter, were, through the making flesh of the divine Word (John 1:14) enabled to do that work which neither man nor God could do separately. Where, but on the throne of judgment, could this personage be seen by any except those who are made partakers of His glory? How fit is His appearance to fill with anguish those who have rejected Him, and with exultation and praise all those who have trusted in Him. . . . The judgment day will clearly exhibit these perfections, and their harmony, to all the intelligences of God.—Boyce, Abstract of Systematic Theology, p. 467 how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? (Hebrews 10:29). We may say, then, that the measure of revealed truth igranted to men will be the standard by which they are judged in the last day. To this also, we may add the words of our Lord—For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required (Luke 12:48) In connection with these principles, we call attention also, to the fact that the judgment is the third or executive department of the moral

law—the first being the legislative, and the second, the judicial. As to the origin of moral law, we may say that it issues from the absolute holiness of God, and is exactly suited to the moral nature of man. This is important; for if moral

Dr. Pope states the principles of the judgment as follows: “The principles of the judgment may be exhibited and summed up in the following five watchwords: The test applied according to various measures of probationary privilege; the revelation of character; the separation of classes; the execution of the condemning sentence; and the tonfirmation or ratification of the acceptance of the saved. All these will be combined in one result. The omniscient Lord will justly apply His unerring tests The foregoing principles are amplified as follows: (I) Self-revelation. In both the Old and New Testaments the day of judgment is represented as the final manifestation of all secrets, whether as such unknown fully to man, or as known only to himself, or as designedly kept hidden by him and known only to God. (2) Separation. The idea of separation or discrimination inheres in the Greek term Kp&~S, and in all the disclosures of judgment. It will be the final separation or sifting of the world. This separation will be in two senses twofold: a broad separation between two classes: and also a discrimination within those classes themselves. Everywhere this division into two vast masses is maintained: acceptance or rejection of Christ being the alternative. But within these great masses the same process of sifting discrimination goes on. For every man there will be a distinct judgment, succeeding or included in the former, by which his position and degree either in salvation or perdition will be determined. (3) Condemnation. There can be no doubt that the term judgment is most frequently connected with condemnation: this, in fact, is the more common meaning of ,cpie~. Judgment determining the sentence, condemnation pronouncing it, and execution administering it, are almost synonymous terms in regard to the wicked: in Scripture, as in the common language of human justice. It is ,car&,cpLou. (4) Confirmation. It is part of the dignity of the saints that the judgment in their case will be only a ratification of a previous decree in their favor and already known to themselves. Though judged, in the more general sense of that administrative, they shall not come into condemnation. But their place and order in the state of salvation has yet to be determined (Cf. Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, pp. 4 16-423) law be in any wise unsuited to the probationary period of man, then its judicial application and its final execution must of necessity, be unjust. If, however, the law is “good” as St. Paul affirms that it is, then in its judicial aspect it is applicable to every transgression. Only on this basis can the execution of the sentence be conducted on the plane of absolute holiness. This execution is now delayed under, and because of, the sway of prevenient or restraining grace. But the wrath of God is constant in the Divine Being, and will move with all its terribleness in the executive department of moral law, when at last grace is finally spurned and no longer mitigates the sentence. The matter of moral law can be understood, therefore, only in relation to the holiness and righteousness of God. Thus the whole question of future punishment is saved from the fallacy of unconditional election, and the “true and righteous judgments” of God fully vindicated The Purpose of the General Judgment. In order to understated the purpose of the general judgment, it must be considered (1) in relation to God; (2) in relation to Christ; and (3) in relation to man. First, the judgment will furnish a worthy arena for the display of the divine attributes. In the presence of the assembled universe, it will be seen that “the judge of all the earth will do right”; and the sentence, whether of acquittal or condemnation, will be sanctioned by countless myriads of angels and men. “Then will appear,” says Dr. Boyce, “the wisdom of His purpose, the truth and faithfulness

We have thus presented the rational argument for the most severe and unwelcome of all the tenets of the Christian religion. It must have a foothold in the human reason, or it could not have maintained itself against all the recoil and opposition which it elicits from the human heart. Founded in ethics, in law, and in judicial reason, as well as unquestionably taught by the Author of Christianity, it is no wonder that the doctrine of eternal retribution, in spite of selfish prejudices and appeals to human sentiment, has always been a belief of Christendom. From theology and philosophy it has passed into human literature, and is wrought into its finest structures. It makes the solemn substance of the Iliad and the Greek Drama, It pours a somber light into the brightness and grace of the Aeneid. It is the theme of the inferno, and is presupposed by both of the other parts of the Divine Comedy. The epic of Milton derives from it, its awful grandeur. And the greatest of the Shakespearean tragedies sound and stir the depths of the human soul, by their delineation of guilt intrinsic and eternal.—Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 747, 748 of His promise, His power to accomplish His will, His universal benevolence, His sacrificing love, His unbounded mercy, His delivering power, His conquering grace, and, not to attempt to enumerate further, everything that can be imagined as constituting that holiness which, in one word, embraces all moral perfection." (BOYCE, Abstract of Systematic Theology, p. 466.) Second, the glory of Christ's work will then appear— not only as Judge, but as Lord and King. As Lord, His dominion is now seen to be universal, and as King who has reigned in the hearts of His people, He now welcomes them into His joy, and invites them to participate in His glory. Third, as it concerns man, the judgment is necessary for the following reasons: (1) It is the testimony of conscience in both Christian and pagan lands, that final judgment awaits the deeds of men. How can this be accounted for, except to say that it is "the The general judgment is not so much an investigative judgment for the determination of character, as it is the summing up and manifestation of man's total moral history. It will (1) reveal every man's true character to all; and (2) vindicate the righteous judgment of God in the final rewards and punishments,

"But will the sins of the redeemed be remembered in that day, and made known in the great congregation? Some suppose they will not, as they are all forgiven in Christ, and as the Scriptures represent them as being blotted out, covered, cast into the depths of the sea, and remembered no more. Others suppose that they will be published to the assembled universe, that all may know from what a depth of sin and misery the grace of God has delivered them. Of this much, however, we may be sure, that the righteous will be far from feeling any painful sorrow or shame for past transgressions. It will be enough for them to know that these were all washed away in the blood of the Lamb, and that they shall be remembered against them no more,"—Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 627,

Mr. Wesley holds that not only the good deeds of the righteous, but their evil deeds also before their justification will be remembered in that day. He says, "It is apparently and absolutely necessary, for the full display of the glory of God—for the clear and perfect manifestation of His wisdom, justice, power and mercy toward the heirs of salvation—that all the circumstances of their life should be placed in open view, together with all their tempers, and all the desires, thoughts, and intents of their hearts: otherwise, how would it appear out of what depth of sin and misery the grace of God had delivered them? . . . And in the discovery of the divine perfections, the righteous will rejoice with joy unspeakable; far from feeling any painful sorrow or shame, for any of those transgressions which were long since blotted out as a cloud, washed away by the blood of the

Lamb. It will be abundantly sufficient for them, that all the transgressions which they had committed shall not once be mentioned unto them to their disadvantage; that their sins and transgressions, and iniquities shall be remembered no more to their condemnation.—Wesley, Sermon, The Great Assize voice of God in man." God does not mock His creatures, and as conscience points to a day of future reckoning, so most certainly that day will come. (2) The condition of the righteous in this world is frequently such, that without the awards of the future, the justice and equity of God cannot be vindicated. (3) But we are not to understand that the general judgment is concerned solely with the acts of men. Men are not only individuals responsible for their own acts, they are also social creatures responsible for others. They exert an influence either for good or evil, and this influence lives on after the present life of the individual. His work, therefore, is not done when he dies. His deeds live after him, and will continue to do so, until history is brought to a close. Only in the final judgment, can the total influence of his life be summed up—either for good or evil. Hereditary and solidarity forces must be reckoned with in the general judgment. (4) The supreme purpose of the general judgment is, therefore, not so much the discovery of character, as it is its manifestation. St. Paul WAKEFIELD ON THE GENERAL JUDGMENT That men enter upon a state of retribution immediately after death is evident from our Lord's declaration to the penitent thief, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and St. Paul's "desire to depart and to be with Christ." This fact, however, does not set aside the necessity of a general judgment at the end of time; for, though we do not pretend fully to understand why God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world, yet there are obvious reasons which seem to justify such an appointment

(I) Man, in his present state, is composed of soul and body. In this compound state he forms his moral character; and hence it is fitting that his whole nature should be the subject of future retribution. But this it cannot be, until the body is raised from the dead, which involves the necessity of a general resurrection in order to a final judgment

(2) We must not suppose that when a man dies his entire moral history is concluded. The influence of his actions may continue to operate, either for good or evil, long after his earthly career is closed. Thus men, though dead, may continue to speak, even to the end of time; and as retribution cannot precede the moral conduct to which it has respect, and on which it is based, it is proper that a general judgment should close the earthly history of the human race

(3) The circumstances of a general judgment will be declarative of the glory of God. "The Judge of all the earth," clothed in the habiliments of heavenly light, and seated upon "the throne of his glory," will summon before him the multiplied millions of our race to receive their final allotments. In the decision of that tremendous day His wisdom, justice, goodness, and truth will shine out in sunlight brilliancy, and be acknowledged by every moral creature.—Wakefield, Christian Theology, pp. 627, 628 says, We must all appear [Eav€poi9~vat or be made manifest] before the judgment seat of Christ; that each may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad (2 Corinthians 5:10). In the judgment, God discriminates between the righteous and the unrighteous, and separates them from each other, that He may uncover or make manifest their true character. Men are saved by faith, but they are rewarded according to their works, and these works spring out of the true nature of faith. As we are justified now by faith without works in the sense of merit, but by a faith that is always evidenced in works; so will it be in the final judgment, when the righteousness which is by faith will be vindicated by the works which

flow from it The Circumstances Attending the General Judgment The Scriptures describe the final judgment as a scene of awful solemnity and grandeur. The circumstances attending it, witness to the solemnity of the occasion. What these circumstances are, the Scriptures alone reveal. Mr. Wesley gives us the following summary of the events connected with this great and terrible day. He says, “(1) Let us, in the first place, consider the chief circumstances which precede our standing before 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 man himself. All 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 th~8 the representations of Scripture do not go.—Hodge, Systematic Theology, Ill, p. 849 That the works are, throughout the New Testament, made so prominent as the judicial test has many reasons. It is the standing and most solemn rebuke of all Antinomianism. It has also reference to that final and full manifestation of the divine righteousness, against all who might impugn it, which is made so prominent everywhere. And, finally, as will be seen hereafter, the works will be the standard by which the various degrees of reward will be determined. Gradations will be as manifold then as now: these will not be decided by faith but by works. “My reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be” (Revelation 22:12); this is our Lord’s last testimony on the subject.— Pope, Compend. Chr. Th,, Ill, p. 418 the judgment seat of Christ, And, first, God will show ‘signs in the earth beneath’; (Acts 2:19) particularly he will ‘arise to shake terribly the earth.’ ‘The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage’ (Isaiah 24:20). There shall be earthquakes, i~ari v6i~-ovc (not in divers only, but) in all places; not in one only, or a few, but in every part of the habitable world (Luke 21:11); even ‘such as were not since men were upon the earth, so mighty earthquakes and so great.’ In one of these, every island shall flee away and the mountains will not be found (Revelation 16:20). Meantime all the waters of the terraqueous globe will feel the violence of these concussions; ‘the sea and the waves roaring’ (Luke 21:25) with such an agitation as had never been known before, since the hour that ‘the fountains of the great deep were broken up,’ to destroy the earth, which then ‘stood out of the water and in the water.’ The air will be all storm and tempest, full of dark vapors and pillars of smoke (Joel 2:30); resounding with thunder from pole to pole, and torn with ten thousand lightnings. But the commotion will not stop in the region of the air; ‘the powers of heaven also shall be shaken. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars’ (Luke 21:25-26); those fixed, as well as those that move round them. ‘The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come’ (Joel 2:31). ‘The stars shall withdraw their shining’ (Joel 3:15), yea, and fall ‘unto the earth’ (Revelation 6:13), being thrown out of their orbits. And then shall be heard the universal shout, from all the companies of heaven, followed by the ‘voice of the archangel,’ proclaiming the approach of the Son of God and man, ‘and the trumpet of God’ sounding an alarm to all that sleep in the dust of the earth (1 Thessalonians 4:16), In consequence of this, all the graves shall open, and the bodies of men arise. The sea also shall give up the dead which are therein (Revelation 20:13) and every one shall rise with ‘his own body’: his own in substance, although so changed in its properties as we cannot now conceive

‘For this corruptible’ will then ‘put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality’ (1 Corinthians 15:53). Yea, ‘death and hades,’ the invisible world, shall deliver up the dead that are in them (Revelation 20:13). So that all who ever lived and died, since God created man, shall be raised incorruptible and immortal, (2) At the same time, the Son of man ‘shall send his angels’ over all the earth; and they shall ‘gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other’ (Matthew 24:31), And the Lord himself shall come with clouds in his own glory, and the glory of his Father, with ten thousand of his saints, even myriads of angels, and shall sit upon the throne of his glory. ‘And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another . . . and he shall set the sheep,

35. Chapter 36 - THE FINAL CONSUMMATION

Chapter 36 - THE FINAL CONSUMMATION Our Lord’s return and, the .final judgment brings about the end of the world, or the consummatio mundi. This is the vanishing point to which all the rays of reve lation converge. But this does not mean the utter destruction of all things-rather it is a new beginning on a higher level. The mediatorial reign of Christ as a means of salvation will cease, and the kingdom of grace will then merge into the kingdom of glory. With the cessation of the mediatorial reign, the estates of men will be eternally fixed. All spirits having reached the final result of their being, the faithful will enter into absolute blessedness, and the wicked into absolute misery. Thus, as it respects the redeemed, man will be restored to the ideal of his Creator, but the wicked will be banished into outer darkness. The consummation will not only affect the world of personal spirits, however, for nature itself shall witness the great transformation. Spiritual bodies demand a new and higher environment, and hence there shall be a new heaven and a The re-established order will be so new that the old things shall hardly come to remembrance; but the relation between the new and the old is in many points a mystery reserved. Meanwhile, the combina tion of these is the only notion of Consummation, an end opening to a new beginning. The end of human development, combined of sin and redemption is but a contribution from one little section of what is to us an unlimited universe presided over by a Being whose infinite re-sources prepare our feeble minds for wonders which we cannot sketch, even in outline, to our imagination. Human science has taught us much of the amazing consummation which the physical universe has reached; the science of faith knows no limits to its hope. There is a third TETAearat of the divine economy, the fullness of time in the fullest sense, which we expect. The first was when the world was finished as the scene of redemption; the second was when the Lord’s cry de-clared the new creation finished. We must reverently look at the dim reflection of the third as it is thrown upon us only from the word of God. The contemplation ought to be one of wonder and joy. As Abraham rejoiced to see the day of Christ in the distance, so may all the children of the faithful rejoice to see in the future the day for which all other days were made.-Pope, Compend new earth. The subjects which now present themselves for consideration may be classified as follows: (1) The Future State of the Impenitent; (2) The Eternal Blessedness of the Saints; and (3) The Final Consummation of the World, THE FUTURE STATE OF THE IMPENITENT The general judgment not only makes possible the bestowment of eternal blessedness upon the saints, but necessitates also the sentence of endless punishment upon the finally impenitent and wicked. The considera-tion of this subject brings before us one of the most solemn themes in the entire range of Christian theology. Dr. Asbury Lowrey says, “The simple thought of misery after death strikes with dread. The severity of that misery, to accord with Scripture representations, immeasurably expands the idea of woe, while its absolute eternity is enough to confound the sense and overwhelm with horror. . . . This consideration should suppress trifling, inspire caution, and wake concern. Nothing could be more unnatural and shocking than to make this doctrine a subject of jesting or the theme of vehement and vindictive declamation. Let none touch the question unless, with becoming solemnity, they can treat it as a note of alarm, sounded in the ear of guilty men for the sole purpose of impelling them to take refuge in Christ.” (LOWREY,Positive Theology, p. 269.) In our

treatment of this serious subject, we shall consider (1) The Development of the Doctrine in the Church; (2) Heretical Theories Concerning the Final State of the Wicked; (3) Scripture Terms Denoting the Place of Punishment; and (4) The Scriptural Doctrine of Eternal Punishment The Development of the Doctrine in the Church. In order to properly understand the objections that have

If we accept the truth of the Scriptures we must be loyal to their teaching on the question of future punishment, as on all others, and none the less so because of its fearful character. On no subject could the perversion of truth be more disastrous. While such perversion may neutralize the practical force of the truth, and induce a false sense of security, it is powerless to avert the doom of sin. Our only safety lies in the acceptance of the salvation in Christ Jesus.—Miley, Systematic Theology. 11. p. 462 been raised against this doctrine, it is necessary to review briefly the catholic position, and the various heretical opinions that have risen from time to time in the history of the Church. (1) In the ancient Church, it was the common opinion among the fathers, that the punishment of the wicked was of endless duration. Justin says that “Gehenna is the place where those will be punished who have lived wickedly”; Minucius Felix (100: 208) that “There is neither measure nor termination to these torments”; Cyprian (100: 258) that “An everburning Gehenna will burn up the condemned, and a punishment devouring with living flame; neither will there be any source whence at any time they may have either respite or end of their torments”; while Lactantius (100: 325) says that “They shall be burnt forever with perpetual fire in the sight of angels and the righteous.” The first and principal deviation from the catholic view of endless retribution was in the Alexandrine school, founded by Clement and Origen. Their position is thus stated, “The punishments of the condemned are not eternal, but only remedial; the devil himself being capable of amelioration.” Dr. Shedd points out that the question reduces itself to this, “whether the suffering to which Christ sentences the wicked is for the purpose of correcting and educating the transgressor, or of vindicating and satisfying the law he has broken: a question which is the key to the whole controversy. For if the individual criminal is of greater consequence than

Minucius Felix says, "there is neither measure nor termination to these torments. There the intelligent fire burns the limbs and restores them, feeds on them and nourishes them. As the fires of thunderbolts strike on the bodies and do not consume them, as the fires of Etna and Vesuvius glow, but are not wasted, so that penal fire is not fed by the waste of those who burn, but is nourished by unexhausted eating of their bodies.”

Origen’s Restorationism grew naturally out of his view of human liberty. He held that the liberty of indifference and the power of contrary choice, instead of simple self-determination, are the substance of freedom. These belong inalienably and forever to the nature of finite will. They cannot be destroyed, even by apostasy and sin. Consequently, there is forever a possibility of a self-conversion of the will in either direction. Free will may fall into sin at any time; and free will may turn to God at any time. This led to Origen’s theory of an endless alternation of falls and recoveries, of hells and heavens; so that practically he taught nothing but a hell.—Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 669 the universal law, then the suffering must refer principally to him and his interests. But if the law is of more importance than the individual, then the suffering must refer principally to it (SHEDD, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 668, 669). (2) The Mediaeval. Church was almost a unit in holding to the doctrine of endless punishment. Erigena (100: 850), however, was inclined toward the views of Origen, maintaining that the consciousness of sin and helplessness

would constitute the misery of the lost; but ultimately all things would be purified from evil, and return to God. Thomas Aquinas taught that Gehenna is situated under the surface of the earth, that darkness reigns there, and a real material fire. The orthodox mystics dwelt with painful elaboration on the subject of eternal torment. (3) The Reformers accepted the catholic belief in eternal punishment, but avoided all detail in their confessions. The Augsburg Confession (1530) contains only the simple statement that Christ “will give the pious and elect eternal life and perpetual joy, and will condemn impious men and devils to be tormented without end.” Since the Reformation, Annihilationism, Universalism and Restorationism have been affirmed at different times, but have never been generally accepted by the Church. (4) In modern times, Universalism grew up with German rationalism, and like deism before it, vehemently opposed this evangelical truth. The anti-rationalistic and mediating theologians, however, did much to spread the idea of universal salvation under the form of Restorationism. Schleiermacher and his school objected to the doctrine

Schleiermacher offers the following objections to eternal punishment. “(a) Christ’s words inMatthew 25:46;Mark 9:44;John 5:29are figurative. (b) The passage in I Cor. I 5:25, 26, teaches that all evil shall be overcome. (c) Misery cannot increase, but must decrease. If it is bodily misery, custom habituates to endurance, and there is less and less suffering instead of more and more. If, on the other hand, it is mental suffering, this is remorse. The damned suffer more remorse in hell than they do on earth. This proves that they are better men in hell than upon earth. They cannot, therefore, grow more wretched in hell, but grow less so as they grow more remorseful. (d) The sympathy which the saved have with their former companions, who are in hell, will prevent the happiness of the saved. The world of mankind, and also the whole universe, is so connected that the endless misery of a part will destroy the happiness of the remainder.” This is a fair sample of the rationalistic positions of that age of eternal punishment; Nitzsch taught restorationism, and Rothe contended for the doctrine of annihilation. Dorner concludes his discussion of endless punishment with the remark, that “We must be content with saying that the ultimate fate of individuals, namely, whether all will attain the blessed goal or not, remains veiled in mystery.”

Heretical Theories Concerning the Final State of the Wicked. While these heretical theories concerning the future state of the wicked reach back in some instances to the earlier periods of Church history, they have had their chief development in modern times. Four theories may be mentioned—Destructionism, Univer salism, Annihilationism and Restorationism

1. Destructionism is a term which was formerly used to express the materialistic belief that the soul is mortal and perishes with the body. Materialism as we have indicated (Cf. Volume I, p. 275) is that form of philosophy which gives priority to matter as the ground of the universe, and hence regards the soul as only rarefied material essence. Being material, the soul is not immortal, and therefore perishes with the body

2. Universalism is the doctrine that all men will be saved, and exists in several different forms. The earliest English congregation of Universalists was founded in 1760. The promoters of this doctrine were men who believed in the divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ, and that He suffered the penalty for all men. Hence they taught that sooner or later, in this world or in the next, all men would believe and be saved. This it will be noted is a form of universal restorationism. Another class of Universalists taught that sin would be punished but the sinner himself would be saved.

They based their doctrine on the Scripture, If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire (1 Corinthians 3:15). A grosser form of universalism was found in that of the Necessarians or Fatalists, who denied any distinction between sin and holiness, and held that "one man does the will of God as much as another. Every man answers the end for which he was made, and of course is a fair candidate for everlasting happiness." There are other forms of Universalism which are also Unitarian. They deny the divinity of Christ and the merit of His atonement. They admit that men are sinners in varying degrees, but hold that none are entirely so. Punishment of sin, they maintain, takes place in this life. They believe in a future life also, in which all will be gathered at the resurrection, and upon which all will enter, regardless of their characters formed upon earth. The scriptures already cited are a sufficient refutation of these false positions

3. Annihilationism holds that the souls of the wicked will be punished by destruction, which is interpreted to mean annihilation The form of this doctrine which is most popular in modern times, is based upon a belief in conditional immortality. Man's soul which survives his body, was created to be immortal, but by sin, this precious gift was forfeited. Christ died that men might

It may be stated in general, as to all the places which speak of destruction and death of the soul, that reference is made to its spiritual loss of God's favor and holines8, and not to the extinction of its being. This extinction would be contrary to the natural immortality conferred on spirit. It is not even true, so far as we can know, that even matter will ever be annihilated. What is called its destruction is simply such a change of form as makes it unfit for the uses for which it had been so formed. Thus we speak of the utter destruction of a house, of machinery, of an animal, not meaning the annihilation of the matter which composed it; but the destruction of the form in which that matter appeared, and which was essential for its use. In like manner, the death of the soul means its becoming unfit for the uses for which it was made, namely, for happiness, for holiness, for the service of God, for the complacent love of God and for the reflection of His image. Such an utter deprivation of all the faculties for which the moral nature of man was made, may well be called its death, even its utter destruction.—Boyce, An Abstract of Theology, p. 49 I

Many other objections to this hypothesis of annihilation might be mentioned, which do not affect theology so much as isolated interpretations of Scripture, and the psychological or physiological theories of human nature which it forces or tempts those who accept it to adopt. The student must be constantly on his guard as to both these points; otherwise he will be bewildered by the variety of plausible arguments with which both the heavier and the lighter literature on this subject abound. But, after all, it cannot be too habitually remembered that this solemn question does not depend upon isolated texts, nor upon speculations as to the nature of personality and consciousness. It is connected with the great principles and steadfast tendency of all the teaching of revelation, which everywhere speaks to man as an immortal being, having an eternal destiny, the issues of which are bound up with his use of the means provided of God for his salvation in this probationary state.—Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 444 be saved, and all who accept His offer, will receive in the most literal sense, the gift of eternal life. This gift is the restoration of the forfeited immortality, and is bestowed upon believers only. Hence in the resurrection, both the righteous and the wicked appear before God, but only those who have the gift of immortality will enter into His eternal kingdom. The wicked not being immortal, will be annihilated. Some hold that this takes place immediately; others, that there will be a longer or shorter period of suffering—but all teach

that ultimately the wicked will cease to exist. This theory claims support from such terms as diróX€ta which is sometimes translated “perdition” and sometimes “destruction”; and ~X€Opoc, generally translated destruction (1 Thessalonians 5:3; 2 Thessalonians 1:9; 1 Timothy 6:9). These words, however, do not mean annihilation, as other scripture references clearly indicate. Thus, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the ,wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he 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 for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name (Revelation 14:9-11). There is no way to evade the force of such scriptures as these, without a direct denial of their teaching concerning eternal punishment. Without further discussion, we may say, (1) that, the theory of annihilation contradicts the commonly received doctrine of immortality; (2) that annthilation cannot be regarded as a proper punishment for sin; (3) that it allows no degrees in punishment—a fact clearly expressed in the Scriptures; and (4) that the doctrine is out of harmony with general trend of scriptural truth

4. Restorationism is based upon the principle that punishment of sin is not so much retributive as disciplinary and reformatory; and therefore teaches that sinners, however intensely they may suffer in the will ultimately . be.- brought to holiness and heaven. While this is a form of universal salvation, it differs from what is commonly known as Universalim, in that it does not limit the punishment of sin to this life. Restorationism lays claim to the support of such scriptures as the following: (1) the general promise to Abraham, that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed

Dr. Wakefield gives the beat refutation of annihilationism, in our opinion, of any of the Protestant theologians. We can give only a summary of his position. He says:

I. That the term death, as applied to man in the Scriptures, ever means annihilation and that annihilation is the penalty of the divine law, are mere assumptions for which there is not the shadow of proof, and which we may very confidently deny. Indeed, to understand the term death in the sense of annihilation would turn many passages of scripture into downright nonsense, as a few examples will show. Thus: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death [annihilation] of his saints" (Psalms 116:15). "We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son" (Romans 5:10). "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans 7:24). "He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death" (1 John 3:14)

2. The theory is inconsistent with itself. Its advocates teach, not only that annihilation is the penalty of the law, but that it is the most dreadful of all punishments, even worse than endless suffering; and yet they maintain that the annihilation of the righteous between death and the resurrection is no punishment at all, but a real gain. Will the wicked suffer any more from annihilation between death and the resurrection than the righteous? Certainly not. And if the annihilation of the righteous at death is not the penalty of the law, how can the annihilation of the wicked be? If in the former case there is no infliction of punishment, how can the punishment be so dreadful in the latter? The system teaches, therefore, that annihilation is the penalty of the law and not the penalty; that it is a most dreadful punishment, and no punishment at all; and that the only difference between the righteous and the wicked, as far as this matter is concerned, is that the

former shall be annihilated once, the latter twice

3. That annihilation will not be the future punishment of the wicked is evident from the absurdity of supposing that they shall be raised again into existence merely to be annihilated. If annihilation is true, all men lose their personal identity at death; for it would be perfect folly to talk about continued existence of persons who are annihilated. If death is annihilation, a resurrection is impossible. There might be other moral beings created, but they could not be justly rewardable or punishable for the moral conduct of annihilated generations of men

4. If the future punishment of the wicked is to consist in annihilation, then all sinners will be punished alike; which is both unreasonable and unscriptural. But as there will be different degrees of future punishment, and as there cannot be different degrees of annihilation, therefore, annihilation cannot be that punishment. Again, to those who are suffering these supposed torments, annihilation would either be a curse or a blessing. If the former, a state of endless torment would be better for the sinner than a release from all suffering by annihilation; and if the latter, annihilation cannot be the penalty of the law, unless it can be made to appear that a penalty and a blessing wre the- same rhjng.-Wakef eld, Ehriatian Theology, pp. (47, 60,

(Genesis 22:17-18; Genesis 26:4; Genesis 28:14;Galatians 3:8-16) ; (2) that Christ tasted death for every man, and consequently is the Savior of all men (Hebrews 2:9;1 Timothy 4:10) ; (3) that God wills the salvation of every man (1 Timothy 2:4) ; (4) that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (Php 2:10-11) ; and (5) that death itself shall be destroyed (1 Corinthians 15:26; 1 Corinthians 15:54). Reference is also made to the purpose of God to gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him (Ephesians 1:10) ; and also the pleasure of the Father to reconcile all things unto himself; whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven (Colossians 1:19) . A careful study of these scriptures and their contexts, however, makes it clear that they do not support the doctrine of restorationism

T hg ~cripture T_erms-D,e2g1fng..the _Placa-4:-P-unishment. There are three words translated ".min the Au--tborized Version of the New Testament-Hades, Tarta .,qnd Gehenna. (1) Hades refers--ta:-t4e.realm of the dead, and the distinctions between place and state have already--been discussed. (2) Tartarus appears only in the _part cjple.f.Qrm,_f.the.verb..z%pFpapoc~z which means to cast down to Tartarus. It is found only in 2 Peter 2:4-For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [TapTap"a-as], and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. We may, therefore, regard Hades as the

It would be easy to show, however, by careful examination of all such passages (the references cited above), that they do not prove the doctrine in support of which they are adduced; but such an examination is uncalled for at this point. It is only necessary to remark, (1) that the blessing which comes upon all men through the seed of Abraham, does not necessarily imply the actual salvation of all. (2) That though Christ died for all men, and is, in this respect as well as in others, the Savior of all men, yet He is the special Savior only "of those that believe." (3) That God wills the salvation of all men, but only in the appointed way, that is, "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," and not whether they believe in Christ or not. (4) That all men shall bow to Christ and acknowledge Him, either by a voluntary reception of His grace and salvation, or by a constrained subjection to His avenging justice; and (5) That death shall be destroyed when "all that are in the

graves shall hear" the voice of Christ "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," -Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 644 intermediate state of wicked men, and Tartarus as the intermediate state of wicked angels. (3) Gehenna is compounded from the two Hebrew words Ge an Hinnom, and means "the valley of Hinnom." In the New Testament it is called Gehenna (y€evva), and appears twelve times (Matthew 5:22; Matthew 5:29-30; Matthew 10:28; Matthew 18:9; Matthew 23:15; Matthew 23:33; Mark 9:43; Mark 9:45; Mark 9:47; Luke 12:5 and James 3:6). In all of these places, the word refers to torture and punishrnent in the future world. In Matthew 18:9 the word Gehenna isi associated with the punishment to be meted out at the judgment; and in the preceding verse, the words "everlasting fire" are used as its equivalent. In Mark 9:43, Jesus says, It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched [ao-, a-rov or inextinguishable] : where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched [o~ a-,&vvv-rac] ; in Luke 12:5, the words of Christ are, Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell [Gehenna]. It is frequently pointed out, that of the twelve passages in the New Testament in which the word Gehenna occurs, all were used by Christ himself, except that in James 3:6. The word "hell," therefore, in the sense of Gehenna, refers to the place provided for the final punishment of evil,angels..and impenitent- men, after the day of judgment-the intermediate Hades of the wicked, and the Tartarus.of the fallen angels, already anticipating the horrors of Gehenna in the same sense- that Paradise anticipates the joys of heaven

Bishop Weaver says, that in arriving at the meaning of any generic term, we must not only take the definition of the word, but it must be such a definition as will agree with the context. This general rule shouldbe observed in determining the meaning of all generic words. Because the word "Gehenna" literally signified the valley of Hinnom, we are not thence to conclude that it was never used in any other sense. The proper meaning must be determined by the connection in which it is used. The original meaning of the word "Paradise" is, "a place inclosed for pleasure and delight." In the Old Testament, it is used in reference to the garden of Eden. In the New Testament it is used as another name for heaven (Luke 23:43;2 Corinthians 12:4;Revelation 2:7). If, because the word "Gehenna " literally signifies the valley of Hinnom, it never means anything else, then Paradise never means anything else than the garden of Eden, or a place on earth inclosed for pleasure and delight. (Cf. Weaver, Christian Theology, p. 323.)

The„ Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, as. Taught in the Scriptures. As in aYI matters which concern the future, the Scriptures must be our sole authority. We shall, therefore, in our study of this subject, arrange the scriptures in answer to three important questions which commonly arise: (1) Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of future punishment? (2) What is the nature of this punishment? and (3) Is this punishment eternal?

1. Do the Scriptures teac e dQgtx9aae ue punish` meWn~~e mere perusal of Christ's,tW Ws, without any note or comment, should convince the un„pye judiced reader, that.. e taught lijr,,,.:.fut e t. The following should be carefully studied. T en wil11 profess unto them, I never knew you: de

Watson's Dictionary, Article Hell. This is a Saxon word, which is derived from a verb which signifies to hide or conceal. A late eminent Bible critic, Dr. Campbell, has investigated this subject with his usualaccuracy; and the following is the substance of his remarks: In the Hebrew

Scriptures the word sheol frequently occurs, and uniformly he thinks, denotes the state of the dead in general, without regard to the virtuous or vicious characters of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the LXX have almost invariably used the Greek term a1S77s, hades, which means the receptacle of the dead, and ought rarely to have been translated hell, in the sense in which we now use it, namely, as the place of torment. To denote this latter object, the New Testament writers always make use of the Greek word 7Eevva, which is compounded of two Hebrew words Ge Hinnom, that is, "The Valley of Hinnom," a place near Jerusalem, in which children were cruelly sacrificed by fire to Moloch, the idol of the Ammonites (2 Chronicles 33:6). This place was also called Tophet (2 Kings 23:10) alluding, as is supposed, to the noise of drums (toph signifying a drum) there raised to drown the cries of helpless infants. As in process of time this place came to be considered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state, the name Tophet came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it. In this sense, also, the word gehenna, a synonymous term, is always to be understood in the New Testament, where it occurs about a dozen times. The confusion that has arisen on this subject has been occasioned not only by our English translators having rendered the Hebrew word sheol and the Greek word gehenna frequently by the term hell; but the Greek word hades, which occurs eleven times in the New Testament, is in every instance, except one, translated by the same English word, which it ought never to have been

Stuart says, while the Old Testament employs sheol, in most cases to designate the grave, the region of the dead, the place of the departed spirits, it employs it also, in some cases, to designate along with this idea the adjunct one of the place of misery, place of punishment, place of woe. In this respect it accords fully with the New Testament use of hades. For though hades signifies the grave, and often the invisible region of separate spirits, without reference to their condition, yet inLuke 16:23, it is clearly used for a place and condition of misery. The word hell is also used by our translators for gehenna, which means the world of future punishment.-Stuart, Essay on Future Punishment part from me, ye that work iniquity (Matthew 7:23); And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Matthew 10:28) ; The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and theyshall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matthew 13:41-42) ; So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matthew 13:49-50) ; Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: and these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal (Matthew 25:41; Matthew 25:46); For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? (Mark 8:36) ; And if thy hand offend-thee, cut it off: it is better for thee 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 (Mark 9:43-44 cf. vs. 45-48) ; The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom (Luke 16:22-23) ; and Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done The miseries of the wicked, previous to the resurrection, must be purely spiritual; but, after that event, they will be, in part, corporeal. They will consist in the loss, the absence, of everything desirable, and in the infliction of positive, unmingled, sufferings. The

rich man in hell is said to have received his good things; implying that no more good remained for him. Accordingly, he was denied a drop of water to cool his burning tongue. The wickedinhell are said to "have no rest day nor night." "The wine of the wrath of God is poured out without mixture into their cup" (Revelation 14:10). They will endure the tortures of an ever-accusing, stinging conscience. They will suffer from the indulgence of unsated malice, envy, revenge, rage, and every other hateful passion of which they are capable. They will suffer from perpetual disappointment, defeat, and despair. They will suffer from one another. They will suffer all that is implied in those awful figures, those appalling representations, by which the Holy Spirit has set forth their agonies.Pn-l_ Ch-t;- Th-l- „ 57A good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation (John 5:28-29). The solemn truth taught in these scriptures is, that those who reject Christ and the salvation offered through Him, shall die in their sins and be separated from God forever. Many learned men have sought to explain away this truth as contrary to the goodness of God, but the simple fact still remains that God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall o f the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting (Galatians 6:7-8). This present life is one of probation, and following it must be the eternal consequences. This is no more than simple

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 the 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 of 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 the Scripture. The reverse is the case. It is a doctrine which the natural heart revolts from the 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.-Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, p. 870

We have already admitted that the language of Scripture on this subject is more or less figurative; but whether it is figurative or otherwise, of one thing we may be sure, that it was intended to convey ideas strictly conformable to truth. God can no more make a false impression on the human mind by use of figures, than he can lead men into error by the plainest and most positive declarations; for both alike would be contrary to the divine veracity. Nor will his goodness, any more than his truth, allow him to alarm his moral creatures with groundless fears or to represent the consequences of sin as more dreadful than they really are. We may therefore safely conclude, that the future state of the wicked, as to its general character, will be one of intense suffering; for, to suppose that it will be more tolerable than absolute darkness, the agonies of death, and the action of fire, is virtually to charge God with the utterance of falsehood, and to set up our own standard in opposition to divine revelation. This intense suffering which will be the portion of the ungodly, will arise (I) from what is called the punishment of loss . . . and (2) from the punishment of

sense.-Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 642 justice, and every person of sincerity must admit that the principles here laid down are eternally just

2. What will-be the--r3 t nature of future ishment The terms which are used in the Scriptures to express the idea of future punishment, must of necessity be in part figurative. Only by comparing it with that which is within our mental grasp, are we able to understand even in a small measure, something of this solemn truth. The following terms are used in the Scriptures to express the nature of future punishment: (1) .," called the second death. This is the term used by St. John n in h Apocalypse. But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death (Revelation 21:8 cf. Revelation 20:14-15). The fear of death brought the whole race of men into bondage (Hebrews 2:15) . It is surrounded with gloom and terror, and is the source of tormenting fears. Then sentence of death cannot be executed while the sinner lives, but comes as an unescapable consequence at the judgment, because of the withdrawal of the remedy of grace. During his lifetime, the corruption of his soul was mitigated by prevenient and restraining grace, but at death he becomes eternally exposed to the corruption of his own soul without this mitigation. Thus the second death is the only possible condition of the unregenerate in the world to come. We have pointed out that physical death is a change which indicates the corruption consequent upon sin; we may now reverse the order and say that the second death is that spiritual corruption of which physical death is the visible type. Physical death is soon over, but here is a death that never dies-where groanings shall never cease, and

"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matthew 25:41). These words are not only pronounced against them by the Son of man, they echo against them from the depths of their own being, from the abused divine likeness in themselves, they echo against them from all ranges of the creation, which now unanimously bear witness for Him. There is no more peace in the glorified creation for those who are thus condemned; they must be separated therefrom, and to any inquiry concerning their state, we have no other answer than this, "outer darkness."-Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 474 agony never end. (2) Our rd_speaks of future punishment as outer_ c> ness It is to be noted also, that in ment as outer each instance, He associates this darkness with weeping and gnashing of teeth (Cf. Matthew 8:12; Matthew 22:13; Matthew 25:30). St. Peter speaks of the chains o f darkness, and the mist o f darkness reserved for the ungodly forever (2 Peter 2:4; 2 Peter 2:17) ; while St. Jude speaks o f the evil angels which are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day (Jude 1:6) ; and again, of the blackness of darkness forever (Jude 1:13). Dr. Wakefield speaks of this darkness as resembling "the deep midnight of the grave, lengthening onward from age to age, and terminated by no succeeding day." "Let this darkness be understood literally," says Dr. Ralston, "and it denotes a condition inexpressibly horrible. We have read of a darkness in Egypt so thick that it could `be felt'; we have tried to imagine the cloud of gloom that would soon envelop our world, if the light of the sun and every star were to be instantly and completely quenched; but how indescribably inadequate must be these illustrations to portray the horrors of that `outer darkness' into which the wicked will be driven, and by which they will be forever overwhelmed!" (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, p. 520). (3) it is described as a state of positive punishment. Our Lord himself informs us that the wicked shall be cast into a furnace o f fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matthew 13:42) ;

while St. Paul speaks of the Lord as being 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 (2 Thessalonians 1:7-8). Attempts have been made to tone down the severity of these scriptures by regarding them as purely

Dr. Charles Hodge states that "the sufferings of the finally impenitent, according to the Scriptures, arise: (1) From the loss of all earthly good. (2) From the exclusion from the presence and favor 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 evil associates. (8) From their external circumstances; that is, future suffering is not exclusively the natural consequence of sin, but also includes positive inflections. (9) From their perpetuity."-Hodge, Systematic Theology, 111, p. 868 figurative. But the figure never fully portrays the reality; and the reasonable conclusion is, therefore, that the fire of future punishment, if not literal, will be infinitely more intolerable. (4) Future punishment is further described as banishment from God is is worst form of punis ment conceivable---before which death, everlasting fire, and the blackness of darkness are as nothing. God is the author of every good and every perfect gift, and the loss of God is the loss of all good. The words, Depart from me, ye cursed (Matthew 25:41) indicate a loss of light and love, of friendship, of beauty and song-the loss of even hope itself. To be banished from God is to be forever separated from heaven and all good. Such are the solemn representations which the Holy Spirit has seen proper to make concerning the state of the finally impenitent and the nature of their punishment

3. Is future punishment eternal? Since this question has been answered in the negative by some, a careful consideration of the subject necessitates a study of the word autohog, which in the Scriptures is rendered everlasting or eternal. The word aicriv, as the substantive from which the adjective alWVCos is derived, signifies an "age," and denotes indefinite duration-that is, it does not of itself determine the length or duration of the age. Thus the Creator has an alaiv and the creature has an alcov, but the former is infinite and the latter finite. Behold, thou hast made my days as an handbreadth; and mine age is as nothing before thee (Psalms 39:5). Dr. Shedd, who made an excellent study of this question, says, that "In reference to man and his existence, the Scriptures speak of two, and only two alWves, or ages; one finite, and one infinite; one limited, and one endless; the latter succeeding the former.... The two aeons, or ages, known in Scripture, are mentioned together in Matthew 12:32, It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world [aiwv], neither in the world [aiwv] to come; in Mark 10:30, But he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time [rcatpos],. . . and in the world [alcev] to come, eternal life; in Luke 18:30, Who

Since the word aeon (aiwv), or age, in Scripture, may denote either the present finite age, or the future endless age, in order to determine the meaning of "aeonian" (al6vsos), it is necessary first to determine in which of the two aeons, the limited or the endless, the thing exists to which the epithet is applied; because anything in either aeon may be denominated "aeonian." The adjective follows its substantive, in meaning. Onesimus, as a slave, existed in this world (aiwv) of "time," and when he is called "aeonian" or "everlasting" (ai6vtos) servant (Philemon 15), it is meant that his servitude continues as long as the finite aeon in which he is a servant; and this is practically at an end for him, when he dies and leaves it. The mountains are denominated aeonian, or "everlasting" (aidrvta), in the sense that they endure as long as the finite world (aiwwv) of which they are a part endures. God, on the other hand, is a Being that exists in the infinite alawv, and is

therefore aiwVLos in the endless signification of the word. The same is true of the spirits of angels and men, because they exist in the future aeon, as well as in the present one. If anything belongs solely to the present age, or aeon, it is aeonian in the limited signification; if it belongs to the future age, or aeon, it is aeonian in the unlimited signification. If, therefore, the punishment of the wicked occurs in the present aeon, it is aeonian in the sense of temporal; but if it occurs in the future aeon, it is aeonian in the sense of endless. The adjective takes its meaning from the noun. The English word "forever" has the same twofold meaning, both in Scripture and in common use. Sometimes it means as long as a man lives upon earth. The Hebrew servant that had his ear bored with an awl to the door of his master, was to be his servant "forever" (Exodus 21:6). Sometimes it means as long as the Jewish state should last. The ceremonial laws were to be statutes "forever" (Leviticus 16:34). Sometimes it means, as long as the world stands. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but the earth abideth forever" (Ecclesiastes 1:4). In all such instances, "forever" refers to the temporal aeon, and denotes finite duration. But in other instances, and they are the great majority in Scripture, "forever" refers to the endless aeon; as when it is said that "God is over all blessed forever." The limited signification of "forever" in the former cases, does not disprove its unlimited signification in the latter. That Onesimus was an everlasting" (aiwVLOS) servant, and that the hills are "everlasting" (atwna), no more disproves the everlastingness of God, and the soul; of heaven, and of hell; than the term "forever" in a title deed disproves it. To hold land "forever" is to hold it "as long as grass grows and water runs" that is, as long as this world, or aeon, endures. The objection that because al6veos, or aeonian, denotes "that which belongs to an age," it cannot mean endless, rests upon the assumption that there is no endless aiwv, or age. It postulates an indefinite series of limited aeons, or ages, no one of which is final and everlasting. But the texts that have been cited disprove this. Scripture speaks of but two aeons, which cover and include the whole existence of man, and his whole duration. If, therefore, he is an immortal being, one of these must be endless. The phrase "ages of ages," applied to the future endless age, does not prove that there is more than one future age, and more than the phrase "the eternities" proves that there is more than one eternity; or the phrase the infinities" proves that there is more than one infinity. The plural in these cases is rhetorical and intensive, not arithmetical in its force (Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 686-688). Dr. Shedd holds that an indefinite series of limited aeons with no final endless aeon, is a Pagan and Gnostic, not a biblical conception. The importation of the notion of an endless series of finite cycles, each of which is without finality and immutability, into the Christian system, has introduced error, similarly as the importation of the Pagan conception of Hades has (cf. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 682, 683) shall not receive manifold more in this present time [rcatpos], and in the world [aiWv] to come, life everlasting; in Ephesians 1:21, Above ... every name that is named, not only in this world [aiWv], but also in that which is to come. The things present, and the things to come, mentioned in Romans 8:38 and 1 Corinthians 3:22, refer to the same two ages. These two aeons, or ages, correspond to the two durations of `time' and `eternity,' in the common use of these terms. The present age, or aeon, is `time'; the future age, or aeon, is `eternity.' " (SHEDD, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 682-686). The present or limited aeon is denominated in Scripture, "this world" (Matthew 12:32; Matthew 13:22;Luke 16:8; Luke 20:34;Romans 12:2;1 Corinthians 1:20;1 Corinthians 2:6). The future or infinite and endless aeon, is called "the future world," "the world to come,"

` or "that world" (Cf. Matthew 12:32;Hebrews 2:5; Hebrews 6:5;Mark 10:30;Luke 18:30; Luke 20:35) With this study of the words al(dvtog and alto')v, we may now note their application in the

following scriptures: Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee,cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting [atUVtov] fire (Matthew 18:8). St. Mark uses this same scripture but adds the words into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is

It is also the doctrine of Scripture, that this future punishment of the incorrigible shall be final and unlimited; another consideration of great importance in considering the doctrine of the atonement. This is a monitory doctrine which a revelation could only unfold; but being made, it has no inconsiderable degree of rational evidence. It supposes, it is true, that no future trial shall be allowed to man, the present having been neglected and abused; and to this there is much analogy in the constant procedures of the divine government in the present life. When many checks and admonitions from the instructions of the wise, and the examples of the froward, have been disregarded, poverty and sickness, infamy and death, ensue, in a thousand cases which the observation of every.man will furnish; the trial of an individual, which is to issue in his present happiness or misery, is terminated;'and so far from its being renewed frequently, in the hope of his finally profiting by a bitter experience, advantages and opportunities, once thrown away, can never be recalled. There is nothing, therefore, contrary to the obvious principles of the divine government as manifested in this life, in the doctrine which confines the space of man's highest and most solemn probation within certain limits, and beyond them cutting off all his hope.-Watson, Theological Institutes, I, p. 211 not quenched (Mark 9:43-44). He also says, But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation (Mark 3:29). St. John says, He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting [aiWvtov] life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath o f God abideth on him (John 3:36). In the description of the judgment found in Matthew 25:31-46, Jesus says to those on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting [ahxivtov] fire, prepared for the devil and his angels; and the scene closes with the words, And these shall go away into everlasting [alWvtov] punishment: but the

Stuart in his "Exegetical Essays" states that "atwvcos is employed 66 times in the New Testament. Of these, 51 relate to the future happiness of the righteous; 7 relate to the future punishment: namely, Matthew 18:8; Matthew 25:41; Matthew 25:46; Mark 3:29; 1 Thessalonians 1:9; Hebrews 6:2; Jude 6: 2 relate to God; 6 are of a miscellaneous nature (5 relating to confessedly endless things, as covenants, invisibilities; and one, in Philemon 1:15, to a perpetual service). In all the instances in which aiwvcos refers to future duration, it denotes endless duration; saying nothing of the instances in which it refers to future punishment." The younger Edwards says that al6v, reckoning the reduplications of it, to be single instances of its use, occurs in the New Testament in 104 instances; in 32 of which it means a limited duration. In 7 instances it may be taken in either the limited or endless sense. In 65 instances, including 6 instances in which it is applied to future punishment, it plainly signifies an endless duration. (Both of these notes are quoted in Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, pp. 688, 689.) The Greek words atrw and alwvcos literally and properly denote endless duration. Their etymology (ael and my-being or existing always) shows this. Their ordinary use and signification show the same. They as properly denote an endless duration as our English words eternal and everlasting. They are sometimes used, like the English words, in a restricted sense-restricted by the nature of the subject to which they are applied; but in such cases

the connection readily indicates the sense, so that there is little danger of error. But we are not left to the general meaning of these words, however satisfactory they may be. The word alcuveos is so used by our Savior, in reference to the future punishment of the wicked, as to show, conclusively, that it must denote an endless duration. I refer particularly to the passage (Matthew 25:46) where the future punishment of the wicked, and the future happiness of the righteous are set over against each other, and the same term alorvcos is applied to both; thus indicating that the duration of both is equal and endless.-Pond, Christian Theology, p. 581 The materialistic interpretation of its figurative representations, as held in the earlier centuries, and particularly by the mediaeval church, is now discarded and replaced by a more rational and truthful interpretation. But through all these differences and disputations a very remarkable unanimity has remained respecting the duration of such punishment. On this question the best scholarship of today is in full accord with the historic doctrine of the Church. This is a significant fact, and the more so because such accordance is not from any predilection or preference, but simply by constraint of the plain sense of Scripture.-Miley, Systematic Theology, II, pp. 470, 471 righteous into life eternal [ai&Svtov]. If by these statements our Lord does not mean eternal punishment, what significance can possibly attach to them? The word at0wtos is the strongest word in the New Testament to express the duration of happiness. If, therefore, we limit the meaning of the word in relation to the wicked, we must also limit it in relation to the righteous, so that we shall then have neither a future heaven nor hell. "I have seen," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "the best things that have been written in favor of the final redemption of damned spirits, but I never saw an answer to the argument against the doctrine, drawn from this verse, but that sound learning and criticism should be ashamed to acknowledge." The objections which are urged against eternal punishment may generally be reduced to these two: (1) It is objected that the punishment is disproportionate to the sin. This objection, as Dr. Asbury Lowrey points out, is based upon a low estimate of the nature of sin. He says, "The objection to the eternity of hell is made to appear contrary to divine justice and repugnant to the divine nature by two false assumptions: first, that sin, especially when it is connected with the moral life, possesses so little turpitude, that it may be regarded as a human frailty or weakness; and second, that sin will not disturb any principle of the moral government of the universal Ruler, except only so far as the province of earth and the human family are concerned." (LOWREY, Positive Theology, pp. 276, 277.) (2) It is objected that

Dr. Luther Lee declares that "the sentence which will be passed upon sinners, by the righteous judgment of God, at the last day, will be irrevocable. This must appear from a consideration of the immuta bility of God, the fudge. Immutability is that perfection of God, whi h renders Him eternally unchangeable. The force of this is plain. ich change by way of repentance and regeneration can take place in the sinner, after being condemned at the last judgment and sent to hell. The atonement of merits of Christ’s death, and the advantages of His intercession, will after the day of judgment, no longer be available, and hence, all the benefits of the same, including the efficacy of prayer, and the agency of the Holy Ghost, will be forever lost. For God to condemn a sinner and send him to hell, at one time, and then revoke the sentence and recall him from his infernal prison, while he is yet the same in moral character, is to act differently at different times, in view of the same moral principles; which implies change or mutability.-Lee, Elements of Theology, p. 325

God is too merciful to inflict everlasting punishment upon His creatures. Here, again, there is a low estimate of sin. God’s mercy and His justice are never in conflict with each other. As previously

indicated, Jesus Christ himself, during His earthly ministry, gave to the Church its severest declarations concerning this solemn truth. The opponents of the doctrine, therefore, are brought into direct opposition to Him who sufferedthe just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God (1 Peter 3:18) THE ETERNAL BLESSEDNESS OF THE SAINTS The Scriptures have more to say of the eternal blessedness of the saints, than of the final state of the wicked; but the subject being less controversial, has generally occupied less space in theology. God's grace which warns the wicked against the day of wrath, assures the righteous also, of their eternal blessedness. In our treat The Christian Gospel-the universal offer of pardon through the self-sacrifice of one of the Divine Persons-should silence every objection to the doctrine of endless punishment. For as the case now stands, there is no necessity, as far as the action of God is concerned, that a single human being should ever be the subject of future punishment. The necessity of hell is founded in the action of the creature, not of the Creator. Had there been no sin, there would have been no hell; and sin is the product of man's free will. And after the entrance of sin and the provision of redemption from it, had there been universal repentance in this life, there would have been no hell for man in the next life. The only necessitating reason, therefore, for endless retribution that now exists, is the sinners impenitence. Should every human individual, before he dies, sorrow for sin, and humbly confess it, Hades and Gehenna would disappear.-Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 749

Those who deny the position that sin is an infinite evil forget that the principle upon which it rests is one of the commonplaces of jurisprudence: the principle, namely, that crime depends upon the object against whom it is committed as well as upon the subject who commits it. The merely subjective reference of an act is not sufficient to determine whether it is a crime. The act may have been the voluntary act of a person, but unless it is also an offense against another person, it is no crime. To strike is a voluntary act; but to strike a post or a stone is not a culpable act. Furthermore, not only crime, but degrees of crime depend upon the objective reference of a personal act. . . . One and the same act may be simultaneously an offense against an individual, a family, a state, and God. Measured by the nature and qualities of the offender himself, it has no degrees. But measured by the nature and qualities of these moral objects against whom it is committed, it has degrees of turpitude. As the first three are only finite in worth and dignity, the culpability is only certain degrees of the finite. As the last is infinite in worth and dignity, the culpability is infinite also. (Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, II, p. 750 cf. Edwards: Justice of Clod, Works, IV, 228.) ment of this subject, we shall consider (1) Heaven as a Place and a State; (2) The Blessedness of the Saints; (3) The Employments of Heaven; and (4) The Endless Duration of Heaven Heaven- Is oth a placeand a state That at heaven is a state of eternal blessedness is admitted. by _all. But heaven is a a place also ` in our d iscussion of the Intermediate State, we pointed out the scriptural teaching that both heaven and hell are places, and that at death, souls enter the one or the other. There they await the judgment which shall fix their final state with its rewards or punishments. Heaven therefore, as we „must now view it, is. the abode. o _ e righteous in their final state of"glorification. It is perhaps impossible to speak. o p ace in reference to spiritual bodies, in the same sense that we use the term when speaking of the present bodies of flesh and blood. We know, however, that Jesus comforted His sorrowing disciples with the words, In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And i f I go and prepare a place for you, I will

There is a blessed state beyond this life, of which we cannot speak minutely as if we had seen it, but of which we can speak confidently because we know the principle of it. The man who has entered it is present with God and with Christ, in a clearer and truer consciousness of the divine presence than was possible on earth, and enters upon the higher stages of that divine life which has already been begun. He is living the life of progressive holiness; he is like his Lord and Savior, and is ever growing more like Him, advancing to perfection. He is under the most holy and inspiring influences, where all that is best in him is constantly helped to increase. All characteristic activities of the Christlike life are open to him. The grade of being in which he finds himself is higher than that which he has left, and fresh opportunities of holy service and of holy growth and blessedness are constantly set before him. He is in the life that he loves and ought to love, and the course of free and Godlike activity stretches on before him without end.-Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology, pp. 471, 472

God and blessed spirits are the exhaustless constituents of the life of bliss. Each spirit not only reflects God, but the entire kingdom of which he is a member. When God shall be all in all, it may be said that all are in all, in one another; and the multiplicity of charismata unfolds itself, in this unlimited and undarkened reflection of love and contemplation; in this ever new alteration of giving and receiving, of communication and receptivity. The medium by which the blessed in a spiritual manner communicate with each other, and are in each other, we designate as light (Colossians 1:12), according to the indications given in Scripture, and we take this word in both a spiritual and corporeal sense. Thus we read of "the inheritance of the saints in light."Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 488 come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also (John 14:2-3). But we need not here discuss the relation of the spiritual body to space. The Scriptures speak of the physical heavens above us, but they also speak of a third heaven, where God dwells and where His presence is manifested in ’a peculiarly indescribable sense. St. Paul speaks of being caught up into this highest heaven-whether in the body or out of the body, he could not tell, and having heard there, words which could not be uttered. It is commonly supposed that this was the occasion when he saw the glorified body of Jesus (1 Corinthians 9:1) . Stephen looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God (Acts 7:55) ; and St. Paul tells us that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (2 Corinthians 5:8). We need not, therefore, think of the soul as having to travel long distances spatially, in order to enter heaven. The distance is not to be conceived in terms of physical space, but of changed conditions. At the ascension Jesus was taken up into heaven, and a cloud received Him out The heaven of the saints will therefore not be a realm of shades, unsubstantial and indeterminate, but a kingdom substantial and real, where the faculties and functions of human personality will be active in the joy of righteous freedom. Like the capacities of the soul, the powers of the body will be commensurate with the law and vocation of the everlasting life. These are they which have come out of the Great Tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God; and they serve Him day and night in His temple: and He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them. They shall hunger no more; neither shall the sun strike upon them, nor any heat: for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life, and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes.-Gerhart, Institutes of the Christian Religion, II, pp. 914, 915 When the teaching of the New Testament regarding the after life is carefully considered, the question naturally rises, "What difference is

there between Paradise and heaven? What is the distinction between the life of departed believers before the judgment and after it?" The answer should embrace four particulars: in heaven a physical organism is bestowed upon the soul; the Church will be complete and perfected; the universe will be brought into harmony with the spiritual needs and longings of the Christian soul; a new and clearer vision of God will be opened to believers. At the resurrection and judgment the spirit will be clothed anew with a material framework which is so completely in harmony with the thoughts and desires of the Spirit that it is itself designated a spiritual body.-Clapperton, The Essentials of Theology, p. 461 of sight (Gets 1: 9) : Heaven, therefore, is just behind the veil, which so often but "thinly intervenes," as marking that which to us is visible, and that which is beyond the range of mortal sight. The word apocalypse means an unveiling, and at death, the righteous pass through this veil into the beatific vision of Christ. This to the redeemed soul is heaven. But as the cloud veiled Jesus from the sight of the disciples, so also, He will come again with clouds, that is, He will burst through the veil in an apocalypse, and be revealed from heaven in majesty and power. When also, St. Paul speaks of Jesus as having ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things (Ephesians 4:10), he is not speaking primarily of physical distance, but of his glorious majesty and the fullness of His redeeming grace. Heaven, there

, will be a place, the eternal abode of all the redeemed of all the ages

St. John states specifically, that he saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband (Rev 21:2) ; and again, he heard the words, Come hither, 1 will show thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife (Revelation 21:9) The Scriptures ever represent heaven as a place. This is so plain a fact that it hardly needs any illustration. Our Lord represented it as a place or mansion in His Father’s house (John 14:1-3); St. Paul, as abuilding of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (2 Corinthians 5:1). Again, it is the temple of God, the place of His throne and glory (Revelation 7:9-17); and a great city, the holy Jerusalem (Revelation 21:10). No doubt these are figurative representations of heaven; but that does not affect the underlying reality of place.-Miley, Systematic Theology, p. 473

Dr. Gerhart while regarding heaven as having substantial reality, emphasizes the difference between the present earthly order, and the future spiritual order. He says, "Heaven is the domain of uncreatedglory, in which God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, lives the life of absolute love in fellowship with Himself. Heaven, the self-produced oticfa of God, is eternal, supernatural, transcendent. It is not a part of the created universe. It may not be located. Heaven is the form of existence which differs essentially from the present economy of mankind or of the cosmos, as the Creator differs from His creation Nor may we think of heaven as an abode which is separated from.us conformably to the laws of nature-space or nature-time. Considered from this point of view, heaven is neither far from us nor near us. The conception is equally defective, whether we imagine the ohcla of God to be locally present or locally distant. Like God himself, the sphere of His essential glory does not, objectively, exist under the conditions of any natural or earthly category.-Gerhart, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 11, pp. 889, 890

These references clearly indicate that the apostle is speaking of the Church in her perfected glory. Other passages, however, seem to refer to the Church militant on earth. Thus, they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it (Revelation 21:26). One passage seems to blend the militant and triumphant aspects of the Church in a single statement-And the nations o f them which are

saved shall walk in the light of it, referring to the light which streams down from the Jerusalem which is above; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it-referring to the Church Militant on earth (Revelation 21:24). Dr. Adam Clarke's comment is significant, as indicating the quick transition in thought from the Church Militant to the Church Triumphant. On Revelation 21:2 concerning the new Jerusalem he says, "This doubtless means the Christian Church in a state of great prosperity and purity"; while the declaration, "there shall be no more death," he applies to the Church after the resurrection. Dr. Ralston thinks that the true interpretation of the last three chapters of the Apocalypse is this: "In the preceding part of Revelation a prophetic sketch had been given of the history of the Church to the commencement of Christ's millennial reign. In the last three chapters the millennial reign of 'Christ, the solemn events of the resurrection, the general judgment, and the glories of the future state, are depicted. As the millennial reign of Christ with His saints on earth will precede, and is typical of, His triumphant reign with them in the heavenly state, the most rational inference is, that both of these states are included. The burden of this description unquestionably relates to the heavenly state; yet, as both the millennial and heavenly glory are connected with the mediatorial reign of Christ, the one unfolding its greatest triumphs in this world and the other revealing its final issues in the world to come, it is but natural that the description of both should be blended. The triumphs of Christ's mediatorial reign on earth, and its rewards in heaven, are, in an important sense, one." (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, pp. 535, 536.) As the one Church is sometimes viewed as militant, and at other times as triumphant, so if we mistake not, the concluding chapters of the Apocalypse, open up the prospect of a new and eternal order, in which the old boundary line between heaven and earth is effaced, and the latter inhabited by redeemed and glorified beings, has in itself become a part of heaven. Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God (Revelation 21:3)

The, Bl ssedness of the Saints. While the nature of future happiness cannot be known in this life, the Scriptures give us many intimations of what God has prepared for them that love Him. (1) Heaven will be a place from which all sin_ and unrighteousness shall be banished forever. There shall in no wise enter into it any thingth at defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie (Revelation 21:27). No unholy thing shall ever enter the abode of the blessed, nor shall the saints ever feel the sinister influence of Satan or wicked men. (2) It _will be a place where the penal consequences of sin are all. removed. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed In referring to the description of the new Jerusalem, Dr. Ralston says, "But the question is often asked: Are these descriptions figurative, or are they literal? It is generally assumed that they are figura tive. Perhaps they are. But we dare not affirm that they are entirely so. The human body, in the resurrection, will be the identical body that we have here: yet it will be changed into a 'spiritual body'; it will be 'fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body'; even so, for aught we know, when the new heaven and the new earth' shall be created, God may produce new substances of gold and precious stones, so refined and spiritualized, that they will far transcend those metals, as known on earth, as will the spiritual bodies of the saints the 'vile bodies' they now possess. And if this be correct (and who can say that it is not?) then the descriptions here given of the magnificent city which shall be the final habitation of the people of God may be different from the literal acceptation only in so far as the spiritual gold

and precious stones, and rivers and trees, of the celestial world, shall excel in beauty, magnificence and purity, those substances on earth; just as the vile body of the saint on earth shall be excelled by that body which shall rise from the tomb, with all the undying energies and unfading beauties of immortality. But if we conclude that these descriptions are entirely figurative, then we are bound to infer that all these glowing descriptions must come far short of imparting a full conception of the glorious reality.-Ralston, Elements of Divinity, pp. 536, 537 away (Revelation 21:4). (3) Heaven, will not only De cnaracterized negatively by the absence of-all evil, but the saints shall also enjoy the possession of all positive good. The curse having been removed, St. John says, 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 (Revelation 22:3-5). The scriptures just cited represent heaven as the perfect answer of every holy desire. For those who are weary, it is everlasting rest; for the sorrowing, it is a place where God shall wipe away all tears; for the suffering, there shall be no more pain; for the mistakes and blunders of a sincere but imperfect service, the throne of God shall be there, and His servants shall serve Him-every deed being performed in His presence and under His approving smile; for those who are perplexed and bewildered by the uncertainties and disappointments of this life, it is promised that there shall be no night there; for the Lord God giveth them light, and they shall reign with Him forever and ever

Another source of blessedness to the saints, will be their communion with each other and with their common Lord. We may be sure that the distant personality of every redeemed saint will be preserved inviolate; and that the social instincts which characterized them here, will not be obliterated there, but rather intensified. Hence the apostle says, But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city o f the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of. angels, joy consists in that vivid pleasure or delight which results from the reception and possession of what is peculiarly grateful. The humble Christian, even in this vale of tears, may sometimes possess a "joy unspeakable and full of glory"; but the glorified in heaven shall realize a fullness of joy which never can be experienced in this life. It will be joy raised to its highest degree of perfection, and expressing itself in songs of heaven-inspired rapture and delight. They will unite in ascribing "glory and dominion unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood"; while the chorus of that multitude shall be heard "as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 635 to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect (Hebrews 12:22-23). Our Lord says that they shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 8:11) . "They shall hold converse with prophets and righteous men of olden time. They shall listen to the orations of Enoch and Elijah, of Abraham and Job, of Moses and Samuel, of David and Isaiah, of Daniel and Ezekiel, of Peter and James, of Paul and John. If a few moments of Mt. Tabor, where Moses and Elijah talked with Jesus, so entranced the apostles, with what thrilling emotions must the souls of the redeemed be inspired, when on the eternal mount on high they shall listen to the sublime strains in which so many eloquent and immortal tongues shall comment on the stupendous wonders of redemption!" (RALSTON, Elements of Divinity, pp. 539, 540). Furthermore, the plain inference of scripture is, that the saints shall recognize and mingle with their loved ones of earth, who like

themselves have been saved through the blood of the Lamb. "Then shall I know," writes the Apostle Paul, "even as also 1 am known (1 Corinthians 13:12). To the question, Shall we know each other in heaven? we may then, confidently answer in the affirmative. Since memory remains, and the theme of our song is redemption, we may be assured that we shall also retain the knowledge of persons, places and circumstances connected with our salvation. St. Paul appears to hold out to the Thessalonians the joy of this knowledge when he says, For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence o f our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? (1 Thessalonians 2:19)

Heaven will be replete with loving fellowships and holy worship. The imperfections which so often mar our present social life, even in its most spiritual forms, will have no place in those fellowships. There love shall be supreme. Through the headship of Christ saints and angels shall form a happy brotherhood. Yet the saints will have a song and a joy which angels can share only by the power of sympathy-the song of redemption and the joy of salvation. Holy love will make all duty a holy delight. The heavenly worship, kindled by the immediate presence and open vision of God and the Lamb, shall be full of holy rapture.-Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 475

If the apostle looked forward to meeting those who had been converted under his ministry, may not all cherish the same hope in respect to their own loved ones? But highest and best, it is promised that without dimming veil, they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads (Revelation 22:4) ; and St. John in an equally exultant strain exclaims, Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure (1 John 3:2-3) The EmploymentHeaven. While heaven will be a place of rest, we are not to suppose that it will be a place of inactivity. The question, therefore, naturally arises, What will be the nature of the employments of heaven? We may well suppose that they will be first of all spiritual. God, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus (Ephesians 1:3), will enable the souls of the redeemed to con tly expand in the ocean- of divine love. He who hat redeemed them, shall dwell in t e midst of them, and lead them to fountains of living waters. New views of divine grace, and fresh visions of His adorable person, will constantly burst in upon their enraptured minds and hearts. Their intellectual faculties will be enlarged and purified. "Before them shall lie the whole circle of creation," says Dr. Graham; "the system of providence and

Heaven must be a social state, because this is our nature. Our character and our history have been wrought out in connection with our relations to our fellowmen. This makes our life; we must lose ourselves, our identity, before we can find satisfaction in a solitary, subjective life. The friends we haveknownwe must still know. . . The rest of heaven, then, is not cessation from activity, but relief from toil and hardship and the burdens of life; a difference like that between Eden and the world cursed andbringingforth thorns, so that in the sweat of our face we eat our bread. We must have activity and responsibility in heaven, because our nature requires these as conditions of blessedness. Heaven must be a progressive state, because growth, progress, is the law of our nature; and with an endless life before us, and a wide field of action opened to us, no limit can be set to progress in knowledge, in power, and in blessedness. Thatconceptionof heaven must be most true which is most wholesome, most effective, in its reaction, to beget a heavenly mind in those who cherish it.-Fairchild, Elements of Theology, p. 334 the character and attributes of God.

His wisdom, love and power they shall be able to trace in the mysteries of The intellectual life of heaven must infinitely transcend the attainments of the present life. The mental powers will there be free from any present limitations. In the new conditions they must have large development. There is no apparent reason why they should not have perpetual growth. Certainly they will be capable of a perpetual acquisition of knowledge, and a universe of truth will be open to their research. Many problems, now dark and perplexing, will there be solved. The ceaseless pursuit and acquisition of knowledge through all the realms of truth will be a ceaseless fountain of pleasure.-Miley, Systematic Theology, II, p. 475

It is highly probable that the happiness of the redeemed in heaven, however full and perfect at first, will nevertheless be progressive. We know that the capacities of the soul for holy enjoyment are increased on earth by holy exercises; and may we not conclude that the continuance of such exercises, under more favorable circumstances, will still enlarge these capacities? Again, the desires of the soul for happiness are constantly increasing in this life, and will probably increase in eternity. Hence, as the capacities for enjoyment will be progressive, and the sources of gratification inexhaustible, an ever-growing happiness will necessarily follow.-Wakefield, Christian Theology, p. 636 The perfection of heaven includes the body, not the present earthly corruptible body of flesh and blood, but the spiritual body which is incorruptible (1 Corinthians 15:42). As Christ now enthroned in glory is veritable man, in body as in soul, so will every saint be conformed to the body of his glory (Php 3:21). Of that spiritual body we are now not able to form a conception that is just and satisfying. Nor is such a conception a present necessity. What is chiefly a matter of importance is to recognize the life everlasting to be a reality comprehending the whole man. The spiritual body is the finite form of personal existence which will answer completely to the status of glorified manhood, not less real, but more real than the earthly body. Compared with corporeity during our present abnormal history, the spiritual body is the only true human body, of which our present material organization is but an imperfect type and prophecy.-Gerhart, Institutes of the Christian Religion, II, p. 910

Heaven is a sphere of unique blessedness as being the sphere of a unique harmony. External nature, ordered as perfect and unchecked benevolence may dictate, is there completely adjusted, we may believe, to the spiritual bodies of the saints, and spreads out into a scene of transcendent beauty. Each member of the heavenly community, radiant with spiritual perfection, is an object of complacency and spontaneous delight to every other. Thus, mutually giving and receiving holy joys, all know the fruition of a society in which love is absolutely sovereign. As the center of this holy society, the ground of its harmony, the life of its life, sufficiently known to invite to full confidence and loving communion, sufficiently mysterious in the infinite depths of His being to afford a field of endless research and revelation, is He who is truly known as Immanuel, the ever-present One, who is above, and in, and through, all things, and by whom all things consist. Each heir of immortal life knows Him as the source of his own perfection, and sees His grace and beauty mirrored in all the rest of the heavenly host. So all are "perfected into one," and the prayer of Christ gains its ideal fulfillment. To the Church Militant, struggling through earthly vicissitudes and battling with foes, has succeeded the Church Triumphant, dwelling in unclouded light and secure in its eternal inheritance. -Sheldon, System of Christian Doctrine, pp. 578, 579 nature and providence which are now hidden from human eyes.... The enjoyments of the mind must make up a great part of the b e sedness e va en. The freed and expanded reason will no doubt delight in

tracing the laws of the material universe and the supreme wisdom which ordained them, the rise and progress of the various kingdoms and empires, nations and races, which constitute the dominion of God; in tracing the wisdom, love and goodness of the Creator in every department of being, from the insect on earth to the seraph before the throne. Oh, what a field for the intellect!" (GRAHAM, On the Ephesians, p. 72). Nor must we forget the bodily en joyments also. A new physical framework or bodily organism will be given to the soul at the resurrection, which will so perfectly express the new redeemed and spiritual nature, that it is called a spiritual body. The soul and body were made for each other, and death which occasioned their separation in this life, will itself be destroyed in the world to come The Endless Duration of Heaven. The crowning excellency of heaven is, that its joys shall never end. Heaven is called "the city of God," a city which hathfoundations, whose builder and maker is God (Hebrews 11:10) ; it is called a better country, that is, an heavenly (Hebrews 11:16) ; and it is spoken of as a kingdom which cannot be moved (Hebrews 12:28). The word eternity or some of its forms, is frequently associated with heaven. It is a house ... eternal in the heavens (2 Corinthians 5:1) ; eternal glory (1 Peter 5:10) ; everlasting habitations (Luke 16:9) ; and the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Peter 1:11) . We have already considered the word a''Ovtos in its relation to future punishment, and the same word, as signifying endlessness, is used in connection with eternal life. In fact, the endlessness of the future life is essential to the life itself. The very possibility of an end would seriously mar the concept of its felicity and security. When the saints enter into that eternal glory, they enter upon a life that shall never be finished, and of which it may be said of them, as it is of God himself, that their "years shall have no end." In meditating upon what is revealed of the conditions of heavenly existence two errors are to be avoided: (1) the extreme of regarding the mode of existence experienced by the saints in heaven as too nearly analogous to that of our earthly life; (2) the opposite extreme of regarding the conditions of the heavenly life as too widely distinguished from that of our present experience. The evil effect of the first extreme will, of course, be to degrade by unworthy associations our conceptions of heaven; while the evil effect of the opposite extreme will be in great measure to destroy the moral power which a hope of heaven should naturally exert over our hearts and lives, by rendering our conception of it vague, and our sympathy with its characteristics consequently distant and feeble. To avoid both of these extremes, we should fix the limits within which our conceptions of the future existence of the saints must range, by distinguishing between those elements of man's nature, and of his relations to God and other men, which are essential and unchangeable, and those elements which must be changed in order to render his nature in his relations perfect. The following must be changed: (I) all sin and its consequences must be removed; (2) spiritual bodies must take the place of our present flesh and blood; (3) the new heavens and the new earth must take the place of the present heavens and earth, as the scene of man's life; (4) the laws of social organization must be radically changed, since in heaven there will be no marriage, but a social order analogous to that of the "angels of God" introduced. The following elements are essential, and therefore unchangeable. (I) Man will continue ever to exist, as compounded of two natures, a spiritual and material. (2) He is essentially intellectual and must live by knowledge. (3) He is essentially active, and must have work to do. (4) Man can, as a finite creature, know God mediately, that is, through His works of creation and providence, the experience of His gracious work upon our hearts, and through His incarnate Son, who is the image of His person, and the fullness of the Godhead bodily. God will, therefore, in heaven continue to teach man through His works, and to act upon him by means of

motives addressed to his will through his understanding. (5) The memory of man never finally loses the slightest impression, and it will belong to the perfection of the heavenly state that every experience acquired in the past will always be within the perfect control of the will. (6) Man is essentially a social being. This, taken in connection with the previous point, indicates the conclusion that the associations, as well as the experience of our earthly life, will carry all of their natural consequences with them into the new mode of existence, except as so far they are necessarily modified (not lost) by the change. (7) Man's life is essentially an eternal progress toward infinite perfection. (8) All the known analogies of God's works in creation, in His providence in the material and moral world, and in His dispensation of grace, indicate that in heaven saints will differ among themselves both as to inherent capacities and qualities, and as to relative rank and office. These differences will doubtless be determined (a) by constitutional differences of natural capacity, (b) by gracious rewards in heaven corresponding in kind and degree to the gracious fruitfulness of the individual on earth, (c) by the absolute sovereignty of the Creator.-A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology, pp. 461, 462 THE FINAL CONSUMMATION The final consummation, sometimes known as the consummatio secu 1: or consummatio mundi, marks the close of the history of this present world. In its place there will be a new eaven an a new earth, wherein e e rug eousness desti be e sea e kingdom of God in its prefection of beauty In this triumphant kingdom Christ will lay down the mediatorial work of salvation from sin, for the last enemy shall have been overcome. He will not, however, cease to be the exalted one, for He shall still be the Firstborn among many brethren, our fountain of living waters, and our everlasting light. He shall forever be the mediate cause of our eternal life and light, our holiness and our happiness, even when He gives up the kingdom to the Father. The final consummation brin s to a close: (1) the ro ' na history o mdividua -t e na consequences being the future The final issues of our Lord's return may be said to be the consummation of all things. This, with reference to the Redeemer, will be the end of His mediatorial kingdom as such, while as it respects man it will be the finished redemption of the race, and its restoration to the divine ideal and primary purpose of the Creator. In regard to the scene of redemption, the world, it will bring in a renewal or transformation; and, as to the Church of Christ collectively and individually, it will seal the perfection in the eternal vision of God and blessedness of the heavenly state.-Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 424 The Son has now advanced the kingdom of God to that point at which the love of the Father can be perfectly realized. He has given up the kingdom to the Father, laid aside His mediatorial office, for by the perfect destruction of sin and death, no more place is found for the mediatorial work by making atonement and redemption, because all the saved are matured for the glorious liberty of the children of God. But the meaning of the apostle by no means is that the mediatorial office of Christ is in every sense terminated, for Christ abides eternally the Bridegroom, the Head of the blessed kingdom; all communications of blessings from the Father to His creatures pass through the Son, and now it is for the first time, in the full sense of the words, true that Christ is present in all creation, for He now fills all with His own fullness.-Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 484 The mediatorial kingdom will cease in its relation to the Triune God; the redemptional Trinity which introduced the economy of subordination in the Two Persons will be again the absolute Trinity. The Son incarnate will cease to mediate; as Incarnate He will be forever subordinate, but there will be nothing to declare His subordination: no mediatorial rule over enemies, no mediatorial service or worship of His people. The Triune God will be seen by all mankind in the face of Jesus Christ; and the mediation of grace will become the mediation of glory. The Intercessor will pray for us no

more, but will reveal the Father openly forever.-Pope, Compend. Chr. Th.. III. n. 425 punishment of the wicked and the eternal-bless- edness o the saints. (2) It marks also the prefection of the hurch. Heaven will not be inhabited by an innumerable company of redeemed individuals only, but by the Church as an organic unity. However glorious the angels may be which in adoration hover about the throne, she will be the most precious jewel of heaven. Perhaps none, in an affectional sense, will be nearer the throne. For this reason, St. John speaks of the Church as the Bride of the Lamb, which he describes in the symbolism of a holy city-the New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven (Revelation 21:2; Revelation 21:9-10). No symbol is better adapted to express the complexity of social organization. In the present world, through the illadjustments of an imperfect social structure, the city becomes the seat of sin and wickedness, of want and penury, of pain and suffering. But in the city of God, the organization will be so perfect, as it affects the relation of the individual to the social order, that there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away (Revelation 21:4). The Church Militant on earth, becomes triumphant in heaven, but she will never lose her identity. And when the Church shall have reached this perfection, and every enemy has been subdued and death itself shall be no more, then it is that the mediatorial kingdom as an agency of salvation must of necessity cease, and be absorbed in the endlessly blessed kingdom of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. (3) But the consummatio mundi includes the physical univers ^c well as the e Church There shall be a new heaven and a new eartha subject to which we must now give brief attention in the final paragraphs of our treatise on Christian Theology The New Heavens and the New Earth. At the end of the present world, there shall be a new heavens and a new earth. The resurrected and glorified bodies of the saints demand a new and glorious environment. The form of the present world must be changed, and in its place will be a new and eternal order, as the sphere of the kingdom of glory. "While the path of eschatology," says Dr. Van Oosterzee, "is traced over against the highest mountain heights, we cannot be surprised that the loftiest peaks are bordered by the deepest chasms. This is notably the case with regard to those questions which yet remain. We saw, after the long working week of the history of our race, with the appearing of the Millennial Kingdom, the dawn of a Sabbath of rest, and after that Sabbath a last conflict, succeeded by perfect, victory. Time now disappears from our eye, and that which further awakens our devout attention belongs wholly to the realm of eternity. Yet the question cannot be put aside: what will now become of the world itself, for whose inhabitants the eternal destiny has been forever decided? If the Christian consciousness can give no single decision on this point, yet it is something more than a question of mere curiosity; and we rejoice to say that the word of prophecy is not wanting even here in hints, although these in turn call forth a multitude of new questions (VAN OOSTERZEE,Christian Dogmatics, II, p. 804). The Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testaments look forward to a new creation, when the present heavens and earth shall have grown old, and are folded up as a vesture. Thus, Of old hast thou laid the foundation o f the earth: the heavens are the work o f thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all o f them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed The kingdom will have a newbeginning:new as the kingdom of the new heavens and a new earth made one. The Spirit of Christ will be theimmanentbond between Him and us, between us and the Holy Trinity: "He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit" (1 Corinthians 6:17). The Incarnate Person will be glorified then as never before: His personality as divine will be no more veiled or obscured by any humiliation, nor will it be intermittently revealed. God shall be All in All:

first in the Holy Trinity, and then through Christ in us.-Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., III, p. 426 The heaven of the saints will therefore not be a realm of shades, unsubstantial and indeterminate, but a kingdom substantial and real, where the faculties and functions of human personality will be active in the joy of righteous freedom. Like the capacities of the soul, the powers of the body will be commensurate with the law and vocation of everlasting life.-Gerhart, Institutes of theChristianReligion, II, p. 914

(Psalms 102:25-26; cf. Hebrews 1:10-12) . "The earth as yet wears its working garb," says Martin Luther, "then the earth also will put on its paschal and pentecostal raiment." The Prophet Isaiah waxes eloquent in contemplation of the new creation: And all the host of heaven," he says, "shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf f alleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree (Isaiah 34:4) -a judgment against Idumea, which seems prophetic of the greater day of judgment to come. Again, 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, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished (Isaiah 51:6) ; For, behold, 1 create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy (Isaiah 65:17-18). In the New Testament, we are drawn to the plastic representation of St. Peter, But 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 work that are therein shall be burned up.... Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Peter 3:10; 2 Peter 3:13). This seems to be in harmony with our Lord’s own statement that Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away (Matthew 24:35). In our discussion of the events connected with the Second Advent, we pointed out that the word "dissolved" as here translated is from the Greek ww which means to unloose, unfasten, unbind, but never

God and blessed spirits are exhaustless constituents of the life of bliss. Each spirit not only reflects God, but the entire kingdom of which he is a member. When God shall be all in all, it may be said that allare in all, in one another; and the multiplicity of charismata unfolds itself, in this unlimited and undarkened reflection of love and of contemplation; in this ever new alternation of giving and receiving, of communication and receptivity.-Mortensen, Christian Dogmatics, p. 488 to annihilate. The Scriptures lead us to believe that God in time will set free these forces of earth which are now held in reserve, and use them to the purifying of that which has been defiled by sin. God destroys only that He may create something more beautiful; and upon the ruins of earth laboring under the curse, he will raise up another, which shall bloom in unfading splendor. This new heaven will be the consequence of dissolution and purifying-"the noblest gold, brought forth from the most terrible furnace heat." The Restoration o f All Things. The great consummation marks the restoration of harmony and order in the universe. It was to this, doubtless, that St. Peter re ferred when he said that the heaven must receive, or retain Jesus Christ, 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 3:21). The doctrine of restorationism is known in theology as the apokatastasis, from the phrase a1TOKaTaaTaa•ews iravTwv which occurs only in the passage just mentioned. As a form of

universalism based on the disciplinary idea of suffering, this subject has already been sufficiently discussed. In this connection, however, the subject presents a different aspect. Many of the finest and tenderest minds of the ages, have sincerely hoped that all men might eventually turn to God and be saved. Attractive ag this doctrine is, however, these men have been compelled to confess the rugged truth of the Scriptures, that some will be finally impenitent, and consequently lost forever. "When we thus start from the idea of God’s character," says Bishop Martensen, "and reason therefrom, we are led on to the doctrine of universal restoration a7TOKaTaa-,raa-ts; but the anthropological, psychological, and ethical methods, that is, life and facts, conduct us, on the other hand, to the dark goal of eternal damnation. For if man can by no means be made blessed by a process of nature, must it not be possible for the will to retain its obduracy, and forever to reject grace, and in this manner to elect its own damnation? If it be replied that this possibility of a progressive obduracy implies also a continual possibility of conversion-this is a rash inference. For our earthly life already bears witness to that awful and yet necessary law according to which evil ever assumes a more unchangeable character in the individual who chooses it." (MARTENSEN, Christian Dogmatics, p. 478.) Dr. Raymond, who holds firmly to the doctrine of eternal punishment says this: "The idea of endless torment is, beyond question, the most terrible idea ever conceived. It is the great burden of religious thought. It is not strange that generous minds have endeavored to avoid it. It is not prima facie evidence of the love of sin, or of enmity to truth, that man seeks grounds for belief that it will never become a fact of history. But on the other hand, it is evidently vain for human philosophy to attempt decisive proof on the negative of this question; no man can affirm that endless torment will not be; it is not absurd or selfcontradictory to affirm that it will be." (RAYMOND, Systematic Theology, II, p. 520.) The Scriptures are clear on this important subject, and our Lord to whom all authority and power is committed, is a merciful and faithful high priest. Christian theology has to do with no other thoughts than those revealed by Himself. And when the curtain is drawn on this present age, we hear the words, He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still (Revelation 22:11). The consummation

Dr. Pope says that "there are some indications that the end of human history will be the restoration of the universe; as if man will then at length, perfectly redeemed, join with the other orders of in telligent creatures in the worshipping service of the eternal temple: their harmony, without human voices, not being counted perfect. But this does not sanction the speculative notion that the number of the saved from the earth will precisely fill up the vacancy caused by the fall of those who kept not their first estate. This speculation of the Middle Ages introduces a predestinarian element into the final consummation which the Scriptures do not warrant. Nor does the testimony of Jesus by the Spirit of prophecy sanction the thought that the consummation will unite all spirits with all men in the blessedness of union in God. Discord will be suppressed, but not in that way. The reconciliation of which St. Paul speaks (1 Corinthians 15:25-28) ; (Ephesians 1:10) is heaven and earth: it does not couple hell. And the union is effected as the result of the atonement by the sacrifice of Jesus, which was offered in human nature and in human nature alone.’-Pope, Compend. Chr. Th., 111, pp. 450, 451 of the ages, marks the glorious completion of the kingdom of God. Then the kingdom will have a new beginning, in a new heavens and a new earth made one. The glory of the divine Christ will no longer be obscured nor intermittently revealed, and His countenance is as the sun shineth in his strength (Revelation 1:16). His kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever

(Revelation 22:5). But until that glorious and dread day shall come, when the destinies of men shall be fixed for weal or woe, for eternal life or endless death, the invitation of divine love rings clear and strong, the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely (Revelation 22:17)

Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen (Hebrews 13:20-21)

36. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY The following bibliography includes a partial list of those books frequently cited as references in the study of theology. Its purpose is to acquaint the student with the literature of theology, and the books mentioned, therefore, do not necessarily express the views of the author. Their worth must be evaluated by the student himself. Whenever possible, the name of the publisher and the date of the work are both given. Since different editions are frequently published, these dates may vary in some instances PART I. INTRODUCTION: THE PROVINCE OF THEOLOGY GENERAL REFERENCE WORKS William Burton Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (3 volumes), Phillips & Hunt, Second Edition, 1880

John Miley, Systematic Theology (2 volumes), Eaton & Mains, 1892 Miner Raymond, Systematic Theology (3 volumes), Hitchcock & Walden, 1877 John J. Tigert, Summers' Systematic Theology (2 volumes), Nashville, 1888 Thomas N. Ralston, Elements of Divinity (Edited by T. O. Summers), Cokesbury, 1924 A. M. Hills, Fundamental Christian Theology (2 Volumes), C. J. Kinne, Pasadena College, 1931 Emanuel V. Gerhart, Institutes of the Christian Religion (2 volumes), Funk & Wagnalls, 1894

Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology (4 volumes), Scribners, 1871, 1883 A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology, Carter & Brothers, 1860 Henry C. Sheldon, System of Christian Doctrine, Methodist Book Concern, 1903'

Enoch Pond, Lectures on Christian Theology, Boston, 1867 James Petigru Boyce, Abstract of Systematic Theology, Wharton & Co., 1888

S. J. Gamertsfelder, Systematic Theology, Cleveland, Ohio, 1913 H. Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, T. & T. Clark, 1898 Joseph Stump, The Christian Faith, MacMillan, 1932

Francis J. Hall, Dogmatic Theology (10 volumes), New York, 1907-1922 Francis J. Hall, Theological Outlines, Morehouse, 1933

John MacPherson, Christian Dogmatics, T. & T. Clark, 1898 James H. Fairchild, Elements of Theology, Oberlin, 1892 Olin A. Curtis, The Christian Faith, Eaton & Mains, 1905 Edgar Y. Mullins, The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression, Judson Press, 1917 J. J. Butler and Ransom Dunn, Lectures on Systematic Theology, Boston, 1892 Samuel Sprecher, The Groundwork of a System of Evangelical Lutheran Theology, Philadelphia, 1879 William G. T. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology (2 volumes), Scribners, 1888 Henry B. Smith, Introduction to Theology, 1883; Systematic Theology, 1884, New York

William Adams Brown, Christian Theology in Outline, Scribners, 1906 William Newton Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology, Scribners, 1905 Ezekiel Gilman Robinson, Christian Theology, 1894

J. J. Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics (2 volumes), Scribners, 1874 William Burton Pope, A Higher Catechism of Theology, Hunt & Eaton Alvah Hovey, Manual of Christian Theology, Silver Burdett & Co., 1900 Samuel Wakefield, Christian Theology, New York, 1869

Isaac A. Dorner, A System of Christian Doctrine, T. & T. Clark, 1888 A. W. Drury, Outline of Doctrinal Theology, Otterbein Press, 1914, 1926 Jonathan Weaver, Christian Theology, United Brethren Publishing House, 1900 J. T. Horger, Fundamental Revelation in Dramatic Symbol. Miles Grant, Positive Theology, Boston, 1895

Theodore Haering, The Christian Faith (2 volumes), London, 1915 L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology (2 volumes), Eerdmanns, 1938 L. Berkhof, Reformed Dogmatics, Eerdmanns, 1937 W. Elert, An Outline of Christian Doctrine, Philadelphia, 1927 R. F. Weidner, Dogmatic Theology, based on Luthardt and Krauth (8 volumes), 1888-1915 A. G. Voigt, Biblical Dogmatics, Columbia, S. C., 1917 J. A. Singmaster, A Handbook of Christian Theology, Philadelphia, 1927 W. Hove, Christian Doctrine, Minneapolis, 1930 C. E. Lindberg, Christian Dogmatics, Rock Island, 1922 P. L. Mellenbruch, The Doctrines of Christianity, New York, 1931

H. Schmid, Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Translated by Hay and Jacobs, Philadelphia, 1876, 1889

M. Valentine, Christian Theology (2 volumes), Philadelphia, 1906 H. E. Jacobs, A Summary of the Christian Faith, Philadelphia, 1905

A. H. Strong, Systematic Theology (3 volumes), Griffith & Rowland, 1907 Amos Binney, Theological Compend Improved, Nelson & Phillips, 1875 Asbury Lowrey, Positive Theology, Eaton & Mains, 1853 W. B. Godbey, Bible Theology, Cincinnati, 1911 E. P. Ellyson, New Theological Compend, 1905 Nels F. S. Fere, The Christian Faith, Harper Brothers, 1942 Henry David Gray, A Theology for Christian Youth, Cokesbury, 1941 J. S. Whale, Christian Doctrine, MacMillan, 1941 Frank Hugh Foster, The Fundamental Ideas of the Roman Catholic Church, Philadelphia, 1899 W. Wilmers, Handbook of the Christian Religion (Roman Catholic), Benziger, 1891 John Dickie, The Organism of Christian Truth, London, 1930 William Edgar Fisher, Sound Doctrine, 1918 H. L. Smith, Bible Doctrine, Upland, 1921 John Milton Williams, Rational Theology, Chicago, 1888 J. M. Conner, Outlines of Christian Theology, Little Rock, 1896 Charles G. Finney, Lectures on Theology, 1878

Dabney, Theology, Dogmatic and Polemic, Richmond, 1885 Beard, Lectures on Theology (3 volumes), Nashville, 1871 Lewis French Steams, Present Day Theology, Scribners, 1893 J. M. Pendleton, Christian Doctrines, Philadelphia, 1878 Wilhelm Herrmann, Systematic Theology, MacMillan, 1927 Wilhelm and Scannell, A Manual of Catholic Theology (2 volumes), London, 1890 A. G. Mortimer, Catholic Faith and Practice (2 volumes), New York, 1897, 1898 1 Henry R. Percival, A Digest of Theology, Philadelphia, 1893 E. A. Litton, Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, London, 1912 Darwell Stone, Outlines of Christian Dogma, London, 1905 T. A. Lacey, The Elements of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1901

Joseph Pohle and Arthur Preuss, Dogmatic Theology, St. Louis, 1911-1917 John P. Norris, Rudiments of Theology, New York, 1876 D. C. Macintosh, Theology as an Empirical Science, New York, 1919 Orchard, Foundations of the Faith, New York, 1926 Nathanael Burwash, Manual of Christian Theology on the Inductive Method (2 volumes), London, 1900 H. Maldwyn Hughes, Basic Beliefs, Abingdon Press, 1929

Edw. G. Selwyn, (Editor), Essays Catholic and Critical, New York, 1926 F. R. Tennant, Philosophical Theology (2 volumes), London, 1928, 1930 Hunter, Outline of Dogmatic Theology (3

volumes), Longmans Green & Co

Moule, Outlines of Christian Doctrine, Hodder & Stoughton James Denny, Studies in Theology, Hodder and Stoughton B. H. Streeter, Foundations, London, 1913 T. B. Strong, A Manual of Theology, London Norris, Rudiments of Theology, New York, 1876 Buell, Systematic Theology (2 volumes), New York, 1889

A. L. Graebner, Outlines of Doctrinal Theology, St. Louis, 1898 J. A. Clapperton, Essentials of Christian Theology, London, 1913 Older Works on Theology John Dick, Lectures on Theology, Glasgow and New York, 1859 Joseph Bellamy, Works (1850 Edition, Boston) Herman Venema, Institutes of Theology, Translated by Brown, T. & T. Clark, 1850 Alexander Vinet, Outlines of Theology, London, 1866 George Tomline, Elements of Christian Theology (2 volumes), London, 1812 Thomas Ridgley, A Body of Divinity (4 volumes), London, 1812 George Hill, Lectures in Divinity, Herman Hooker, 1844 Timothy Dwight, Theology Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons (4 volumes), Harper Brothers, 1849 Samuel Hopkins, The System of Doctrines Contained in Revelation, Explained and Defended Richard Watson, Theological Institutes (2 Volumes), Lane & Scott, New York, 1851

John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion (2 volumes), New York, 1819 (Translated by John Allen, London, 1813) James Arminius, Works (3 volumes), Translated from the Latin, Auburn and Buffalo, 1853 Thomas C. Thornton, Theological Colloquies, or a Compendium of Divinity, Lewis Coleman, 1837 Henry E. Jewett, Analysis of Lectures delivered by Professor Park, Andover, 1867-1868 S. H. Willey, Notes of Lectures by Rev. H. White, Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminarv_ 1 1846 George Christian Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, Translated by Leonard Woods, Philadelphia, 1845 Nitzsch, System of Christian Doctrine, 1849

Robert J. Breckinridge, The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered, 1859; and The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered, 1860 Chr. Ernst Luthardt, Fundamental Truths of Christianity, Translated by Sophia Taylor, T. & T. Clark, 1869: cf also, Dogmatics, 1865, Seventh Edition, 1886 Dagg, Manual of Theology, Charleston, 1859

Randolph, Lectures an Systematic Theology (3 volumes), London, 1869 Granahan, Introduction to the Theologica Summa of St. Thomas, Zybura Herder Book Co., St. Louis Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE K. R. Hagenbach, History of Doctrine (2 volumes), Edited by Henry B. Smith, New York, 1861 Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma (7 volumes), Translated by Buchanan, London, 1905 George P. Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine, New York, 1896 R. Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrine, Translated by C. E. Hay (2 volumes), Philadelphia, 1905 J. F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, Methuen & Co T. R. Crippen, A Popular Introduction to the History of Christian Doctrine, T. & T. Clark, 1883 Henry C. Sheldon, History of Christian Doctrine (2 volumes), New York, 1886 William G. T. Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine (2 volumes), Scribners, 1884 Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought (2 volumes), Scribners, 1932

Augustus Neander, History of Christian Dogmas (2 volumes), Translated by J. E. Ryland, Edited by J. L. Jacobi, London, 1882

John Stoughton, An Introduction to Historical Theology, London Charles A. Briggs, History of the Study of Theology (2 volumes), Scribners, 1916 Herbert B. Workman, Christian Thought to the

Reformation, Scribners, 1911

Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Protestant Thought Before Kant, Scribners Edward Caldwell Moore, An Outline of the History of Christian Thought Since Kant, Scribners W. A. Butler, Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine, Dublin, 1850 Bernard Otten, A Manual of the History of Dogmas (2 volumes), St. Louis, 1917, 1918 J. Tixeront, History of Dogmas, English Translation (3 volumes), St. Louis, 1910

J. F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon, London, 1903 Ante-Nicene Library (14 volumes), Christian Literature Edition, Edinburgh, American Reprint, New York, 1926 Ante-Nicene Fathers (10 volumes), New York, 1905 Nicene and Post-Nicene Library, First Series (14 volumes) New York, 1907 Nicene and Post-Nicene Library, Second Series (14 volumes), New York, 1904 Ante-Nicene Christian Library, T. & T. Clark, 1868 E. Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church, London, 1890, 1914 G. Uhlhorn, The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, Translated by Smyth and Ropes, New York, 1891 C. Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 1886 A. T. Drane, Christian Schools and Scholars, 1867, 1881, 1910 C. Kingsley, Alexandria and Her Schools, 1854

E. Caird, Evolution of Theology in Greek Philosophers (2 volumes) Cunningham, Historical Theology (2 volumes), Edinburgh, 1862

J. Donaldson, A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council (3 volumes), London, 1864 R. Blakey, Lives of the Primitive Fathers, 1842 Douglas, Christian Greek and Latin Writers (Edited by F. A. March), New York, 1874-1880 Fred Watson, The Ante-Nicene Apologies: Their Character and Value, Cambridge, 1870

J. Bennett, The Theology of the Early Christian Church Exhibited in the Quotations from the Writers of the First Three Centuries, London, 1852

W. J. Bolton, The Evidences of Christianity as exhibited in the Writings of its Apologists down to Augustine, New York, 1854 John Wright Buckham, Progressive Religious Thought in America, Houghton-Mifflin, 1919

Earlier Period The Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (previously mentioned) Migne, Patrologia Latina (An extensive work on the Literature of the Fathers)

J. F. Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of -the Council of Chalcedon, London, 1903 Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers; Clement of Rome (2 volumes); Ignatius and Polycarp (3 volumes) F. J. A. Hort, Six Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers Farrar, Lives of the Fathers (2 volumes) Kruger, History of Ancient Christian Literature (English translation) Hall, Papias Poole, Life and Times of St. Cyprian

Roberts and Donaldson (Editors), Writings of Irenaeus, T. & T. Clark, 1868; Writings of Hippolytus, T. & T. Clark, 1868

J. W. Benson, Life and Times of St. Cyprian, 1898 J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus (2 volumes), 1888 C. Siegfried, Philo V. Alexandria, Jena, 1875 Origen, De Principiis, Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. IV William Fairweather, Origen and the Greek Patristic Theology, Scribners, 1901 C. H. Lommatzsch,

Origen, English Translation by F. Crombie, Berlin, 1831-1848

T. Taylor, Works of Plotinus,1794, with Notes by G. R. S. Mead, 1895 J. Patrick, The Apology of Origen in Reply to Celsus, 1892 G. Hartel, Cyprian (3 volumes), Vienna, 1868-1871 T. Whittaker, Apollonius of Tyana, 1906 G. R. S. Mead, Apollonius of Tyana, 1901

H. L. Mansel, Gnostic Heresies, 1875 (Edited by Bishop Lightfoot) W. Wright, Apocryphal Acts of Apostles (2 volumes), 1871 F. Oehler, Tertullian (3 volumes), Leipsic, 1854 A. Robertson, Selected Works of Athanasius translated into English, Oxford, 1892 Augustine, Enchiridion; De Doctrina Christiana; De Civitate Dei; Nicene and Post-Nicene Library Cunningham, St. Austin and His Place in the History of Christian Thought

Philip Schaff, Life and Labors of St. Augustine, 1851 A. Hatzfeld, St. Augustine (6th Edition), Paris, 1902 Przywara, An Augustine Synthesis Augustine, Works, Nicene Fathers Athanasius, C. Arianos, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers; C. Gentes; On the Incarnation

H. M. Gwatkin, Studies in Arianism, 1882, 1900; Arian Controversy, 1896 J. H. Newman, Arians of the Fourth Century, 1871 J. de Soyres, Montanism and the Primitive Church, 1878 C. E. Raven, Apollinarianism: An Essay of the Christology of the Early Church, 1923

J. F. Bethune Baker, The Meaning of Homoousios in the "Constantinopolitan" Creed, Cambridge, 1901; Nestorius and His Teaching, Cambridge, 1908 E. R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr W. Bright, The Age of the Fathers (2 volumes), 1903 J. A. Neander, Antignosticus or Spirit of Tertullian, Translated by Ryland, London, 1851 Lactantius, Divinarum Institutionum Libri Septem; De ira Dei; De ave Phoenice, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers

John of Damascus, De Fide Orthodoxa, part of a larger work, The Fountain of Knowledge. (Works edited by LeQuien, Paris, 1712) English translation, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers J. H. Lupton, St. John of Damascus, London, 1882 G. A. Jackson, The Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists of the Second Century, New York, 1879

W. G. T. Shedd (Editor), The Confessions of Augustine, Andover, 1860 J. Fitzgerald, The Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, John B. Alden, New York, 1884 Philip Schaff, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 1885 F. Loofs, Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine, 1914 Driver and Hodgson, The Bazar of Heracleides, 1925 (The Apology of Nestorius) H. Koch, Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, 1900 C. E. Rolt, Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology, 1920 Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, 1909 (Chapter VI deals with Dionysius) A. Robertson, Selected Works of Athanasius, Oxford, 1892 J. Patrick, Clement of Alexandria, 1914 R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria The Mediaeval Period Church, St. Anselm

Sykes, Peter Abailard, Cambridge University Press, 1932 E. H. Blakeney, The Tome of Leo the Great, London, 1923 Townsend, The Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages Maurice De Wulf, History of Mediaeval Philosophy, 1909; Scholasticism Old and New, Longmans Green & Company

West, Alcuin Sykes, Peter Abailard, Cambridge University Press, 1932 Anselm, Cur Deus Homo, London, 1896; Proslogium; Monologium, Chicago, 1903 Deane, Translation of Anselm’s Proslogium, Monologium and Cur Deus Homo Storrs, Bernard of Clairveaux Compayre, Abelard

E. A. Moody, The Logic of William of Ockham, New York, 1935 McKeon, Selections from the Mediaeval Philosophers, Scribners, 1929 Thomas Aquinatis, Summa Theologica (8 volumes), Paris, 1880; English Translation (22 volumes); Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard E. I. Watkin, St. Thomas, Angel of the Schools, Translation by Scanlan, London, 1931 Vaughn, Hours with the Mystics Eales, Life and Works of St. Bernard (2 volumes), London, 1889 Hugo of St. Victor, Summa Sententiarum; De Sacramentis Fidei Christiannae

Liebner, Hugo van St. Victor, Leipsic, 1832 Richard of St. Victor, De gratin contemplationis Peter Lombard, Libri sententiarum quattuor, or "Four Books of Sentences."

Robert Pulleyn, Sententiarum William of Champeaux, De Origine Animae; De Eucharistia Abelard, Introductio ad theologiam; Sic et Non

John Scotus Erigena, De Divisione Naturae Alexander of Hales, Summa Universae Theologiae Albertus Magnus, Summa Theologiae

Bonaventura, Breviloquium (An exposition of Christian Dogmatics) Duns Scotus, Opus Oxoniense (Comments on the Books of Sentences); Opus Parisiense (Notes on Lectures) The Mystics

Meister Eckhart, Works (Edited by Franz Pfeiffer, Leipsic, 1857) Johannes Tauler, Sermons (English translation by Winkworth), London, 1857, New York, 1858 Heinrich Suso, "On Eternal Wisdom," 1338 John Ruysbroeck, Works (5 volumes), by J. David. Ghent. 1857-1869

Cf. Ullmann,_ Reformers before the Reformation (2 volumes); and Vaughn, Hours with the Mystics (2 volumes), London, 1880 Precursors of the Reformation

John Wycliffe, Trialogus (Edited by Lechler), Oxford, 1869; Translation of the Bible (Edited by Forshall and Madden), (4 volumes), Oxford, 1850 John Huss, De Ecclesia, "On the Church"

Johann Wessel, Works (Collected and published by Luther, 1522) The Reformation Period Martin Luther, De Servo Arbitrio, 1525 Philip Melanchthon, Loci Communes, 1521 Zwingli, Commentarius de Vera et Falsa Religione John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, London, 1813, Philadelphia Krauth, The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology, Philadelphia, 1871 Cunningham, The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation, Edinburgh, 1862 The Confessional Period

Leonard Hutter, Compendium Locorum Theologicorum, 1610 (Translation by Jacobs and Spieker, Philadelphia, 1881); Loci Communes Theologici, 1619

John Gerhard, Loci Theologici, 1610-1625 (9 volumes), Leipsic; Meditationes Sacra (English translation by John Winterton)

George Calixtus, Epitome Theologiae, 1619; Life and Correspondence, London, 1863. (See also, W. C. Dowding, German Theology during the Thirty Years War) John William Baier, Compendium Theologiae Positivae, 1685 (Ed. C. F. W. Walther, St. Louis, 1879) Johann Quenstedt, Theologia Didactica Polemica, 1685 A. Calovius, Systema Locorum Theologicorum (12 volumes), 1655-1677; Biblia Illustrata (4 volumes) David Hollaz, Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum, 1707 Daniel Chamier (polemical writings), Memoir of D. Chamier, London, 1852; Read, Daniel Chamier, Paris, 1858 Francis Turretin, Institutio Theologiae Elencticae (3 volumes), Edinburgh, 1847 Jean Alphonse Turretin, A Discourse Concerning the Fundamental Articles of Religion, London, 1720

William Twisse, Opera (3 volumes), Amsterdam, 1652 Johannes Wolleb, Compendium Theolbgiae Christianae, 1626

M. F. Wendelin, Compendium Christianae Theologiae, 1634; Christianae Theologiae Systema Majus, 1656 (Published from manuscript after his death) W. R. Bagnall, The Writings of James Arminius (3 volumes), Auburn and Buffalo, 1853 Bangs, Life of Arminius, New York, 1843

Simon Episcopius, Institutiones Theologicae and Responsio ad Quaestiones Theologicas. (Works in 2 volumes, the first edited by Curcellaeus and the second by Polenbrugh, 1665. See also, Calder, Memoirs of Simon Episcopius, New York, 1837; Philip Limborch, Life of Simon Episcopius, Dutch and Latin, 1701

Hugo Grotius, Defensio Fidei Catholicae de Satisfactione Christi, 1617: De Veritate Relig. Christianae, 1627; also Annotations upon the Old and New Testament. (Grotius' theological works, Opera Theologica, were published at Amsterdam, 1644, and reprinted at London, 1660.) See also Butler, Life of Hugo Grotius, London, 1826

Philipp van Limborch, Institutiones Theologiae Christianae, 1686 (English translation by William Jones, London, 1702) ; Historia Inquisitionis, 1692, and De Veritate Religionis Christianae, 1687; (English translation by Samuel Chandler, London, 1731)

Etienne de Curcellaeus, Vindicia Arminii, 1645; Defensio Blondelli, 1657; Dissertationes, 1659; also edition of Greek New Testament (Collected works, Amsterdam, 1675

Francis Gomarus, Loci Theologiae, 1644 (Opponent of Arminianism) Johannes Macovius, Loci Communes, 1626 (Opponent of Arminianism) Gysbertus Voetius (Opponent of Arminianism and Federalism) Johannes Cocceius, Summa Doctrinae, 1648; Summa Theologiae. (Founder of the Federal or Covenant Theology) Melchoir Leydecker, De Aeconomia Trium Personarum, 1682

Hermann Witsius, De Aeconomia Foederum Dei cum Hominibus, English translation "The Covenants" (2 volumes), London, 1837

` The writers of this period in the Church of England were Hooker, Field, Jackson and Laud; Bull, Jeremy Taylor, Stillingfleet, Waterland, Beveridge, Pearson and Burnett. The Puritan writers were Charnock, Bunyan, Baxter, Owen and Howe. The works of these authors have been cited in other connections

John Wesley, Works (7 volumes), Methodist Book Concern, New York. In addition to his Sermons, Notes and Journals, special mention may be made of his Treatise on Original Sin (a reply to Dr. Taylor) ;

Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, (a defense of Methodism); and Plain Account of Christian Perfection, 1766 (numerous later editions). The literature concerning Wesley and Wesleyanism is abundant. We mention but a few of the older sources: Biographies by John Hampson (3 volumes), London, 1791 (earliest published biography) ; Dr. Adam Clarke, Wesley Family, London, 1823; Henry Moore (2 volumes), London, 1824; Richard Watson, London, Tyerman (3 volumes), London, 1870; George J. Stevenson, Memorials of the Wesley Family, London, 1876; Abel Stevens, History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism (3 volumes), New York, 1859-1862

John William Fletcher (Vicar of Madeley), Five Checks to Antinomianism; Scripture Scales to Weigh the Gold of Gospel Truth, Being an Equal Check to Pharisaism and Antinomianism. Posthumous work, Portrait of St. Paul. First complete edition of works (8 volumes), London, 1803; The Works of the Rev. John Fletcher (4 volumes), Methodist Book Concern, New York. There are lives of Fletcher by John Wesley, London, 1786; L. Tyerman, 1882; Macdonald, 1885. See also Stevens, History of Methodism; and Ryle, Christian Leaders o f the Last Century, London, 1865 W. P. Harrison, The Wesleyan Standards (Sermons by the Rev. John Wesley) with notes and analysis, 1886, Nashville, 1894 The Modern Period Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith, T. & T. Clark Nitzsch, System of Christian Doctrine (Fifth edition translated into English, Edinburgh, 1849) Tweston, Dogmatics (2 volumes), 1838 Karl August Hase, Evangelical Dogmatics, Leipsic, 1826; Hutterus Redivivus, Leipsic, 1883 (12th edition)

Daniel Schenkel, Christian Dogmatics (2 volumes), 1858-1859 (German) Richard Rothe, Theologische Ethik (Considered most important work next to that of Schleiermacher); Christian Dogmatics (2 volumes), Edited by Schenkel, Heidelberg, 1870

Isaac August Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, T. & T. Clark, 1888; History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, 1835 (See also J. A. Dorner); Foundation Ideas of the Protestant Church; Christian Ethics Bishop H. L. Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, T. & T. Clark, 1898

J. P. Lange, Christian Dogmatics, Heidelberg, 1849-1852; (Also editor of Lange's Commentary, and author of the Life of Christ (6 volumes) J. H. Ebrard, Christian Dogmatics (2 volumes), 1851. Second edition, 1862 H. J. M. Voight, Fundamental Dogmatics, Gotha, 1874

Heinrich Schmid, The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, (Translated by Hay and Jacobs), Philadelphia, 1876, 1889 Gottfried Thomasius, Christ's Person and Work (2 volumes), Erlangen, 1886-1888

K. F. A. Kahnis, Lutheran Dogmatics (2 volumes), Leipsic, 1874-1875 F. A. Philippi, Kirchliche Glaubenslehre (9 volumes), 1883 A. F. C. Vilman, Dogmatics (2 volumes), 1874

F. H. R. Frank, Die Theologie der Concorddienformel (4 volumes), Considered standard work on the Theology of the Formula of Concord Christoph Ernst Luthardt, Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity, T. & T. Clark, 1869; Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity, 1868; Apologetic Lectures on the Moral Truths of Christianity, 1875; Compendium of Dogmatics, 1893 S. L. Bring, Outlines of the Christian Doctrine of Faith (Lund), 18691877 Gisle Johnson (Norway), Outlines of Systematic Theology Axel F. Granfelt (Finland), Christian Dogmatics Carl Olof Bjorling (Sweden), Christian Dogmatics according to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, 1866 Ralph Wardlaw, System of Theology (3 volumes), 1856-1857 (posthumous work) A. Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation Julius Kaftan, Das Wesen der Christlichen Religion, 1881 Richard Adelbert Lipsius, Lehrbuch der Evang. Prot. Dogmatik; Dogmatische Beitraege. 1878 (Third Edition, 1893) Theodore Haering, The Christian Faith (2 volumes), London, 1915 The British and American works on theology will be found in the General Reference list and need not be repeated here Contemporary Theology

Walter Marshall Horton, Theism and the Modern Mood; Realistic Theology, 1934; A Psychological Approach to Theology, 1931; Contemp- orary English Theology; Contemporary Continental

Theology, 1938, Harper Brothers

Karl Barth, The Word of God and the Word of Man, Pilgrim Press, 1928; The Christian Life, London, 1930; Epistle to the Romans, Oxford, 1933; God in Action, Round Table Press, 1936; Credo, Scribners, 1936; The Doctrine of the Word of God, T. & T. Clark, 1936 (Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics) See also, The Resurrection of the Dead, Revell, 1933; The Knowledge of God and the Service of God, Scribners, 1939 Emil Brunner, The Theology of Crisis, Scribners, 1929; The Word and the World, Scribners, 1931; The Mediator, MacMillan, 1934; God and Man, MacMillan, 1936; Philosophy of Religion, Scribners, 1937; The Divine Imperative, MacMillan, 1937; The Christian Understanding of Man (Oxford Conference Books)

H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology, London, 1937 A. Keller, Karl Barth and Christian Unity, MacMillan, 1933 A. Nygren, Agape and Eros, MacMillan, 1932 J. S. Zybura, Present-day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism, St. Louis, 1926

N. Berdyaev, The End of Our Time, Sheed & Ward, 1935; The Fate of Man in the Modern World, London, 1935; The Meaning of History, Scribners, 1936; The Destiny of Man, Scribners, 1937; Freedom and the Spirit, Scribners, 1939 J. Baillie, Our Knowledge of God, Scribners, 1939 P. A. Bertocci, The Empirical Argument for God in Late British Thought, Harvard University Press, 1938

E. E. Aubrey, Present Theological Tendencies, Harper Brothers, 1936 G. P. Conger, The Ideologies of Religion, Round Table Press, 1940 S. Bulgakov, The Orthodox Church, London, 1935; The Wisdom of God, Paisley Press, 1937 CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS

Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (3 volumes), Harper Brothers, 1877 W. A. Curtis, History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith, Scribners, 1912 Charles A. Briggs, Theological Symbolics, Scribners, 1914 E. H. Klotsche, Christian Symbolics, Eerdmanns, 1929 J. L. Neve, Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics, Burlington, 1917

J. A. Moehler, Symbolism, or the Exposition of Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, Translated by J. A. Robertson, London, 1906

T. Herbert Bindley, Ecumenical Documents of the Faith, London, 1906 J. R. Lumby, The History of the Creeds, London, 1873 T. E. Schmauk and C. T. Benze, The Confessional Principle and the Confessions, Philadelphia, 1897 A. C. McGiffert, The Apostles' Creed, Scribners

T. Zahn, The Articles of the Apostles' Creed, Hodder & Stoughton, 1890 McFayden, Understanding the Apostles' Creed, MacMillan, 1927 Arthur Cushman McGiffert, The Apostles' Creed, Scribners, 1903 J. Kunze, The Apostles' Creed and the New Testament, Funk & Wagnalls, 1912 John Pearson, An Exposition of the Creed, London, 1824 A. E. Burn, The Apostles' Creed, New York, 1906; The Nicene Creed, New York, 1909 Thomas Richey, The Nicene Creed and the Filioque, New York, 1884 John H. Skrine, Creed and the Creeds, London, 1911

C. A. Heurttley, Harmonica Symbolica: A Collection of Creeds belonging to the Ancient Western Church, and to the Mediaeval English Church, Oxford, 1858 S. S. Schmucker, Lutheran Manual on Scriptural Principles, Philadelphia, 1855 M. Loy, The Augsburg Confession, Columbus, 1908 J. H. W. Stuckenberg, The History of the Augsburg Confession, Philadelphia, 1869 R. W. Jelf, The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, London, 1873 C. Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion, with Documents, London, 1859 Bishop A. P. Forbes, An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine

Articles, London, 1866

T. P. Boultbee, An Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England in an Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, London, 1871 Edward Bickersteth, Questions Illustrating the Thirty-Nine Articles, Philadelphia, 1845 Henry Blunt, Discourse on the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, Philadelphia, 1839

E. J. Bicknell, A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, Longmans Green, 1919 (Last impression, 1936) Bishop George Tomline, Christian Theology, an Exposition of the ThirtyNine Articles of Religion, London, 1843

W. Baker, A Plain Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, London, 1883 Bishop E. Harold Browne, Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Oxford, 1947 Bishop Gilbert Burnet, Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, New York, 1845 B. J. Kidd, The Thirty-Nine Articles: Their History and Explanation, New York, 1901 Edgar C. S. Gibson, The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England Explained, London, 1904

John Macpherson, The Westminster Confession of Faith, New York, 1881 R. L. Cloquet, Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, London, 1885 E. Terrel Green, The Thirty-Nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation, London, 1896

A. A. Hodge, Commentary on the Confession of Faith, Philadelphia, 1869 Silas Comfort, An Exposition of the Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, 1847

Henry Wheeler, History and Exposition of the Twenty-Five Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, 1908 A. A. Jimeson, Notes on the Twenty-Five Articles, Cincinnati, 1855 G. W. Bethune, Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism (2 volumes), New York, 1864

RELIGION History of Religion E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, 1871 Allan Menzies, History of Religion, MacMillan, 1910, Scribners, 1927 M. Jastrow, The Study of Religion C. P. Tiele, Elements of the Science of Religion (2 volumes), 1897 A. Lang, Myth, Ritual and Religion F. B. Jevons, Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion, MacMillan, 1916 Frazer, The Golden Bough (one volume edition), New York, 1926 Brinton, Religions of Primitive Peoples De la Saussaye, Handbook of Religions George F. Moore, History of Religions (2 volumes), Scribners, 1913, 1919 Lowrie, Primitive Religions, 1925 Marett, Sacraments of Simple Folk, 1933; Faith, Hope and Charity in Primitive Religion, 1932 Murray, Five Stages in Greek Religion, 1925 ’ Nilsson, A History of Greek Religion

Radin, Monotheism and Primitive Peoples, 1924 Schmidt, The Origin and Growth of Religion Spencer and Gillen, Native Tribes of Central Australia, 1898 Thomas, History of Buddhist Thought, 1933

Gowen, A History of Religion, Morehouse S. M. Zwemer, The Origin of Religion, 1935 S. Cave, Christianity and Some Living Religions of the East, 1929 Albert Schweitzer, Christianity and the Religions of the World, (Translation, 1923) R. E. Hume, The World’s Living Religions, 1924 S. H. Kellogg, A Handbook of Comparative Religion, 1908 E. A. Marshall, Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions Compared, 1910

R. K. Douglas, Confucianism and Taoism, 1911 A. LeRoy, The Religion of the Primitives, 1922 D. A. Stewart, The Place of Christianity Among the Great Religions of the World, 1920 M. Monier-Williams, Hinduism, 1911 H. H. Underwood, The Religions of Eastern Asia, 1910

W. Tisdall, Christianity and Other Faiths; Comparative Religion, 1909 Charles S. Braden, Modern Tendencies in World Religions, MacMillan, 1933; Varieties of American Religion, Willett Clark and Co., 1936 Albert E. Hayden, Modern Trends in World Religions, Chicago, 1934 George A. Barton, The Religions of the World, Chicago, 1929 Psychology of Religion E. D. Starbuck, Psychology of Religion, Scribners, 1900; The Psychology of Religious Experience, Scribners, 1911 Stratton, The Psychology of the Religious Life, MacMillan, 1911 J. B. Pratt, Psychology of Religious Belief, MacMillan, 1907; The Religious Consciousness, MacMillan, 1923 R. H. Thouless, An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion, MacMillan, 1923

E. S. Waterhouse, Psychology of Religion, MacMillan, 1923 W. R. Selbie, The Psychology of Religion, Oxford, 1924 G. A. Coe, Psychology of Religion, Chicago, 1916 E. R. Uren, Recent Religious Psychology, T. & T. Clark L. W. Grensted, Psychology and God, Longmans, 1931; Religion, Fact or Fancy George Barton Cutten, The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity, Scribners, 1909 John Wright Buckham, Religion as Experience, Abingdon, 1922

W. Boyd Carpenter, The Witness of Religious Experience, London, 1916 William James, Varieties of Religious Experience, New York, 1902 Harold Begbie, Twice Born Men, New York, 1909

S. V. Norborg, Varieties of Christian Experience, Augsburg, 1937 D. Yellowless, Psychology's Defense of the Faith, SCM C. H. Valentine, Modern Psychology and the Validity of Religious Experience W. R. Inge, Christian Mysticism; Faith and Its Psychology E. Underhill, Mysticism, London, 1912 W. M. Horton, A Psychological Approach to Theology, Harpers, 1931 Frederich Heiler, Prayer, Oxford, 1932 Georg Wobbermin, The Nature of Religion, Crowell, 1933 H. N. and R. W. Wieman, Normative Psychology of Religion, Crowell, 1935 William Ernest Hocking, Human Nature and Its Remaking, Yale, 1923 Dewar and Hudson, Psychology for Religious Workers Waterhouse, Psychology and Religion, Richard Smith

L. Weatherhead, Psychology in the Service of the Soul, MacMillan Karl L. Stolz, The Psychology of Religious Living, Cokesbury, 1937 Francis L. Strickland, Psychology of Religious Experience, Abingdon, 1924 Elmer T. Clark, The Psychology of Religious Awakening, MacMillan, 1929 Edmund S. Conklin, The Psychology of Religious Adjustment, MacMillan, 1929 J. Cyril Flower, An Approach to the Psychology of Religion, New York, 1927 Carroll C. Pratt, The Logic of Modern Psychology, MacMillan, 1939 Barbour, Sin and the New Psychology

G. Steven, The Psychology of the Christian Soul, New York, 1911 F. R. Barry, Christianity and Psychology, New York, 1923

H. S. Elliott, The Bearing of Psychology on Religion, New York, 1927 W. E. Hocking, Human Nature and Its Remaking, New Haven, 1918 T. W. Pym, Psychology and the Christian Life, London, 1921

Charles Conant Josey, The Psychology of Religion, MacMillan, 1927 Carl G. Jung, Psychology and Religion, New Haven, 1938 Rudolf Allers, The Psychology of Character, MacMillan, 1931 Frank S. Hickman, Introduction to the Psychology of Religion, Abingdon, 1926 Philosophy of

Religion D. Mial Edwads, The Philosophy of Religion, Doran

William Adams Brown, The Essence of Christianity, Scribners, 1908 A. Sabbatier, Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion, New York, 1927 Edward Caird, The Evolution of Religion, Glasgow

G. B. Foster, The Finality of the Christian Religion, Chicago, 1906 Harald Hoffding, The Philosophy of Religion, MacMillan, 1901, 1906 John Caird, Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, Glasgow, 1880 George Galloway, The Principles of Religious Development, 1909

E. S. Waterhouse, The Philosophy of Religious Experience, London, 1923 Otto Pfleiderer, The Philosophy of Religion on the Basis of History, London, 1888 F. Von Hugel, Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion A. M. Fairbairn, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History, London James Martineau, A Study of Religion

Albert C. Knudson, The Validity of Religious Experience, Abingdon, 1937 Wieman and Meland, American Philosophies of Religion, Chicago, 1936 W. K. Wright, A Student's Philosophy of Religion, MacMillan, 1922, 1935 E. A. Burtt, Types of Religious Philosophy, Harper Brothers, 1939

W. G. de Burgh, Towards a Religious Philosophy, London, 1937 E. S. Brightman, A Philosophy of Religion, New York, 1940 Buttrick, Christian Fact and Modern Doubt, Scribners A. T. Ormond, The Philosophy of Religion, 1922 E. E. Richardson, The Philosophy of Religion, 1920 John Morrison Moore, Theories of Religious Experience, Round Table Press, 1939 John Baillie, The Interpretation of Religion, Scribners, 1928 Vergilius Ferm, First Chapters in Religious Philosophy, Round Table Press, 1937 Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy, Oxford, 1926 D. Eton Trueblood, The Trustworthiness of Religious Experience, Allen and Unwin, 1939

Emil Carl Wilm, Studies in Philosophy and Theology, Abingdon, 1922 D. C. Macintosh, The Reasonableness of Christianity, Scribners, 1926 G. T. Ladd, Philosophy of Religion, 1905 Emil Brunner, The Philosophy of Religion, Scribners, 1937 Fundamentals o f the Christian Religion J. A. W. Haas, The Unity of Faith and Knowledge, New York, 1926 F. L. Patton, Fundamental Christianity, London, 1926 L. T. Townsend, Credo, 1869 F. Hamilton, The Basis of the Christian Faith, New York, 1927 W. H. Turton, The Truth of Christianity, London, 1919 E. H. Johnson, Christian Agnosticism, Philadelphia, 1907

L. F. Steams, The Evidence of Christian Experience, New York, 1890, 1916 P. H. Buehring, Modernism, a Pagan Movement in the Christian Church, Columbus, 1928 J. G. Machen, Christianity and Liberalism, New York, 1923 W. P. King, Behaviorism., A Battle Line, Nashville, 1930; Humanism, Another Battle Line, Nashville, 1931

B. F. Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy, New York, 1870; Lectures on the Truth of the Christian Religion, Detroit, 1873 H. Cremer, Reply to Harnack on the Essence of Christianity, (Translation by Pick), New York, 1903 W. P. Paterson, The Rule of Faith, Hodder and Stoughton, New York & London,1912 REVELATION AND INSPIRATION

A. B. Bruce, The Chief End of Revelation, London, 1887 C. M. Mead, Supernatural Revelation, New York, 1889 George P. Fisher, The Nature and Method of Revelation, New York, 1890 Edwin Lewis, A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation, Harper Brothers, 1940 W. R. Matthews, The Idea of Revelation J. Oman, Vision and Authority

Samuel Harris, The Self-Revelation of God, New York, 1892 W. T. Conner, Revelation and God, Broadman Press, 1936 E. F. Scott, The New Testament Idea of Revelation B. H. Streeter, The God Who Speaks, MacMillan, 1936 Baillie and Martin, (Editors) Revelation Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God D. C. Macintosh, The Problem of Religious Knowledge W. P. Montague, The Ways of Knowing William Adams Brown, Pathways to Certainty C. H. Dodd, The Authority of the Bible John Elof Boodin, Truth and Reality, MacMillan, 1911

Etienne Gilson, Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages, Scribners, 1938 H. Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, Harper Brothers, 1942 B. B. Warfield, Revelation and Inspiration, 1927 B. H. Carroll, Inspiration of the Bible, 1933 W. E. Vine, The Divine Inspiration of the Bible, 1923

R. A. Torrey, Is the Bible the Unerrant Word of God? 1922 W. A. Erickson, Inspiration, History, Theory and Facts, 1928 J. C. Ryle, Is All Scripture Inspired?

W. B. Riley, Inspiration or Evolution, 1923 W. G. Scroggie, Is the Bible the Word of God? 1922 A. B. Bruce, The Chief End of Revelation, London, 1881, 1887 J. H. A. Ebrard, Revelation: Its Nature and Record, Edinburgh, 1884 W. E. Gladstone, The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, Philadelphia, 1891 William Sanday, The Oracles of God, London, 1891 J. R. Illingworth, Reason and Revelation, London, 1902 H. Rogers, The Superhuman Origin of the Bible, London, 1884 S. J. Andrews, God's Revelation of Himself to Men, New York, 1901

C. A. Auberlein, The Divine Revelation: An Essay in Defense of the Faith Henderson, The Bible a Revelation from God, Edinburgh, 1910

F. Bettex, The Bible the Word of God, Cincinnati, 1904; The Word of Truth (Translated by A. Bard), Burlington, Iowa, 1914 James Orr, Revelation and Inspiration, New York, 1910 A. T. Pierson, The Inspired Word, 1888 J. A. O. Stubb, Verbal Inspiration, 1913 R. S. MacArthur, The Old Book and the Old Faith, 1900

Cave, The Inspiration of the Old Testament Inductively Considered, 1888 G. D. Barry, The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scriptures, 1919 A. W. Pink, The Divine Inspiration of the Bible, 1917 L. T. Townsend, Bible Inspiration W. E. Atwell, The Pauline Theory of Inspiration, London, 1878

C. Wordsworth, On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, London, 1867 E. Elliot, Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Edinburgh, 1877

F. L. Patton, The Inspiration of the Scriptures, Philadelphia, 1869 William Lee, The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, New York, 1866

J. M. Gibson, Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture, London, 1908 R. F. Horton, Inspiration of the Bible, London, 1906 J. Urquhart, The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scripture, New York, 1904 THE CANON The Bibliography for this section properly belongs to the Department of Biblical Introduction, and consequently only a few of the older and better known works are cited W. H. Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament, 1898

Wescott, A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament during the first Four Centuries, London, 1855 J. H. Raven, Old Testament Introduction, General and Special T. Zahn,

Introduction to the New Testament, 1917 Henry M. Harman, Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, New York, 1878

Marcus Dods, Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1909 Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, Scribners, 1913 Wescott, History of the English Bible, MacMillan, 1916

H. W. Hoare, The Evolution of the English Bible, New York, 1901 E. C. Bissell, Historic Origin of the Bible, New York, 1878 James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament T. Whitelaw, The Old Testament Problem K. T. Kiel, Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament R. S. Foster, The Supernatural Book, New York, 1890 W. C. Proctor, The Authenticity and Authority of the Old Testament, 1926 Apologetics For the Older Works on Apologetics, see Notes, Volume I, p. 207; for the Later Works on General Apologetics, I, pp. 210, 211; for the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, I, pp. 208, 209; for a partial list of works on Archaeology, I, p. 208. Mention should also be made of the following helpful books:

G. F. Owen, From Abraham to Allenby J. A. Huffman, Voices from Rocks and Dust Heaps of Bible Lands, 1923; Biblical Confirmations from Archaeology, 1931

A. W. Ahl, Bible Studies in the Light of.Recent Research, 1930 G. L. Robinson, The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization, 1930 V. L. Trumper, The Mirror of Egypt in the Old Testament, 1934 Leander S. Keyser, The Problem of Origins, 1926; A Reasonable Faith, 1933; System of Christian Evidences (last edition), 1935

H. Rimmer, Voices from the Silent Centuries, 1934 W. W. Prescott, The Spade and the Bible, 1933 E. J. Banks, The Bible and the Spade, 1913 G. H. Scherer, The Eastern Color of the Bible, 1931 M. G. Kyle, Explorations in Sodom, 1928; Excavating Kirkjeth-Sepher's Ten Cities, 1934 W. Evans, His Unchanging World, 1933 W. T. Pilter, The Pentateuch: A Historical Record, 1928 J. S. Griffith, The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology, 1923 W. Arndt, Does the Bible Contradict Itself? 1926 PART II. THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHER

Theism Robert Flint, Antitheistic Theories, Edinburgh, 1889; Theism, Edinburgh, 1890; Agnosticism, Edinburgh, 1909 George P. Fisher, The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief, New York, 1903

Charles Carroll Everett, Theism andthe Christian Faith, MacMillan, 1909 W. L. Walker, Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism, T. & T. Clark, 1906 Borden Parker Bowne, Theism, American Book Co., 1902

Walter Marshall Horton, Theism and the Scientific Spirit, Harpers, 1933 Leander S. Keyser, A System of Natural Theism, 1917

G. D. Hicks, Philosophical Bases of Theism, MacMillan, 1937 Samuel Harris, The Philosophical Basis of Theism, Scribners, 1883 Davidson, Theism as Grounded in Human Nature Iverach, Theism in the Light of Present Science and Philosophy Kelly, Rational Necessity of Theism, 1909 Reuterdahl, Scientific Theism versus Materialism, 1920 Balfour, Theism and Humanism Tigert, Theism: A Survey of the Paths that Lead to God R. S. Foster, Theism, Hunt & Eaton, 1889 James Ward, Naturalism and Agnosticism (2 volumes), London, 1906; The Realm of Ends

J. Lewis Diman, The Theistic Argument, Boston, 1882 Robert A. Thompson, Christian Theism, New York, 1855 Forsyth, The Justification of God, 1917 Valentine, Natural Theology The Existence and Nature of God

William Newton Clark, The Christian Doctrine of God, Scribners, 1909 Albert C. Knudson, The Doctrine of God, Abingdon, 1930 Clarence A. Beckwith, The Idea of God, MacMillan, 1924 A. S. Pringle-Pattison, The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy, Oxford, 1917 A. E. Garvie, The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead: The Christian Belief in God, Harpers, 1932 Micou, Basic Ideas in Religion Edgar Sheffield Brightman, The Problem of God, Abingdon, 1930; Personality and Religion, Abingdon, 1934

James Orr, The Christian View of God and the World, Scribners, 1908 W. E. Adeny, The Christian Conception of God, Revell, 1912 A. Gratry, Guide to the Knowledge of God, Boston, 1892 Illingworth, Divine Immanence, MacMillan, 1898 Robert J. Breckenridge, The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered, New York, 1859 Heim, God Transcendent, Scribners, 1936 A. C. McGiffert, The God of the Early Christians, Scribners, 1924 W. E. Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, Yale University Press, 1912

J. Baillie, Our Knowledge of God, Scribners, 1939 Joseph Fort Newton, My Idea of God, Boston, 1926 Samuel Harris, The Self-Revelation of God, Scribners, 1889 William Temple, Nature, Man and God, MacMillan, 1935 Maness, Evidences of Divine Being, 1935 W. R. Matthews, The Purpose of God, Scribners, 1936; God in Christian Thought and Experience, Scribners Albert Taylor Bledsoe, A Theodicy, 1854 E. W. Lyman, The Experience of God in Modern Life, New York, 1922 C. C. J. Webb, God and Personality, New York, 1918 B. H. Streeter, Reality, New York, 1926 Borden Parker Bowne, Personalism, Boston and New York, 1908 Albert C. Knudson, The Philosophy of Personalism, 1927 J. H. Snowden, The Personality of God, New York, 1920 William Temple, Christ's Revelation of God, London, 1925

J. E. Davey, Our Faith in God through Jesus Christ, New York, 1922 R. M. Vaughan, The Significance of Personality, New York, 1930 Robert Tyler Flewelling, Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy, New York, 1915; Creative Personality, MacMillan, 1926 J. R. Illingworth, Personality, Human and Divine, London and New York, 1894 J. B. Pratt, Personal Realism, MacMillan, 1937 J. R. IIlingworth, Divine Immanence, London and New York, 1898; Divine Transcendence, London, 1911

H. R. Mackintosh, The Divine Initiative, London, 1921 F. J. McConnell, The Christlike God, New York, 1927 J. M. Wilson, Christ's Thought of God, London, 1920 Gwatkin, The Knowledge of God, Edinburgh, 1906 D. E. Trueblood, The Knowledge of God, Harper Brothers, 1939 Rees Griffiths, God in Idea and Experience

Charles A. Bennett, The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge, Yale, 1931 Karl Barth, The Knowledge of God and the Service of God, Scribners, 1939

C. Hartshorne, Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism, Chicago, 1941 D. C. Macintosh, The Problem of Religious Knowledge, Harper Brothers, 1940 John Elof Boodin, Truth and Reality, MacMillan, 1911 A. C. Garnett, Reality and Value, Yale, 1937 E. Gilson, God and Philosophy, Yale, 1941

P. E. Dove, The Logic of the Christian Faith, Edinburgh, 1856 Asa Mahan, The Science of Natural Theology, Boston, 1867 Georg Wobbermin, Christian Belief in God, 1918 Josiah Royce, The Conception of God, MacMillan, 1902 E. Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, New Haven, 1912 J. Iverach, Is God Knowable? London, 1874 L. D. McCabe, Divine Nescience and Future Contingencies, New York, 1882 J. Fiske, The Idea of God as Affected by Modern Knowledge, Boston and New York, 1886 R. L. Swain, What and Where Is God, New York, 1921 W. J. Moulton, The Certainty of God, New York

W. F. Tillett, The Paths that Lead to God, New York, 1924 William Adams Brown, Pathways to Certainty, New York, 1930 Rufus M. Jones, Pathways to the Reality of God, New York, 1931 L. F. Gruber, The Theory of a Finite and Developing Deity Examined, 1918 S. Mathews, The Growth of the Idea of God, New York, 1931 John Wright Buckham, The Humanity of God, Harper Brothers, 1928; Christianity and Personality, New York, 1936 E. H. Reeman, Do We Need a New Idea of God? Philadelphia, 1917 J. E. Turner, The Revelation of Deity, New York, 19$1 R. S. Candlish, The Fatherhood of God, Edinburgh Crawford, The Fatherhood of God, Edinburgh C. H. H. Wright, The Fatherhood of God and Its Relation to the Person and Work of Christ, Edinburgh Scott-Lidgett, The Fatherhood of God, T. & T. Clark Samuel Clarke, The Being and Attributes of God Gordon W. Allport, Personality, Henry Holt and Co., 1937 C. C. J. Webb, God and Personality, MacMillan, 1919; Religion and Theism, Scribners, 1934 THE TRINITY J. R. Illingworth, The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered, London, 1907

G. S. Faber, The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism (2 volumes), London, 1832 E. H. Bickersteth, The Rock of Ages, New York, 1861 R. N. Davies, Doctrine of the Trinity, Cincinnati, 1891

P. H. Streenstra, The Being of God as Unity and Trinity, New York, 1891 L. L. Paine, Evolution of Trinitarianism, Houghton Mifflin, 1902 Pease, Philosophy of Trinitarian Doctrine, Putnams, 1875 L. G. Mylne, The Holy Trinity, London, 1916

S. B. McKinney, Revelation of the Trinity, London, 1906 A. F. W. Ingram, The Love of the Trinity, New York, 1908 Samuel Clarke, Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity William S. Bishop, The Development of the Trinitarian Doctrine in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, New York, 1910

E. Burton, Testimonials of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, London, 1831 COSMOLOGY

A. S. Eddington, The Nature of the Physical World; The Philosophy of the Physical Sciences; Science and the Unseen World, MacMillan, 1929 J. Needham, Science, Religion and Reality

F. Leslie Cross, Religion and the Reign of Science, New York, 1930 George Allen Dinsmore, Religious Certitude in the Age of Science, Chapel Hill, 1924 J. H. Jeans, The New Background of Science; The Mysterious Universe, MacMillan

G. M. Price, Plain Facts about Evolution, Geology and the Bible, 1911; New Light on the Doctrine of Creation, 1917; Back to the Bible, 1920; The New Geology, 1923; The Phantom of Organic Evolution, 1924; The Predicament of Evolution, 1926; Evolutionary Geology and the New Catastrophiswn, 1926; A History of Some Scientific Blunders, 1930; Modern Discoveries which Help Us to Believe, 1931 A. Fairhurt, Organic Evolution Considered, 1911; Theistic Evolution, 1919 W. K. Azbill, Science and Faith, 1914 T. Graebner, Evolution: An Investigation and a

Criticism, 1921, 1926 W. H. Johnson, The Christian Faith Under Modern Searchlights, Revell, 1916 A. L. Gridley, The First Chapter of Genesis as the Foundation of Science and Religion, 1913

G. F. Wright, The Ice Age in North America and Its Bearing on the Antiquity of Man; Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 1906; Origin and Antiquity of Man, 1912 L. T. Townsend, Evolution and Creation F. Bettex, The Six Days of Creation in the Light of Modern Science L. M. Davies, The Bible and Modern Science, 1925 Baker and Nichol, Creation Not Evolution, 1926 C. F. Dunham, Christianity in a World of Science, 1928 G. Bartoli. The Biblical Story of Creation, 1926 S. J. Bole, The Modern Triangle, Evolution, Philosophy and Criticism, 1926 H. W. Clark, Back to Creationism, 1929

A. H. Finn, the Creation, Fall and Deluge, 1923 J. W. Gibbs, Evolution and Christianity, 1930 L. S. Keyser, The Problems of Origins, 1926 T. H. Nelson, The Mosaic Law in the Light of Modern Science, 1926 B. C. Nelson, The Deluge Story in Stone, 1931 A. R. Short, The Bible and Modern Research

J. H. Morrison, Christian Faith and the Science of Today, Cokesbury Press G. B. Nimrod, Science, Christ and the Bible, 1929

J, L. May (Editor), God and the Universe; The Christian Position, 1932 J. F. Kiskaddon, Scientific Support of Christian Doctrines, 1934 W. B. Dawson, The Bible Confirmed by Science, 1932 A. N. Whitehead, Science and the Modern World; Religion in the Making, New York, 1926 J. A. Thompson, The System of Animate Nature, 1920; Science and Religion, New York, 1925 C. L. Morgan, Life, Mind and Spirit, New York, 1926 J. S. Haldane, Mechanism, Life and Personality, New York, 1904 J. Y. Dimpson, The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature; Nature, Cosmic, Human and Divine L. F. Gruber, Creation ex Nihilo, Boston, 1918

W. H. C. Thomas, Evolution and the Supernatural, Philadelphia B. G. O'Toole, The Case Against Evolution, New York, 1929 H. H. Lane, Evolution and Christian Faith, Princeton, 1923 E. Dennert, At the Death-bed of Darwinism, Burlington, Iowa, 1926 Philip Mauro, Evolution at the Bar, New York, 1922 A. Patterson, The Other Side of Evolution, Chicago, 1903 A. C. Zerbe, Christianity and .False Evolutionism, Cleveland, 1925 H. C. Morton, The Bankruptcy of Evolution, London and New York Older Works Hugh Miller, The Testimony of the Rocks, Boston, 1870 Gerald Molloy, Geology and Revelation, New York, 1870 John Phin, The Chemical History of the Six Days of Creation, New York, 1870 A. T. Richie, The Creation, London, 1882

B. F. Cocker, The Theistic Conception of the World, New York, 1875 John Pye Smith, Geology and Scripture, New York, 1840

Henry Calderwood, The Relation of Science and Religion, New York, 1881 George Warrington, The Mosaic Account of Creation, New York, 1875 George Wight, Geology and Genesis, London, 1857 Alexander Winchell, Reconciliation of Science and Religion, New York, 1877 Joseph H. Wythe, The Agreement of Science and Revelation, Philadelphia, 1872 James Martineau, Modern Materialism and Its Relations to Theology and Religion, New York, 1877 Tayler Lewis, The Bible and Science, 1856; The Six Days of Creation or the Scriptural Cosmogony, 1879

John Henry Kurtz, The Bible and Astronomy, or an Exposition of the Biblical Cosmology and Its Relations to Natural Science, Philadelphia, 1861 T. Landon Bruntin, The Bible and Science,

London, 1881

J. W. Dawson, Archai: or Studies of the Cosmogony and Natural History of the Hebrew Scriptures, Montreal, 1860; Nature and the Bible, New York, 1875

William Fraser, Blending Lights, or Relations of Natural Science, Archaeology and History to the Bible, New York, 1874 James H. Chapin, The Creation and the Early Development of Society, New York, 1880

Providence A. B. Bruce, The Providential Order of the World, New York, 1897; The Moral Order of the World, New York, 1899 W. F. Tillett, Providence, Prayer and Power, Nashville, 1926 O. Dewey, The Problem of Human Destiny, or The End of Providence in the World and Man, New York, 1866 R. Anderson, The Silence of God, Edinburgh M. J. Savage, Life's Dark Problems, New York and London, 1905 Rudolf Otto, Naturalism, and Religion, (English translation), New York, 1907

ANTHROPOLOGY For the best theological discussions of this subject, see the standard works on Dogmatics or Systematic Theology. The following supplementary list is drawn largely from the older works on science in relation to the Bible. The newer works on science are listed under the subject of Cosmology

John Laidlaw, The Bible Doctrine of Man, T. & T. Clark, 1879, 1911 H. W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1911 G. F. Wright, Origin and Antiquity of Man, 1912 R. L. Swain, What and Why Is Man? New York, 1925 John Laird, The Idea of the Soul, New York, 1927 J. B. Heard, The Tripartite Nature of Man, T. & T. Clark

Franz Delitzsch, A System of Biblical Psychology, Edinburgh, 1867 J. F. Beck, Outlines of Biblical Psychology, T. & T. Clark Alexander Winchell, Pre-Adamites, or a Demonstration of the Existence of Man Before Adam, Chicago and London, 1880 Joseph P. Thompson, Man in Genesis and Geology, New York, 1870 George Rawlinson, The Origin of Nations, New York, 1878

R. S. Poole, The Genesis of the Earth and of Man, London, 1860 Dominick M'Causland, Adam and the Adamites, London, 1868 Quatrefages, The Human Species Charles L. Brace, The Races of the Old World, New York, 1863 John Harris, Man Primeval, Boston, 1870; The Pre-Adamite Earth, Boston, 1857 F. Lenormant, The Beginnings of History, New York, 1882 J. L. Cabell, The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind, New York, 1860

D. MacDonald, The Creation and the Fall, Edinburgh . James D. Dana, Manual of Geology, 1875 (Special reference to the unity and antiquity of the race) St. George Mivart, The Genesis of Species, London, 1871

HAMARTIOLOGY Julius Muller, The Christian Doctrine of Sin (2 volumes), Edinburgh, 1877

F. R. Tennant, The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin, Cambridge, 1903; The Origin and Propagation of Sin, Cambridge, 1908; The Concept of Sin, Cambridge, 1912

W. E. Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin, Boston, 1910 J. S. Candlish, The Bible Doctrine of Sin, Edinburgh J. Tulloch, The Christian Doctrine of Sin, New York, 1876 R. Mackintosh, Christianity and Sin, New York, 1914 H. H. Horne, Free Will and Human Responsibility, New York, 1912 King,

Origin of Evil R. Tsanoff, The Nature of Evil H. Lovett, Thoughts on the Causes of Evil, Physical and Moral, London, 1810 E. J. Bicknell, The Christian Doctrine of Sin and Original Sin, London, 1923 Ernest Naville, The Problem of Evil, New York, 1872 James Orr, God's Image in Man and Its Defacement, New York, 1906 John Young, Evil not from God, New York, 1858 Richard S. Taylor, A Right Conception of Sin, Kansas City, 1939 Boardman, The Scriptural Doctrine of Original Sin

Flower, Adam's Disobedience and Its Results Taylor, The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin Glover, A Short Treatise on Original Sin

John Wesley, Sermon XIII, On Sin in Believers; Sermon XIV, Repentance of Believers, (Harrison, Wesleyan Standards, Vol. I)

George P. Fisher, Discussions in History and Theology, Scribners, 1880 (The Augustinian and the Federal Doctrines of Original Sin) Wiggers, Augustinianism and Pelagianism

Jonathan Edwads, Works (II, part iv), Original Sin Samuel Hopkins, Doctrine of the Two Covenants Jeremy Taylor, On Original Sin

Landis, Original Sin and Gratuitous Imputation Straffen, Sin as Set Forth in the Scriptures Wallace, Representative Responsibility N. P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin, Longmans Green, 1929 (Liberal) PART III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SON CHRISTOLOGY J. A. Dorner, History and Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Edinburgh, 1878 J. J. Van Oosterzee, The Image of Christ as Presented in Scripture, London, 1874

W. F. Gess, The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Andover, 1870 J. A. Reubelt, The Scriptural Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Andover, 1870

H. R. Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, New York 1912 A. M. Fairbairn, Studies in the Life of Christ, 1880; The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, Hodder & Stoughton, 1907 H. P. Liddon, The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, London, 1867

A. B. Bruce, The Miraculous Element in the Gospels, 1886; The Providential Order of the World, 1897; The Parabolic Teaching of Jesus; The Humiliation of Christ, Hodder & Stoughton; The Moral Order of the World, Scribners, 1899; Apologetics, New York, 1901 Carl Ullman, The Sinlessness of Jesus an Evidence for Christianity, Edinburgh, 1858. Later Edition, 1870 R. S. Franks, History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ, Hodder & Stoughton S. Cave, The Doctrine of the Work of Christ; The Doctrine of the Person o f Christ, New York, 1925 P. T. Forsyth, The Cruciality of the Cross, 1908; The Person and Place of Jesus Christ, Duckworth, 1909 Herbert M. Relton, A Study in Christology, London, 1922, 1923

Otto Pfleiderer, Early Christian Conception of Christ, Bethany Press, 1911 A. T. Robertson, The Divinity of Christ in the Gospel of John, 1916 Frank Coulin, The Son of Man: Discourses on the Humanity of Jesus Christ, Philadelphia, 1869 John Pye Smith, The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah (2 volumes). Edinburgh, 1868 Frederick C. Conybeare, The Historical Christ, Chicago, 1914

A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, London, 1926 Charles H. Robinson, Studies in the Character of Christ, London, 1900 W. E. Vine, Christ's Eternal Sonship, 1934

E. D. La Touche, The Person of Christ in Modern Thought, London, 1912 John Wright Buckham, Christ and the Eternal Order, Pilgrim Press, 1906 J. Warshauer, The Historical Life of Christ, New York, 1926 L. W. Grensted, The Person of Christ

W. Norman Pittenger, Christ and the Christian Faith, New York, 1941 D. W. Forrest, The Christ of History and Experience, Edinburgh, 1899 Edward Mott, The Christ of the Eternities, Portland, 1936

P. C. Simpson, The Fact of Christ, Revell, 1900 Arthur C. Headlam, Jesus Christ in History and Faith C. E. Raven, Jesus and the Gospel of Love

Good, The Jesus of Our Fathers Pope, The Person of Christ, London B. F. Wescott, Christus Consummator, MacMillan Drown, The Creative Christ Adamson, The Mind in Christ, T. & T. Clark J. A. Findlay, Jesus Human and Divine

J. A. Huffman, Old Testament Messages of the Christ, 1909 Edward H. Bickersteth, The Rock of Ages, New York, 1861 C. Gore, Belief in Christ, New York, 1922 Edwin Lewis, Jesus and the Human Quest

William Temple, Christ the Truth, MacMillan, 1924 William Sanday, Christologius, Ancient and Modern E. H. Merrell, The Person of Christ

S. W. Pratt, The Deity of Christ According to the Gospel of John, 1907 H. S. Coffin, The Portraits of Christ in the New Testament, New York, 1926 T. R. Glover, Jesus in the Experience of Men A. T. Case, As Modern Writers See Jesus, Boston, 1927 G. E. Merrill, The Reasonable Christ, 1893 C. L. Brace, Gesta Christi, 1910 F. Bettex, What Think Ye o f Christ? 1920

Lily Dougall and Cyril W. Emmet, The Lord of Thought, Doran, 1923 Shirley Jackson Case, The Historicity of Jesus, Chicago, 1912, 1928 C. C. McCown, The Promise of His Coming, MacMillan, 1921 C. W. Gilkey, Jesus and Our Generation, Chicago, 1925 R. F. Horton, The Mystical Quest of Christ A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus

V. G. Simkovitch, Towards the Understanding of Jesus, New York, 1923 J. A. Robertson, The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus, Boston, 1921 Halford E. Lucock, Jesus and the American Mind, Abingdon, 1930 B. B. Warfield, The Lord of Glory, 1907 J. E. Whittaker, A Biblical Defense of the Divinity of Christ, 1909 E. Burton, Testamonials of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, London, 1829 The Life of Christ Alfred Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (2 volumes), Longmans Green, 1898 Bernhard Weiss, The Life of Christ (3 volumes)

Theodor Keim, The History of Jesus of Nazareth (3 volumes) F. W. Farrar, The Life of Christ (2 volumes); The Life of Lives W. R. Nicoll, The Incarnate Savior: A Life of Jesus Christ G. Aulen, Christus Victor, MacMillan, 1931 A. M. Rihbany, The Syrian Christ, Boston, 1916 J. Middleton Murray, Jesus the Man of Genius, New York, 1926 C. F. Kent, The Life and Teachings of Jesus

Fred F. Kramer, Jesus the Light of the World James Moffatt (Editor), Everyman's Life of Jesus H. F. Rall, The Life of Jesus

D. L. Sharp, Christ and His Time David Smith, Our Lord's Earthly Life Philip Volmer, The Modern Student's Life of Christ L. M. Sweet, The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ J. J. Taylor, My Lord Christ A. M. Stewart, The Infancy and Youth of Jesus Jacob Boss, The Unique Aloofness of Jesus

W. H. Bennett, The Life of Christ According to St. Mark Burton and Matthews, The Life of Christ Charles R. Erdman, The Lord We Love: Devotional Studies in the Life of Christ W. M. Clow, The Five Portraits of Jesus W. J. Dawson, The Man Christ Jesus A. E. Garvie, Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus A. G. Paisley, The Emotional Life of Jesus

D. G. Browne, Christ and His Age Samuel G. Craig, Jesus as He Was and Is Henry Ward Beecher, The Life of Jesus the Christ Hall Caine, Life of Christ Ecce Homo, A Survey of the Life and Work of Christ C. J. Ellicott, Historical Lectures on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ William Hanna, Life of Christ Robert Keable, The Great Galilean R. H. Walker, Jesus and Our Pressing Problems G. O. Griffith, St. Paul's Life of Christ J. V. Bartlet, The Lord of Life B. W. Bacon, The Story of Jesus, New York, 1927 Shirley Jackson Case, Jesus, a New Biography, Chicago, 1927 W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, T. & T. Clark, 1906; Life of Christ in Recent Research, Oxford, 1907 G. Papini, Life of Christ, Appleton, 1921, New York, 1923 R. J. Campbell, The Life of Christ, Appleton, 1921 Baab, Jesus Christ Our Lord, Abingdon, 1937 August Neander, Life of Jesus Christ, Harper Brothers, 1850 J. de Q. Donehoo, Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ, MacMillan, 1903 S. Townsend, Weaver, The Biblical Life of Jesus Christ, Philadelphia, 1911 James Stalker, Life o f Christ, Revell, 1880 George Matheson, Studies in the Portrait o f Christ, Hodder & Stoughton, 1900

A. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, New York, 1925 (Jewish Interpretation) E. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, Edinburgh, 1911 C. A. Scott, Dominus Noster, Cambridge, 1918 The Virgin Birth James Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ, New York, 1909 R. J. Knowling, Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of Today, 1907 T. J. Thoburn, A Critical Examination of the Evidences for the Doctrine of the Virgin Birth, 1908 A. C. A. Hall, The Virgin Mother, New York, 1894

J. G. Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ, New York, 1930 L. M. Sweet, The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 1907 G. H. Box, The Virgin Birth of Jesus, Milwaukee, 1916 G. W. McPherson, The Modern Mind and the Virgin Birth, 1923 J. A. Faulkner, The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord William B. Ullathorne, The Immaculate Conception, 1904 J. B. Champion, The Virgin's Son, 1924 R. J. Cooke, Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth? 1926 W. Evans, Why I Believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ, 1924

A. T. Robertson, The Mother of Jesus: Her Problems and Her Glory, 1925 J. M. Gray, Why We Believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ

F. W. Pitt, New Light on the Virgin Birth The Incarnation Robert J. Wilberforce, The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ E. H. Gifford, The Incarnation, New York, 1897 T. C. Edwards, The God-Man, Hodder & Stoughton Franzelin, De Verbo Incarnato, Rome Ottley, The Doctrine of the Incarnation, Methuen

Athanasius, On the Incarnation, English Translation by Robertson, London Charles Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, New York, 1900 H. C. Powell, London, 1896, The Principle of the Incarnation, London, 1896 THE ATONEMENT John Miley, The Atonement in Christ, New York, 1879 L. W. Grensted, A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement A. A. Hodge, The Atonement, Philadelphia, 1867

R. S. Candlish, The Atonement: Its Efficacy and Extent, Edinburgh, 1867 Albert Barnes, The Atonement in Its Relation to Law and Moral Government, Philadelphia, 1859

Horace Bushnell, The Vicarious Sacrifice (2 volumes), New York, 1891 D. W. Simon, The Redemption of Man, Edinburgh, 1899; Reconciliation Through Incarnation, Edinburgh, 1898

Anselm, Cur Deus Homo, English Translation by Deane, Chicago, 1903 H. N. Oxenham, The Catholic Doctrine of Atonement, London, 1865 T. V. Tymns, The Christian Idea of Atonement, London, 1904 R. C. Moberly, Atonement and Personality, New York, 1901 A. Sabbatier, The Doctrine of the Atonement and Its Historical Evolution, English Translation, New York, 1904

James Denney, The Death of Christ, New York, 1903; The Atonement and the Modern Mind, London, 1903; The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, New York, 1918 G. B. Stevens, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation, 1905

Rashdall, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, MacMillan, 1920 J. K. Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement, Scribners, 1916 F. D. Maurice, The Doctrine of Sacrifice Deduced from the Scriptures, 1854 John M. Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, London, 1873 Thomas J. Crawford, The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement, 1875 R. W. Dale, The Atonement, New York, 1876 William Symington, The Atonement and Intercession of Jesus Christ, New York, 1849 Howard Malcom, The Extent and Efficacy of the Atonement, Philadelphia, 1870 G. Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught by Christ Himself, Edinburgh, 1868 Ralph Wardlaw, Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement, Glasgow, 1844 William Magee, Scripture Doctrine of Atonement and Sacrifice, New York, 1839 Charles Beecher, Redeemer and Redeemed, Boston, 1864

J. S. Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement, London, 1901 Ritschl, The Scripture Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, Clark Robert Mackintosh, Historic Theories of the Atonement, New York, 1920 Grotius, De Satisfactione (Editions from 1617-1730), English Translation by Foster, Andover

S. Cave, The Scripture Doctrine of Sacrifice, T. & T. Clark H. R. Mackintosh, The Christian Experience of Forgiveness G. W. Richards, Christian Ways of Salvation H. S. Coffin, Social Aspects of the Cross, New York, 1911 J. S. Whale, The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil, 1936 E. W. Johnson, Suffering, Punishment and Atonement, 1919

H. Wheeler Robinson, Suffering: Human and Divine, MacMillan, 1939 A. S. Peake, The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament, 1904 M. C. D'Arcy, The Pain of this World and the Providence of God, 1936 J. K. Mozley, The Impassibility of God, 1926 R. C. Moberly, Sorrow, Sin and Beauty, 1903 James Hinton, The Mystery of Pain, 1866 B. R. Brasnett, The Suffering of the Impassible God, 1928 Leighton Pullen, The Atonement, London, 1913 Lonsdale Ragg, Aspects of the Atonement, London, 1904 P. L. Snowden, The Atonement and Ourselves, London, 1919

F. R. M. Hitchcock, The Atonement and Modern Thought, London, 1911 George C. Foley, Anselm's Theory of the Atonement, New York, 1909 James Denney, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation Albert C. Knudson, The Doctrine of Redemption, Abingdon, 1933 PART IV. THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT James Buchanan, On the Office and Work of the Holy Spirit, Edinburgh, 1856

James B. Walker, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Cincinnati, 1880 Julius Charles Hare, The Mission of the Comforter, London, 1876 W. T. Davison, The Indwelling Spirit, Hodder & Stoughton,

1911 John Goodwin, Pleroma to Pneumatikon; or Being Filled with the Spirit, 1670, 1867 William Arthur, Tongue of Fire, 1856

Downer, The Mission and Administration of the Holy Spirit, 1909 Abraham Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit, Funk & Wagnalls, 1908 A. B. Simpson, The Holy Spirit or Power from on High (2 volumes), New York, 1895 B. H. Streeter, The Spirit, MacMillan, 1919 H. Wheeler Robinson, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, Harper, 1928

Selby, The Holy Spirit and Christian Privilege, 1894 Welldon, The Revelation of the Holy Spirit, 1902 John W. Goodwin, The Living Flame, Nazarene Samuel Chadwick, The Way to Pentecost, Revell, T. Rees, The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience Evelyn Underhill, The Life of the Spirit and the Life of Today Charles A. Anderson-Scott, Fellowship with the Spirit Walker, The Spirit and the Incarnation, 1899 Irving Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 1904 G. Smeaton, Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 1882 T. K. Doty, The Twofold Gift of the Holy Ghost L. R. Dunn, The Mission of the Spirit, New York, 1871 S. L. Brengle, When the Holy Ghost Is Come, New York, 1914 William McDonald, Another Comforter, Boston, 1890 Denio, The Supreme Leader, Boston, 1910

W. P. Dickson, St. Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, 1883 Dougan Clark, The Offices of the Holy Spirit, Philadelphia, 1878 W. H. Hutchings, The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost, Longmans Green, 1897

Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, English Translation by Lewis, London J. S. Candlish, The Work of the Holy Spirit, T. & T. Clark Manning, Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost, London Wheldon, The Holy Spirit, MacMillan Humphrey, His Divine Majesty, London Owen, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, T. & T. Clark, 1684, 1826 Joseph Parker, The Paraclete, New York, 1876 Heber, Bampton Lectures on the Personality and Office of the Comforter, 1846 Raymond Calkins, The Holy Spirit, Abingdon, 1930 A. C. A. Hall, The Work of the Holy Spirit, Milwaukee, 1907 J. D. Folsom, The Holy Spirit Our Helper, New York, 1907 G. F. Holden, The Holy Ghost the Comforter, New York, 1908 F. C. Porter, The Spirit of God and the Word of God in Modern Theology, New York, 1908

J. H. B. Masterman, I Believe in the Holy Ghost, London, 1907 A. J. Gordon, The Ministry of the Spirit, New York, 1894 Kildahl, Misconceptions of the Word and Work of the Holy Spirit, Minn., 1927 Henry B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, London, 1912; The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, London, 1909 W. H. Griffith Thomas, The Holy Spirit of God, London, 1913 C. E. Raven, The Creator Spirit

R. A. Torrey, The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit, New York, 1910 C. I. Schofield, Plain Papers on the Holy Spirit, New York and London, 1899

E. W. Winstanley, The Spirit in the New Testament, New York, 1908 Julius Charles Hare, The Mission of the Comforter, Boston, 1854 J. Robson, The Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, Aberdeen, 1893 L. B. Crane, The Teachings of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit, New York, 1906 Goodwin, The Work of the Holy Ghost in Our Salvation, Edinburgh, 1863 I. Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 1904 J. P. Coyle, The Holy Spirit in Literature and Life, Boston, 1855 Jonathan Goforth, By My Spirit, London and Edinburgh Older Works on the Holy Spirit (Cited by Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit)

John Owen, Works (Richard Baynes, 1826), Contains three treatises on the Holy Spirit published in 1674, 1682 and 1693. Still unsurpassed. Johannes Ernest Gerhard, On the Person of the Holy Spirit, Jena, 1660 T. Hackspann, Dissertation on the Holy Spirit, Jena, 1655

J. F. Buddeuss, On the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, Jena, 1727 Fr. Deutsch, On the Personality of the Holy Spirit, Leipsic, 1711 David Rungius, Proof of the Eternity and Eternal Godhead of the Holy Spirit, Wittenberg, 1599 Seb. Neuman, On the Holy Spirit, Jena, 1656

J. G. Dorsche, On the Person of the Holy Spirit, Konigsberg, 1690 J. C. Pfeiffer, On the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, Jena, 1740 G. F. Gude, On the Martyrs as Witnesses for the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, Leipsic, 1741 J. C. Danhauer, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and from the Son, Strasburg, 1663 Separate Treatises

Anton, The Holy Spirit Indispensable Carsov, On the Holy Spirit in Conviction Wensdorf, On the Holy Spirit as a Teacher Boerner, The Anointing of the Holy Spirit Neuman, The Anointing Which Teaches All Things Fries, The Office of the Holy Spirit in General Weiss, The Holy Spirit Bringing into Remembrance Foertsch, On the Holy Spirit's Leading of the Children of God Hoepfner, On the Intercession of the Holy Spirit Meen, On the Adoration of the Holy Spirit Henning and Crusius, On the Earnest of the Holy Spirit Beltheim, Arnold, Gunther, Wendler and Dumerick, On the Groaning of the Holy Spirit Dutch Theologians Sam. Maresius, Theological Treatise on the Personality and Godhead of the Holy Spirit Jac. Fruytier, The Ancient Doctrine Concerning God and the Holy Spirit, True, Proven and Divine THE PRELIMINARY STATES OF GRACE The best treatment of the Preliminary States of Grace, as also the subjects of Justification and Regeneration, will be found in the standard works on Systematic Theology. Representing the earlier, or what is some times known as modified Arminianism, are the following: Watson, Institutes; Wakefield, Christian Theology; Summers, Systematic Theology; Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology; and Ralston, Elements of Divinity. The last named work contains an excellent discussion of the Calvinistic and Arminian positions. As representative of the so-called later Arminianism, Raymond, Systematic Theology; Miley, Systematic Theology; Whedon, Commentaries, and A. M. Hills, Fundamental Christian Theology. In the Calvinistic theology, Dr. W. G. T. Shedd represents the realistic position, and Dr. Charles Hodge, the Federal or Representative position. Among the older works on both the Calvinistic and Arminian positions, may be mentioned the following:

John Wesley, Works, Volume VI, On Predestination James Arminius, Writings, Volume III John Fletcher, Checks to Antinomianism, Volumes I-H

J. B. Mozley, Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, 1855 George Tomline, A Refutation of Calvinism, London, 1811 John Calvin, Institutes, Book III, Chapters xxi-xxiv

Richard Watson, Theological Institutes, Part II, Chapters xxv-xxviii W. Fisk, The Calvinistic Controversy, New York 1837 Randolph S. Foster, Objections to Calvinism, Cincinnati, 1848 (many editions) Edward Copleston, Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination, London, 1821

John Forbes, Predestination and Free Will Reconciled, or Calvinism and Arminianism United in the Westminster Confession, 1878

Jonathan Edwards, An Essay on the Freedom of the Will, 1754; also, A Divine and Supernatural Light Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God, 1734 (A sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy)

Albert Taylor Bledsoe, An Examination of Edwards on the Will; Philadelphia, 1845; A Theodicy, or Vindication of Divine Glory, New York, 1853 Asa Mahan, System of Intellectual Philosophy, New York, 1845; Election and the Influence of the Holy Spirit, 1851 Daniel D. Whedon, Freedom of the Will, 1864 Martin Luther, Bondage of the Will Thomas C. Upham, Treatise on the Will, 1850

Henry Philip Tappan, A Review of Edwards on the Will, New York, 1839; Doctrine of the Will Determined by an Appeal to Consciousness, 1840; Doctrine of the Will Applied to Moral Agency and Responsibility, 1841 (Single volume, Glasgow, 1857) CHRISTIAN RIGHTEOUSNESS

Here again, the best treatment of the subject will be found in the standard works on theology. The clearest and most specific treatment is found in the earlier treatises. ’

John Wesley, Sermons, V, VI, and XX. (Harrison, Wesleyan Standards, Volume I) Richard Watson, Theological Institutes, II, Chapter xxiii John Calvin, Institutes, III, xi-xxiii John Owen, Works, Volume V, The Doctrine of Justification Faber, The Primitive Doctrine of Justification

Jonathan Edwards (the younger), On the Necessity of the Atonement, and Its Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness, Three addresses, 1875, which form the basis of the "Edwardean Theory" of the Atonement, generally accepted by the "New England School."

Albrecht Ritschl, The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, (Translated by Mackintosh and Macaulay) (Second Edition, 1902 Charles Abel Heurtiey, Justification, 1845 (Bampton Lectures) John Davenant, A Treatise on Justification (2 volumes), London, 18441846

M. Loy, The Doctrine of Justification, Columbus, Ohio, 1869, 1882 James Buchanan, The Doctrine of Justification, Edinburgh, 1867 John H. Newman, Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification, London, 1874 R. N. Davies, A Treatise on Justification, Cincinnati, 1878 Julius Charles Hare, Scriptural Doctrine of Justification Martin Luther, On Galatians S. M. Merrill, Aspects of Christian Experience, Chapters iv-vii H. R. Mackintosh, The Christian Experience of Forgiveness (previously mentioned) G. W. Richards, Christian Ways of Salvation, New York, 1923 John Witherspoon, Essay on Justification, 1756 (Considered one of the ablest Calvinistic expositions of the doctrine) G. Cross, Christian Salvation, Chicago, 1925 CHRISTIAN SONSHIP Outside of the standard works on theology, the literature of Christian Sonship or Regeneration is not extensive John Wesley, Sermons, XVIII and XIX (Harrison, Wesleyan Standards, Volume I) John Fletcher, Discourse on the New Birth

Stephen Charnock, On Regeneration, (Complete works in Nichol’s Series of Standard Divines, 5 volumes, Edinburgh, 1864) Faber, Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration John Howe, On Regeneration (Sermons xxxviii-xlix) Complete Works (2 volumes), London, 1724; New York, 1869 Austin Phelps, The New Birth, Boston, 1867 John Witherspoon, Treatise on Regeneration, 1764 Calvin, Institutes, III, i-ii Jonathan Edwards, On Spiritual Light (mentioned in connection with Prevenient Grace) S. M. Merrill, Aspects of Christian Experience (Chapter x) Witsius, Covenants, III, vi Archbishop Leighton, On Regeneration N. H. Marshall, Conversion or the New Birth, London, 1909 G. H. Gerberding, New Testament Conversions, Philadelphia, 1889 The Witness of the Spirit John Wesley, Sermons, X, XI, and XII (Harrison, Wesleyan Standards, volume I)

R. N. Davies, A Treatise on Justification, 1878 (Lecture x) S. M. Merrill, Aspects of Christian Experience (Chapter x) Walton, Witness of the Spirit Young, The Witness of the Spirit, 1882 Modern Related Works H. Begbie, Twice-Born Men, New York, London and Edinburgh, 1909 (previously cited) H. E. Monroe, Twice-Born Men in America, 1914 G. Jackson, The Fact of Conversion, London, 1908 CHRISTIAN PERFECTION OR ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION

There is a wide variety of literature on this subject, but in general it has been written and published with the dominant thought of propagating the doctrine and the experience. For this reason, the simple first principles of the doctrine have been presented in an evangelistic manner, and consequently there is not a great amount of scholarly and investigative literature on the subject. The following works may be considered representative:

John Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection; Sermon XVII, The Circumcision of the Heart; Sermon XL, Christian Perfection; and Sermon XLIII, The Scripture Way of Salvation Jesse T. Peck, The Central Idea of Christianity, Boston, 1857 R. S. Foster, Christian Purity

W. F. Mallalieu, The Fulness of the Blessing, Jennings & Pye, 1903 Dr. P. F. Bresee, Sermons, Nazarene Publishing House, 1903 Dr. Dougan Clark, Theology of Holiness, Boston, 1893; Offices of the Holy Spirit, 1878 William MacDonald, Scriptural Way of Holiness, 1887; New Testament Standard of Piety, New York, 1860, 1871

J. A. Wood, Purity and Maturity, 1876, Boston, 1899; Perfect Love, 1880, Boston and Chicago, 1907; Christian Perfection as Taught by John Wesley, MacDonald and Gill, 1885 Dr. Adam Clarke, Christian Theology, London, 1835 R. T. Williams, Sanctification, Kansas City, 1928 J. W. Goodwin, The Living Flame, Kansas City C. W. Ruth, Entire Sanctification, Chicago, 1903; The Second Crisis in Christian Experience, Chicago, 1912 Dr. W. B. Godbey, The Incarnation of the Holy Ghost, Louisville; Bible Theology, Cincinnati, 1911 W. Jones, M. D., The Doctrine of Entire Sanctification, National Association. 1885 Asbury Lowrey, Possibilities of Grace, New York, 1888 Dr. A. M. Hills, Holiness and Power Joseph H. Smith, Pauline Perfection, Chicago, 1913 Daniel Steele, Love Enthroned, New York, 1875, 1902, 1908 Sheridan Baker, Hidden Manna, Boston, 1888; The New Name, 1890; Living Waters Commissioner Brengle, When the Holy Ghost Is Come, Salvation Army, N. Y., 1914 Harry E. Jessop, Foundation of Doctrine, Chicago, 1938 Beverly Carradine, The Old Man, Louisville, 1896; The Better Way, Cincinnati, 1896 Isaac M. See, The Rest of Faith, New York, 1871 Mark Guy Pearse, Christian’s Secret of Holiness, Boston, 1886; Thoughts on Holiness, 1884 Benjamin T. Roberts, Holiness Teachings, North Chili, N. Y., 1893

S. H. Platt, Christian Holiness (Philosophy, Theory and Experience), 1882 Asa Mahan, The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, George Hughes & Co., 1870 Dr. C. J. Fowler, Christian Unity, Chicago, 1907 Dr. E. P. Ellyson, Bible Holiness, Kansas City, 1938 S. A. Keen, Pentecostal Papers, Cincinnati, 1895

E. T. Curnick, A Catechism on Christian Perfection, Boston, 1885 E. A. Hazen, Salvation to the Uttermost, Lansing, 1892 Chadwick, The Way to Pentecost, Revell A. Sims, Bible Salvation, 1886 W. E. Shepard, Holiness Typology, San Francisco, 1896 G. D. Watson, White Robes, Cincinnati, 1883; The Heavenly Life J. A. Kring, The Conquest of Canaan, Kansas City, 1930 J. G. Morrison, Our Lost Estate, Kansas City Campbell, Witnesses to Holiness Brockett, Scriptural Freedom from

Sin CHRISTIAN ETHICS In addition to the references cited in the body of the text, the following books dealing with both Christian and theoretical ethics will be found valuable:

William Burton Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology, III, pp. 148-258 Thomas N. Ralston, Elements of Divinity, Part III, pp. 733-857 C. F. Paulus, The Christian Life, New York and Cincinnati, 1892 H. H. Scullard, The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature, London, 1927 W. R. Inge, Christian Ethics and Modern Problems, London, 1932 C. Gore, Christian Moral Principles, London, 1932 W. E. H. Lecky, History of European Morals from Augustine to Charlemagne, London, 1897 P. Gardner, Evolution in Christian Ethics, London, 1918

W. H. V. Reade, The Moral System in Dante's Inferno, Oxford, 1909 A. H. Gilbert, Dante's Conception of Justice, Durham, N. C., 1925 R. Roedder, Savonarola, A Study of Conscience, New York, 1930 G. Harkness, John Calvin, the Man and His Ethics, New York, 1931 F. K. Chaplin, The Effects of the Reformation on the Ideals of Life and Conduct, Cambridge, 1927 J. R. Illingworth, Christian Character, London, 1904

W. R. Sorley, Ethics of Naturalism, Edinburgh, 1904; Moral Life and Moral Worth, Cambridge, 1911; Moral Values and the Idea of God, Cambridge, 1918

K. E. Kirk, The Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum, London, 1931 H. E. Rashdall, Theory of Good and Evil, Oxford, 1907 P. Mayers, History as Past Ethics, Boston, 1913 J. Rickaby, Aquinas Ethicus (2 volumes), London, 1896 W. K. L. Clarke, The Ascetic Works of St. Basil, London, 1925 Bernard of Clairveaux, The Twelve Degrees of Humility and Pride (Translated by B. R. V. Mills), London, 1929 T. K. Abbott, Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics, London, 1909 T. H. Green, Prolegomena to Ethics, Oxford, 1883, 1906 F. H. Bradley, Ethical Studies, Oxford, 1876, 1927 R. H. Murray, Erasmus and Luther, London, 1920 F. H. Dudden, The Life and Times of Ambrose, Oxford, 1935 Augustine, Confessions (Everyman's Edition), London, 1907; City of God, F. W. Bussell, London, 1913 Tertullian, Apologia (Translated by W. Reeve), London, 1926 A. Slater, Manual of Moral Theology (2 volumes), Burns and Oates

F. J. Hall and F. H. Hallock, Moral Theology, Longmans Green & Company K. E. Kirk, Some Principles of Moral Theology; Conscience and Its Problems, Longmans Green & Co

Older Works

William Whewell, The Elements of Morality (2 volumes), New York, 1845 Francis Wayland, The Elements of Moral Science (77th edition), Boston, 1865

Mark Hopkins, The Law of Love and Love as a Law, New York, 1875 Henry Calderwood, Handbook of Moral Philosophy, London, 1881

D. S. Gregory, Christian Ethics, Philadelphia, 1875 Joseph Haven, Moral Philosophy, Boston, 1860 Ralph Wardlaw, Christian Ethics, London, 1833

J. L. Davies, Theology and Morality, London, 1873 H. Winslow, Moral Philosophy, New York, 1866 Samuel Spalding, The Philosophy of Christian Morals, London, 1843 J. Skinner, Synopsis of Moral and Ascetic Theology, Kegan Paul Archibald Alexander, Outlines of Moral Science, New York, 1870 T. R. Birks, Supernatural Revelation, or the First Principles of Moral Theology, London, 1879

J. Bascom, Ethics of the Science of Duty, New York, 1879 G. C. A. Harless, System of Christian Ethics, Edinburgh, 1868 Chr. F. Schmid, General Principles of Christian Ethics, Philadelphia, 1872 J. Seth, A Study of Ethical Principles, London, 1894 J. S. Mackenzie, A Manual of Ethics, London, 1893 Noah Porter, The Elements of Moral Science, Scribners, 1885; Kant's Ethics, Chicago, 1885 Immanuel Kant, The Metaphysics of Ethics (Translated by J. W. Temple), Edinburgh, 1869 John Foster, Lectures on Christian Morals, Nashville, 1855

E. G. Robinson, Principles and Practice of Morality, Boston, 1888 James Martineau, Types of Ethical Theory (2 volumes), Oxford, 1886 Borden Parker Bowne, The Principles of Ethics, Harpers, 1892

W. T. Davison, The Christian Conscience, London, 1888 Alexander Baine, Mental and Moral Science, London, 1868 Marriage and Divorce Oscar D. Watkins, Holy Matrimony, New York, 1895 Herbert M. Luckok, The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian, London, 1895 Hugh Davey Evans, A Treatise on the Christian Doctrine of Marriage, New York, 1870

Alvah Hovey, The Scriptural Law of Divorce, Boston, 1866 George Walter Fiske, The Christian Family, Abingdon, 1929 Flora M. Thurston, A Bibliography of Family Relationships, New York, 1932 Annie I. Dyer, Guide to the Literature of Home and Family Life, Philadelphia, 1924 Regina Wescott Wieman, The Modern Family and the Church, Harpers, 1937 (Contains an extensive bibliography) Modern Social Reform H. Martin, Christian Social Reformers of the Nineteenth Century, London, 1927 W. Cunningham, Christianity and Economic Science, London, 1914 W. E. Orchard, Christianity and World Problems, London J. A. Hobson, God and Mammon: The Relation of Religion and Economics, New York, 1931 A. D. Lindsay, Christianity and Economics, London, 1933 E. Troeltsch, Protestantism and Progress, London, 1912 R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, London, 1925 A. T. Cadoux, Jesus and Civil Government, London, 1923 C. J. Cadoux, The Early Church and the World, Edinburgh, 1925 M. Weber, The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism, New York, 1930 F. E. Johnson, Economics and the Good Life, New York, 1934 THE CHURCH

Some of the best material on the organization, ministry, worship and sacraments of the Church will be found in the treatises on systematic theology. The following list includes a number of miscellaneous works also, together with a few of the treatises on special subjects Thomas O. Summers, Systematic Theology, Volume II, Book VII, pp. 215494 William Burton Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology, Volume III, pp. 259-364

A. H. Strong, Systematic Theology, Volume III, Part VII, pp. 887-980 Samuel Wakefield, Christian Theology, Book VI, pp. 538-596 A. M. Hills, Fundamental Christian Theology, Volume II, pp. 282-336 The Sacraments George D. Armstrong, The Sacraments of the New Testament, New York, 1880

W. R. Gordon, The Church of God and Her Sacraments, New York, 1870 Richard Whately, The Scripture Doctrine Concerning the Sacraments, London, 1857 John S. Stone, The Christian Sacraments, New York, 1866

Richard Watson, The Sacraments (From the Institutes), New York, 1893 C. P. Krauth, The Person of Our Lord and His Sacramental Presence, (Lutheran), 1867

Special Treatises on Baptism Bishop S. M. Merrill, Christian Baptism, New York, 1876 J. W. Etter, The Doctrine of Christian Baptism, Dayton, 1888 William Wall, History of Infant Baptism, London, 1872 Leonard Woods, Lectures on Infant Baptism, Andover, 1829 James Chrystal, History of the Modes of Christian Baptism, Philadelphia, 1851

W. Elwin, The Ministry of Baptism (Historical), London, 1889 Alexander Carson, Baptism in Its Mode and Subjects, American Baptist, 1845, 1860

C. P. Krauth, Baptism: The Doctrine Set Forth in the Holy Scriptures and Taught in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 1866; Infant Baptism and Infant -Salvation in the Calvinistic System. (A review of Dr. Hodge's Systematic Theology), Philadelphia, 1874

Edward Beecher, Import and Modes of Baptism, New York, 1849 Edward Bickersteth, A Treatise on Baptism, Philadelphia, 1841 J. A. Whittaker, Baptism, 1893

R. W. Dale, Classic Baptism, 1867; Johannic Baptism, 1870; Judaic Baptism, 1873; Christie and Patristic Baptism, 1874; Rutter, Philadelphia F. G. Hibbard, Christian Baptism, New York, 1853 William Hodges, Baptism Tested by Scripture and History, New York, 1874 D. B. Ford, Studies on the Baptismal Question, Boston, 1879 C. Taylor, Apostolic Baptism, New York, 1844, 1869 H. Herbert Hawes, Baptism Mode-Studies, Warden, 1887 Church Polity George T. Ladd, Principles of Church Polity, New York, 1882

Samuel Davidson, Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament, Bohn, 1850 Albert Barnes, Episcopacy Tested by Scripture (A review of the work by Bishop Onderdonk), Essays and Reviews, Volume I, New York, 1855 W. Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, 1893 W. J. McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, 1911 Charles Hodge, The Church and Its Polity, New York, 1879

E. Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, London, 1881 R. W. Dale, Manual of Congregational Principles G. A. Jacob, The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament W. Jones Seabury, An Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical Polity, New York, 1894 C. C. Stewart, The Scriptural Form of Church Government, New York, 1872 William Pierce, The Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists, London, 1873

William H. Perrine, Principles of Church Government with Special Application to the Polity of Episcopal Methodism, New York, 1888 Robert Emory, History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1864 Francis Wayland, Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches, Sheldon, 1857 Ralph Wardlaw, Congregational Independency, London, 1848 C. W. Shields, The Historic Episcopate, Scribners, 1894 Thomas B. Neely, The Evolution of Episcopacy and Organic Methodism, New York, 1888

Church History The field of church history is extensive and properly belongs to another department in the study of religion. Only a few of the more important works, therefore, are included in the following bibliography

J. L. Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History (4 volumes), Translated by Maclaine George P. Fisher, History of the Christian Church, Scribners, 1887

J. F. Hurst, Short History of the Christian Church, Harpers, 1893 J. H. Kurtz, Church History (3 volumes), New York, 1890

Philip Schaff, History of the Apostolic Church, New York, 1853; History of the Christian Church (7 volumes), Scribners, 1892; American Church History (12 volumes, Christian Literature Company, N. Y., 1893

H. H. Milman, History of Latin Christianity (8 volumes), New York, 1871 Gibbon, History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (6 volumes), Boston, 1850 John Fulton (Editor), Ten Epochs of Church History (10 volumes), Scribners, 1911

Williston Walker, History of the Christian Church, Scribners, 1924 Leopold von Ranke, History of the Popes (3 volumes), New York, 1901 F. W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, New York, 1882

C. D. Eldridge, Christianity's Contribution to Civilization, Cokesbury, 1928 William Warren Sweet, Story of Religion in America, Harpers, 1930, 1939 G. L. Hunt, Outline of the History of Christian Literature, MacMillan, 1926 K. S. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity (4 volumes), Scribners, 1941

A. Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity Hans Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church Moffatt, The First Five Centuries Abel Stevens, History of Methodism (3 volumes), New York and London, 1858, 1878 L. Tyerman, The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley (3 volumes), Harpers, 1872 T. M. Lindsay, History of the Reformation, (2 volumes), 1911 J. Mackinnon, Luther and the Reformation (4 volumes); Calvin and the Reformation, 1936 M. W. Patterson, A History of the Church of England, 1912 Rufus M. Jones, The Later Period of Quakerism, MacMillan (2 volumes), 1921 Workman and Eays, A New History of Methodism, (2 volumes), 1909 J. W. C. Wand, A History of the Modern Church, 1929 S. Bulgakov, The Orthodox Church, 1935

A. Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church, Edinburgh, 1851-1855. New Edition (6 volumes), Boston, 1859 Miscellaneous

T. M. Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, 1924 C. G. Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion (3 volumes), 1923 B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, London, 1929 W. P. Paterson, The Rule of Faith, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912

William Adams Brown, The Essence of Christianity, New York, 1902; The Church Catholic and Protestant, Scribners, 1935; Church and State in America, 1936 H. Cotterill, The Genesis of the Church, Edinburgh, 1872 J. J. McElhinney, The Doctrine of the Church, Philadelphia, 1871

C. C. Richardson, The Church Through the Centuries, Scribners, 1938 N. Ehrenstrom, Christian Faith and the Modern State, 1937 H. R. Mackintosh, The Originality of the Christian Message, New York, 1920 Ernest F. Scott, The Nature of the Early Church, Scribners, 1941 C. A. Scott, The Church, Its Worship and Sacraments, London, 1927 W. S. Sperry, Reality in Worship, New York, 1925 T. R. Glover, The Nature and Purpose of a Christian Society, New York, 1922 A. B. Macdonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church Philip Carrington, A Primitive Christian Catechism C. E. Raven, The Gospel and the Church

ESCHATOLOGY

S. D. F. Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality, Edinburgh, 1901 J. H. Snowden, The Christian Belief in Immortality, 1925 E. Abbott, The Literature of the Doctrine of a Future Life, New York, 1874 S. Lee, Eschatology, Boston, 1858 N. West, Studies in Eschatology, New York, 1889 L. A. Muirhead, The Eschatology of Jesus, London, 1906 William Newton Clarke, Immortality, Yale, 1920

Charles E. Jefferson, Why We May Believe in Life After Death A. S. Pringle-Pattison, The Idea of Immortality, Oxford, 1922 J. A. Spencer, Five Last Things, New York, 1887 G. T. Cooperrider, The Last Things, Death and the Future Life, Columbus, Ohio, 1911 James H. Hyslop, Science and the Future Life, Boston, 1905 R. E. Hutton, The Soul in the Unseen World, London, 1902; The Life Beyond, Milwaukee, 1916 E. E. Holmes, Immortality, London, 1908 Joseph Agar Beet, The Last Things, London, 1905

Ernest von Dobschutz, The Eschatology of the Gospels, London, 1910 William Adams Brown, The Christian Hope, New York, 1912; The Creative Experience, 1923 B. H. Streeter (and others), Immortality, MacMillan, 1917 J. Y. Simpson, Man and the Attainment of Immortality F. W. H. Myers, Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death, London, 1913

J. Strong, The Doctrine of a Future Life, New York, 1891 W. Smyth, Dorner on the Future State, New York, 1883 R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity, London, 1899

S. Davidson, Doctrine of Last Things, London, 1882 Alger, Critical History of the Future Life, Boston, 1880 J. Marchant, Immortality (A symposium), New York, 1924 H. R. Mackintosh, Immortality and the Future, 1917 M. C. Peters, After Death What? 1908 D. P. Halsey, The Evidence for Immortality, 1931 P. Cabot, The Sense of Immortality, 1924 Ingersoll Lectures The following titles are selected from the Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality, published by the Cambridge University Press

George A. Gordon, Immortality and the New Theology, 1896 Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Dionysius and Immortality, 1898 Josiah Royce, The Conception of Immortality, 1899 John Fiske, Life Everlasting, 1900

Samuel M. Crowthers, The Endless Life, 1905 Charles F. Dole, The Hope of Immortality, 1907 George A. Reisner, Egyptian Conception of Immortality, 1911 Clifford Herschel Moore, Pagan Idea of Immortality, 1918 William Wallace Ferm, Immortality and Theism, 1921 Kirsopp Lake, Immortality and the Modern Mind, 1922 Philip S. Cabot, The Sense of Immortality, 1924 Edgar S. Brightman, Immortality in Post-Kantian Idealism, 1925 Older Works Howe, The Redeemer’s Dominion Over the Invisible World N. L. Rice, On Immortality, Philadelphia, 1871 Isaac Taylor, Physical Theory of Another Life, 1858 Cremer, Beyond the Grave Whately, A View of Scripture Revelation Concerning a Future State, 1873 Perowne, On Immortality Bishop D. W. Clark, Man All Immortal, Methodist Book Concern, 1864 H. Mattison, The Immortality of the Soul, 1864 Thomas A. Goodwin, The Mode of Man’s Immortality, New York, 1874 John Fiske, The Destiny of Man, Boston, 1884 Luther A. Fox, Evidence of a Future Life, Philadelphia, 1874 The Intermediate State

T. Huidekoper, The Belief of the First Three Centuries Concerning Christ’s Mission to the Underworld, New York, 1876

George Bartle, Scriptural Doctrine of Hades, Philadelphia, 1870 J. Fyfe, The Hereafter: Sheol, Hades, and Hell, Edinburgh, 1889 S. H. Kellogg, From Death to Resurrection, New York, 1885 H. M. Luckock, The Intermediate State Between Death and Judgment, London, 1879

G. S. Barrett, The Intermediate State and the Last Things, London, 1896 A. Williamson, The Intermediate State, London, 1891 Watts, Souls Between Death and the Resurrection Charles H. Strong, In Paradise: or the State of the Faithful Dead, New York, 1893 E. H. Plumptre, The Spirits in Prison, London, 1884 Alford, State of the Blessed Dead Bush, The Intermediate State Townsend, The Intermediate World C. T. Wood, Death and Beyond Wightman, The Undying Soul and the Intermediate State V. U. Maywahlen, The Intermediate State, London, 1856 THE SECOND ADVENT The following bibliography includes the older sources from which most of the recent writers have drawn their material. The various positions are represented: pre-millennialism, post-millennialism, and nil or a-millennialism

Edward Bickersteth, The Divine Warning to the Church at This Time, 1849; The Glory of the Church; The Guide to the Prophecies; The Restoration of the Jews, (See Works, London, 1853)

Joseph Mede, Clavis Apocalyptica, Cambridge, 1627 (English translation by R. More, The Key of the Revelation, London, 1643) Thomas Burnet, Sacred Theory of the Earth, London, 1681 Joseph Perry, The Glory of Christ's Visible Kingdom in this World, Northampton, 1721 Nathaniel Homes, The Resurrection Revealed, or The Dawning of the Day Star, London, 1835, 1866

Henry Alford, Advent Sermons (Four on the State of the Blessed Dead, and four on The Coming of the Bridegroom), London, 1863 Increase Mather, Glorious Kingdom of Jesus Christ on Earth now Approaching, Boston, 1770 Carson, The Personal Reign of Christ During the Millennium Proved to Be Impossible, London, 1873 Richard Baxter, The Glorious Kingdom of God, London, 1691 Cummings, Apocalyptic Sketches, London, 1849; Great Tribulation, 1859; Great Preparation, 1861 Frere, Lectures on the Prophecies Relative to the Last Times, London, 1849

Joseph A. Seiss, The Last Times and the Great Consummation, Philadelphia, 1878; Lectures on the Apocalypse, New York, 1865, 1901 George Duffield, Dissertations on the Prophecies Relative to the Second Coming of Christ, New York, 1842; Millenarianism Defended, New York, 1843 J. S. Russell, The Parousia, London, 1887 William Burgh, Lectures on the Second Advent, London, 1845 Joseph Berg, The Second Advent of Christ, Not Premillennial, Philadelphia, 1859 Samuel Lee, Eschatology, or the Scripture Doctrine of the Coming of Our Lord, Boston, 1858 John Durant, Christ's Appearance the Second Time for the Salvation of Believers, 1653, Reprint, London, 1829 E. B. Elliott, Horae Apocalyptica (4 volumes), 1862 Brooks, Elements of Prophetical Interpretation A. A. Bonar, Redemption Drawing Nigh, Edinburgh, 1874 H. Bonar, Coming and Kingdom, London, 1849

T. R. Birks, The Four Prophetic Empires and the Kingdom of the Messiah, 1845; Outlines of Unfulfilled Prophecy, 1854; Plain Papers on Prophetic and Other Subjects Fraser, Key to the Prophecies, 1795 Capel Molyneux, The World to Come, 1853 McNeille, Lectures on the Jews

Samuel Hopkins, A Treatise on the Millennium, Edinburgh, 1806 . Waldegrave, New Testament Millenarianism, (Bampton Lecture), London, 1855 Urwick, Second Advent of Christ, Dublin, 1839 J. H. Alstead, The Beloved City, or The Saints Reign on Earth a Thousand Years, (By William Burton, London, 1643) G. Bush, Treatise on the Millennium

W. Kelly, Lectures on the Second Coming, London, 1866 J. C. Rankin, The Coming of the Lord, New York, 1885 Israel P. Warren, The Parousia, London, 1887 David Brown, Christ's Second Coming, Edinburg, 1849 Bishop S. M. Merrill, The Second Coming of Christ, New York, 1879 Joseph Burchell, The Midnight Cry, 1849

James H. Brookes, "Maranatha" or, The Lord Cometh, St. Louis, 1878 Nathaniel West, John Wesley and Premillennialism, Cincinnati, 1894 Daniel T. Taylor, The Reign of Christ on Earth, Boston, 1882 Henry Varley, Christ's Coming Kingdom, London, 1893 T. H. Salmon, Waiting the Coming One, London A. B. Simpson, The Coming One, New York, 1912 A. Sims, Behold He Cometh, 1900; Deepening Shadows and Coming Glories, Toronto, 1905 W. C. Stevens, Mysteries of the Kingdom, Nyack, 1904 I. M. Haldernann, Why 1 Preach the Second Coming, Revell, 1919 James Edson White, The Coming King, Pacific Press, 1898 Jesse Forrest Silver, The Lord's Return, Revell, 1914 L. L. Pickett, The Blessed Hope of His Glorious Appearing, Louisville, 1901; The Renewed Earth, Louisville, 1903 W. E. Blackstone, Jesus Is Coming, Revell, 1908 Charles Feinberg, Premillennialism or Amillennialism, Zondervan, 1936 The Duke of Manchester, The Finished Mystery Woods, The Last Things J. A. Bengel, Exposition of the Apocalypse, 1740 (Translated by John Robertson, London, 1751); Ordo Temporum, 1741

Symon Patrick, The Appearing of Jesus Christ, London, 1863 David N. Lord, The Coming and Reign of Christ, New York, 1858 THE RESURRECTION C. K. Staudt, The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period, Chicago, 1910 W. F. Whitehouse, The Redemption of the Body, London, 1895 George Bush, Anastasis, or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, New York, 1845 B. F. Wescott, The Gospel of the Resurrection, London, 1869 J. Maynard, The Resurrection of the Dead, London, 1897

C. S. Gerhard, Death and the Resurrection, Philadelphia, 1895 William Hanna, The Resurrection of the Dead, Edinburgh, 1872 J. Hall, How Are the Dead Raised Up and with What Body Do They Come? Hartford, 1875

J. Hughes-Games, On the Nature of the Resurrection Body, London, 1898 W. Milligan, The Resurrection of the Dead, Edinburgh, 1894 E. Huntingford, The Resurrection of the Body, London, 1897 J. G. Bjorklund, Death and the Resurrection from the Point of View of the Cell Theory, Chicago, 1910 William Hanna, The Resurrection of the Dead, Edinburgh, 1872 Kingsley, The Resurrection of the Dead Mattison, The Resurrection of the Dead Balfour, Central Truths and Side Issues, Edinburgh, 1895 Drew, Identity and General Resurrection of the Human Body, London, 1822 Goulburn, The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Same Body as Taught in the Holy Scripture, London, 1850

Landis, On the Resurrection Brown, The Resurrection of Life Cochran, The Resurrection of the Dead Cook, The Doctrine of the Resurrection D. A. Dryden, The Resurrection of the Dead, Cincinnati, 1872 THE FINAL CONSUMMATION

Reference must again be made to the standard works on Systematic Theology for the best treatment of this subject. Special treatises on Future Rewards and Punishments are given below Future Punishment J. B. Reimensnyder, Doom Eternal. The Bible and the Church Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, Philadelphia, 1880 Alvah Hovey, The State of the Impenitent Dead, 1859 Jackson, The Doctrine of Retribution, 1875 F. W. Farrar, Eternal Hope, 1878; Mercy and

Judgment: Last Words on Eschatology, 1881 Cochrane, Future Punishment

G. P. Fisher, Discussions in History and Theology, Scribners, 1880. Chapter on The History of the Doctrine of Future Punishment

Row, Future Retribution in the Light of Reason and Revelation, London McDonald, The Annihilation of the Wicked Scripturally Considered Pusey, Everlasting Punishment (Historical) Mead, The Soul and Hereafter W. G. T. Shedd, The Doctrine of Endless Punishment, 1886 Anderson, Future Destiny

Vernon, Probation and Punishment Goulburn, Everlasting Punishment Lewis, Ground and Nature of Punishment Bartlett, Life and Death Eternal Hopkins, Future State Newton, The Final State Stuart, Exegetical Essays (Cf. Sheol and Aion) Bishop S. M. Merrill, The New Testament Idea of Hell, Cincinnati, 1878.. L. T. Townsend, Lost Forever, Boston, 1874

Heaven E. H. Bickersteth, Hades and Heaven, New York, 1869 S. Fallows, The Home Beyond, Chicago, 1884 Thomas Hamilton, Beyond the Stars, or Heaven, Its Inhabitants, Occupations and Life, Scribners, 1889 H. Harbaugh, Heaven, Philadelphia, 1861; The Heavenly Home, 1853; The Heavenly Recognition, 1865 Archibald McCullagh, Beyond the Stars, or Human Life in Heaven, New York, 1887 R. W. Clark, Heaven and Its Scriptural Emblems, Philadelphia, 1856 G. Z. Gray, The Scriptural Doctrine of Recognition in the World to Come, New York, 1886 J. M. Killen, Our Companions in Glory, New York, 1862 J. A. Hodge, Recognition After Death, New York, 1889 R. Winterbotham, The Kingdom of Heaven and Hereafter, New York, 1898 I. C. Craddock, The Heaven of the Bible, Philadelphia, 1897

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